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# Introduction

* 1. The University of Hull is committed to maximising the satisfaction of all its students wherever they experience learning. This Code of Practice sets out the University of Hull’s requirements for the Continual Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE) of taught programmes.
  2. In striving to improve student satisfaction and success, the University applies the same principles of continual monitoring, evaluation and enhancement to its collaborative provision. Where there are variances to the process these are highlighted throughout this document.
  3. The purpose of the Continual Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE) process is to maintain academic standards and to assure and enhance the quality of learning opportunities for students. The process requires critical reflection by those responsible for delivery of programmes (module leaders, programme directors, heads of academic units and Deans of faculties) on the student experience at programme and faculty level.
  4. The process is informed by key student satisfaction and performance indicators as well as the views of external stakeholders, such as External Examiners and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs).
  5. In addition to critical reflection and evaluation, the CMEE process allows programme and faculty teams to respond to evidence and feedback as and when the need arises, so that students and the programme can benefit from real time improvement.
  6. The outcomes of CMEE will be used to inform Developmental Engagement of Subjects (DES) processes.
  7. The Education Student Experience Committee (ESEC) is responsible for the interpretation and implementation of the CMEE Code of Practice.

# Responsibilities

* 1. Module Leaders complete module reviews, which are made available to programme directors.
  2. Programme Directors **complete** programme/portfolio review via programme journals.
  3. Heads of Academic Units are **responsible** for ensuring that programme directors complete programme journals.
  4. Associate Deans **engage** with Heads of Academic Units throughout the academic year to monitor the completion of the programme journals on behalf of Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC).
  5. FESEC has **responsibility** for the **completion** of the faculty journal. FESEC **reports** to the University Education Student Experience Committee (ESEC) annually in relation to the progress/actions of programme journals through the completion of the faculty journal.
  6. Deans of faculties are **accountable** for the CMEE process.
  7. The Quality Support Service is **responsible** for the completion of the Institutional Quality and Standards Report to Council.

# Collaborative Provision

* 1. Programme/Portfolio Review of collaborative provision is via the annual monitoring template and partner quality annual reporting.
  2. A summary of partners’ quality enhancement reporting is included in the University’s Institutional Quality and Standards Report.

# Module Review

* 1. Module review plays a key part in the CMEE process for assuring the maintenance of academic standards and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities for students.
  2. Module review is completed by module leaders after the completion of each module, providing opportunity for timely reflection, evaluation, intervention and effective enhancement activity.
  3. The process of completing the module review gives assurance that the module syllabus is relevant and up-to-date and the module specification continues to accurately represent the module.
  4. Furthermore, module review ensures that the teaching, learning and assessment approach for the module continues to be effective and allows feedback from the teaching team, external examiners and students to be promptly responded to.

## Evidence Base

* 1. Module leaders complete module reviews after the completion of each module allowing them to record, reflect upon, and respond to the student experience at module level through the referencing of key indicators, results and feedback.
  2. The current University MEQ process is part of module review.

## Access to module reviews

* 1. Results from module reviews **must** be used by programme directors in completing programme journals.
  2. Key student satisfaction and performance indicators that **must** be used to inform module reflection are provided within the guidance document for module review.

# Programme/Portfolio Review

* 1. Programme/Portfolio Review is the mechanism for ensuring the effectiveness and currency of programmes and promotes continued improvement through ongoing reflection.
  2. Programme/Portfolio Review requires programme directors to reflect on programme delivery during the year as key metrics become available and enables them to identify, via a **programme journal**, particular achievements, good practice and areas for development.
  3. Where academic units deliver similar programmes, these programmes can be grouped together and considered as a portfolio via a single programme journal subject to the approval of the relevant Associate Dean (Education).
  4. Programme journals are created for each programme/group of programmes leading to a University of Hull named undergraduate/postgraduate taught award of 60-credits or more.
  5. Programme journals are not required for awards of fewer than 60-credits. Monitoring, evaluation and enhancement of the module(s) that contribute to such awards will be achieved via module review.
  6. Where a programme journal covers more than one programme, one member of academic staff **must** be designated as lead by the head of academic unit to have oversight of all of the programmes in the portfolio. The lead staff member is responsible for completing the programme journal and reporting any concerns, themes, good practice and enhancements.
  7. Where programmes involve more than one academic unit, for example joint, with cross-Faculty programmes, the owning Faculty is responsible for identifying who will complete the programme journal.
  8. The application of CMEE to dual awards will be defined in the relevant Collaborative Delivery Plan.

## Evidence Base

* 1. Although the focus of this Code of Practice is at programme and faculty level, it is integrated with wider reporting processes. This ensures appropriate oversight of actions to address areas for development dissemination of good practice.
  2. The programme journal is a reflection on the evidence at module and programme level.
  3. Key student satisfaction and performance indicators that **must** be used to inform programme reflection are provided within the guidance document for the programme journal.
  4. Programme teams **should** also reflect on any other areas of practice identified (e.g., what is going well/not so well for the programme) and consider local implementation of university-wide initiatives.

## Access to programme journals

* 1. Programme directors **must** update programme journals throughout the programme’s lifetime.
  2. Only the programme director **should** edit the programme journal but all members of the faculty **must** be able to view the journal.
  3. As each new piece of evidence becomes available, there **must** be reflection in the programme journal. Any actions arising or good practice identified **must** be recorded.

# Faculty Review

* 1. The Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC) has managerial responsibility for programmes within its faculty and, therefore, has responsibility for the completion of the **faculty journal**.
  2. It is expected that FESEC will consider programme journals, on a trimesterly basis to identify the key issues, effective practice, enhancements and actual/anticipated impact on the student learning experience. This information will feed into the faculty journal.
  3. Whilst the process of CMEE is continual, the faculty journal **must** be submitted annually to Quality and Standards Committee (QSC) as the faculty’s main reporting mechanism to assure the maintenance of its academic standards and to assure and enhance the quality of learning opportunities for students. The faculty journal will summarise areas for development, effective practice and enhancements across the faculty – see below in 7.

## Evidence base

* 1. The faculty journal is a ‘live’ document that is updated by FESEC throughout the academic year, enabling timely reflection, intervention and effective enhancement activity.
  2. Any matters for escalation arising from FESEC and/or the CMEE process are reported to the University Education Student Experience Committee (ESEC) throughout the year.

## Access to faculty journals

* 1. FESEC with oversight from the Associate Deans for Education and Student Experience **must** update faculty journals throughout the academic year.

# Reporting to University Quality and Standards Committee (QSC)

* 1. FESEC will submit the faculty journal annually to the Quality and Standards Committee (QSC). FESEC faculty journals **must** demonstrate oversight of the CMEE process and have:

1. considered the academic quality and standards of programmes, ensuring that each programme has undertaken the process.
2. identified examples of effective practice and enhancement activity for dissemination within the faculty or university.
3. drawn together key themes and trends.
4. demonstrated actual/anticipated impact on the student learning experience.
5. identified and addressed any areas for development/enhancement.

# Institutional Report

* 1. FESEC faculty journals will inform the annual Institutional Report to Council. The purpose of the report is to assure University Council that the University is meeting its obligations in respect of the Office for Students (OfS) conditions for registration (condition B), core practices are being reviewed effectively, all programmes are maintaining academic standards, and that outcomes are being used to drive enhancement.
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