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# Introduction

* 1. This code of practice sets out the University of Hull’s requirements for the annual monitoring, review and enhancement of taught programmes for collaborative provision.
  2. The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) UK Quality Code outlines its expectations that Higher Education providers review their core practices for quality regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvements and enhancements.
  3. Monitoring refers to the regular and continuous reflective and evaluative practice in which staff are expected to engage collectively and individually to provide a ‘health check’ of academic provision as detailed in module and programme specifications.
  4. The quality management of modules, programmes and courses is the responsibility of module leaders, programme directors, heads of academic units and Deans of faculties.
  5. The Education Committee (EC) on behalf of the University manages the AMREP process.
  6. The processes at the University of Hull provide opportunities for identifying areas for improvement and enhancement and promoting and sharing good practice. This is achieved by the effective and transparent use of a wide range of available data and evidence to inform improvement actions. The early identification of areas for improvement ensures the maintenance of academic standards and/or the enhancement of the quality of student learning opportunities and experience.
  7. The University of Hull is committed to maximising the satisfaction of all its students wherever they experience learning.
  8. The process for the annual monitoring of collaborative provision is:

1. Module Reports (recommended as good practice but there is no requirement to complete or submit to the University);
2. Programme Review and Enhancement Report;
3. Institutional Review and Enhancement Report;
4. A summary of partners’ Institutional Review and Enhancement Reports is included in the University’s Institutional Quality and Standards Report.
   1. Producing these reports provides the opportunity to determine what is important for modules and programmes to develop in their provision. Academic teams are required to make effective use of a range of sources of evidence when completing reports and action plans.
   2. The following key indicators will inform academic teams in their analysis:
5. Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs);
6. The reports of external examiners;
7. Student survey results (e.g. internal Student Survey, National Student Survey (NSS). Including free text comments and key issues raised;
8. Data relating to recruitment and admissions, entry tariff, enrolment, assessment marks, progression and retention, percentage of good Honours (UG only);
9. Graduate Outcomes results (where available);
10. Recommendations made at University Validation Panels;
11. Issues and good practice raised at Student Staff Forums;
12. If available, feedback from former students, staff, employers and professional bodies (PSRBs) as appropriate.
    1. Additionally, module/programme teams will consider how any initiatives originating from University Academic Committees can be implemented.

# Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs)

* 1. All modules must be evaluated each trimester by a set of standard questions. Please refer to the University Code of Practice: Standardised Module Review Process, Mid-Module Review and Module Evaluation Questionnaires.
  2. Results from student completion of MEQs form part of the data available to module and programme leaders for completion of their annual reports.

# Module Reports

* 1. The process of completing the Module Report gives assurance that:

1. The module syllabus is relevant and up-to-date, and the module specification continues to accurately represent the module;
2. The teaching, learning and assessment approach for the module continues to be effective;
3. There is formal opportunity for reflection and evaluation which may lead to further developments; and
4. Feedback from the teaching team, external examiners and students is promptly responded to.

# Programme Review and Enhancement Report

* 1. The development of the programme report requires programme directors, programme management teams and the institution’s quality team to use the analysis provided in module reports to confirm explicitly whether academic standards are being maintained, in line with the UK Quality Code.
  2. The process of reviewing a programme encourages teams to identify areas of good practice where deliberate steps are being taken to improve provision and the student experience. The process also requires active consideration of quality indicators, such as student feedback results, student outcomes and additional programme metrics. Analysis of all information must be detailed in the report including how any issues are being responded to.
  3. The programme report aims to refer to as much data as possible as it becomes available. The deadline for the report submission also aims to allow enough time for data to become available for both two and three trimester programme cycles.
  4. Programme reports include an additional section for Academic Contacts to complete, this section is to assure consistency of the student experience and academic standard, and to feedback on:

1. Assessment tasks and the standard of student performance;
2. Student attainment compared to that of students on comparable programmes;
3. Student support;
4. Strengths or areas of good practice worthy of wider dissemination.

# Institutional Review and Enhancement Report

* 1. The Quality Support Service produces an Institutional Quality and Standards Report annually. This report is to assure University Council and Senate that the University’s core practices are effectively reviewed, all programmes are maintaining academic standards, and the outcomes are being used to drive enhancement.
  2. Partner institutions are required to complete an annual institution-level report. This includes a section for faculties to contribute feedback. The Quality Support Service convenes a panel to review the data, analysis and proposed actions included in the report. The panel should verify or identify areas of good practice and for development and respond to any feedback or recommendations made to the University by the partner institution.

# AMREP in brief

## Collaborative provision

* Module reports (recommended as good practice but there is no requirement to complete or submit to the University);
* Programme Review and Enhancement Reports produced by programme leaders, or equivalent;
* Programme Review and Enhancement Reports inform the Institutional Review and Enhancement Report;
* Institutional Review and Enhancement Reports sent to Quality Support Service;
* Quality Support Service circulate Institutional Review and Enhancement Reports to faculty quality teams for feedback;
* Panels are convened to review Institutional Review and Enhancement Reports including faculty feedback and programme reports.

# Action plans

* 1. The AMREP process promotes a prompt response and implementation of action plans. This includes:

1. prompt referral of any issues requiring institutional action to the appropriate service area or University Committee;
2. the early identification, recording and dissemination of good practice in a timely manner; and
3. the tracking of issues and improvement actions, so that stakeholders, including students, staff and external examiners are aware of such actions.
   1. In all cases, a clear locus of responsibility for the ownership of improvement actions at module, programme, faculty and institution level is identified.
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