**Annex E: Continuous Monitoring of Courses**
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# **Glossary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Acronym** | **Role** | **Note** |
| BoS | Board of Studies | Annex H, Annex I Divisions may opt to have Boards of Studies. |
| DESEC | Divisional Education and UG Student Experience Committee | Annex H |
| DGSSEC | Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee | Annex I |
| DoS | Director of Studies | Annex H, Annex I |
| DQSSC | Divisional Quality and Standards Sub-Committee | Annex H, Annex I |
| EASC | University’s Education and Academic Standards Committee | Terms of Reference: https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/committees/easc/index.html |
| ESEB | University’s Education and Student Experience Board | Terms of Reference:https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/committees/eseb/index.html |
| GRCB | University’s Graduate and Researcher College Board | Terms of Reference: https://www.kent.ac.uk/graduateschool/gsboard/index.html |
| NSS | National Student Survey | Survey of final year UG students onlyQuestions numbers refer to questions in 2023 survey |
| PTES | Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey | Survey of PGT students (managed by Advance HE) |
| QAAM | Divisional Quality Assurance and Accreditation Manager | The title of this role may vary between Divisions. |
| QACO | Quality Assurance and Compliance Office | https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/quality-assurance-compliance-office |
| OfS | Office for Students | Higher Education Regulator |
| SVF | Student Voice Forum | Annex M |
| VI | Validated Institution | Annex L, Annex P |

Note: Validated Institutions may have differently named roles and responsibilities. Equivalent roles and titles shall perform the functions outlined throughout this document to ensure institutional oversight.

# **Introduction to Continuous Course Monitoring**

* 1. The continuous monitoring of courses is part of the internal quality assurance system for taught courses.
	2. The purpose of the internal quality assurance system, as set out in the relevant Regulations, Code of Practice, Credit Framework, and additional guidance, is to assure the quality and standards of all provision in line with external and internal expectations.
	3. Externally, quality and standards are defined by the conditions of registration of the higher education regulator, the Office for Students.
	4. Quality is defined in conditions B1, B2, B3 and B4. Standards are defined in condition B5.
	5. The conditions set out the minimum baseline requirements that providers must meet to remain on the register of providers.
	6. Compliance with the conditions of registration means that the minimum baseline requirements are met.
	7. Continuous course monitoring is one element of internal quality assurance that the university uses to ensure compliance with the conditions.
	8. Continuous course monitoring also provides assurance that the internal expectations for quality and standards are met.
	9. It is action based. By identifying areas where courses are at risk of not meeting the baseline requirements, action plans be drafted. The implementation of action plans is monitored through each iteration of course monitoring.
	10. Continuous course monitoring also identifies opportunities for enhancement beyond the baseline requirements.
	11. Monitoring will also provide formal assurance to the responsible university governing bodies that quality and standards are being met for all courses at all times, and actions taken where they are at risk.

# **Specific Aims**

Continuous course monitoring should:

* Confirm that quality and standards of courses are met.
* Provide an opportunity for structured reflection on teaching provision.
* Facilitate the communication of good practice within and between areas of responsibility for teaching.
* Ensure that areas of concern within teaching provision are quickly addressed, and that the effects of any changes made are monitored.
* Ensure planned and necessary changes to courses are considered ahead of time in line with marketing deadlines and under consideration of CMA advice to be forward looking, according to the Principles of Compliance with Consumer Protection Laws.
* Feed into PSRB reports, periodic reviews, and strategic planning.
* Include students as partners.
* Be proportionate to risk.

# **Scope**

* 1. In line with the B conditions of regulation, the scope of this annex includes all taught provision.
	2. Taught provision is defined as all courses or modules delivered by the university, or on behalf of the university leading to a university award.
	3. It includes all taught provision at levels 4-8 and all provision at level 3 where the latter is integrated into a higher education qualification.[[1]](#footnote-2)
	4. It includes both courses and modules as contributing elements of courses.
	5. The processes defined in this annex should also be followed for provision offered through validated partners. Responsibilities allocated to specific units such as Divisions, Education or Quality Committees should be implemented by the equivalent organisational entities of the partner.

## **3.1. Unit of Reporting**

Continuous course monitoring of courses should be done for each course or cognate group of courses[[2]](#footnote-3). Usually, this would be for the course or courses for which a Director of Studies holds responsibility. A Division can define appropriate groups of courses for joint revision, if it is ensured that individual courses receive a sufficient level of scrutiny to enable a decision to be reached whether or not the course meets the expectation.

# **Relation to other quality assurance processes**

Continuous course monitoring provides the university with continuous assurance that the Conditions for Registration are complied with, that issues arising about the quality and standards of courses are identified in a timely manner and that action plans are set up and implemented where necessary.

It serves to pull together these assurances from different sources, in particular external data, survey data, External Examiner reports and student feedback.

## **4.1. Periodic Course Reviews**

Where continuous course monitoring is designed to identify short-term compliance issues, it complements Periodic Reviews of courses which take a longer-term and more strategic view of the educational offer. Periodic Reviews will focus more on enhancement than compliance.

Where continuous course monitoring demonstrates that courses have a low risk of breaching quality and standards expectations, and where reports are continuously compiled, periodic reviews will be more light touch. This means it will provide an opportunity to focus on excellence rather than on baseline compliance.

However, where continuous course monitoring has shown that courses are not consistently meeting the quality and standards, periodic reviews will offer a deep dive into the issues.

## **4.2. Accreditation / PSRB**

Some courses may be subject to Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) annual reporting requirements. Where this is the case, the Division may want to coordinate their continuous course monitoring reporting with the PSRB returns. It is recommended that the Division contacts QACO in these cases to discuss the details of the process.

## **4.3. Student Module Evaluations**

According to Annex M of the Code of Practice, the main focus of module evaluation is to “inform the annual monitoring of modules” and to “provide short-cycle, developmental feedback to assist staff to reflect on course/module design and teaching”[[3]](#footnote-4).

Results from module evaluations are one source of data that informs course monitoring.

## **4.4. External Examiner Reports**

These reports are collected annually and provide an external perspective and assurance that courses meet the quality and standards expectations as set out in the Code of Practice and Credit Framework.

External examiner reports are a source of data informing course monitoring.

## **4.5. Student Voice Forum**

Annexes M and N set out the requirements for student engagement in quality assurance processes and the implementation of Student Voice Forums. The issues discussed and actions agreed by a Student Voice Forum are a source of data informing course monitoring.

## **4.6. Annual Course Portfolio Review**

Annual Course Portfolio Reviews assess whether courses remain sustainable, attractive to potential applicants and sufficiently resourced. These reviews are described in a separate Annex.

# **Responsibilities**

## **5.1. Divisions**

Divisions are responsible for implementing the monitoring of courses and modules. They provide assurance that quality and standards of their taught provision are meeting the baseline requirements.

## **DESEC/DGSSEC**

Divisional Education and UG and / or PG Student Experience Committees, as appropriate, are expected to review the course level reports, identify any common themes and formally adopt any improvement plans. As monitoring of courses is done continuously, it is expected that each termly meeting of the DESEC/DGSSEC includes a review of the status of continuous course monitoring. This means that they should be aware of where course monitoring reports are not being compiled or where issues are identified that cannot be dealt with on the course level alone.

This will particularly help to identify any courses which are not on track to complete the monitoring.

DESECs/DGSSECs can delegate the operational responsibility to a Divisional Quality and Standards Sub-committee (DQSSC), if applicable.

## **Director of Studies**

The Directors of Studies are responsible for collating the information needed to complete the continuous monitoring report. They can draw information from course leaders, course directors, course and/or module convenors as necessary and depending on the local organisation in the Division.

They are also responsible for ensuring student input into the report.

Directors of Studies are responsible for ensuring that a continuous monitoring report is complete for each course at the end of an academic year.

They also update the DESCE/DGSSEC as relevant about progress and/or any issues identified. Specifically, they report about actions that will need Divisional level input.

## **Board of Study**

Where a Division operates Boards of Studies, these should discuss and approve updated to reports and any action plans prior to reporting to the DESCE/DGSSEC.

Where a Board of Study is the liaising Board for provision at a Validated Partner in line with Annex P, it will also consider the partner’s reports.

## **Students**

It is essential that students are involved in the continuous course monitoring of courses. This can be through involving them through meetings, allocating specific questions to students or engaging students through Student Voice Forums.

Normally, it will be the elected student representatives who will participate in the continuous course monitoring on behalf of the wider student body.

## **Divisional Quality Assurance Manager**

The Divisional Quality Assurance Manager supports the Director of Studies in compiling the report, helping to analyse data and interpreting the expectations of the Code of Practice and other relevant regulations.

The Divisional Quality Assurance Manager will also check that all course reports are updated in good time.

## **5.2. Validated Institutions**

Validated Institutions assign the responsibilities for completing the reports according to their own internal structure.

Where they have a liaising Board of Studies, they will provide updates to that Board, normally once per term. In other cases, report updates shall be submitted to the relevant DESEC/DGSSEC.

QACO receives a copy of the report.

## **5.3. University level**

## **EASC**

Divisions will report into the Education and Academic Standards Committee (EASC) for quality related matters and into the Graduate and Researcher College Board (GRCB) for student experience related matters (see Code of Practice for Taught Courses of Study, Annex I).

EASC deals with matters of quality and standards on behalf of the Education and Student Experience Board (ESEB) which reports to Senate.

A divisional report is to be submitted to the last meeting of EASC per calendar year (Appendix 2).

Based on the Divisional reports, EASC will:

* Receive confirmation that taught provision meets the quality and standards expectations as set out in this Annex and the B Conditions of Registration.
* Be assured that action plans are in place where any provision falls short of baseline requirements.
* Share examples of good practice across the university.
* Identify any common areas that need to be addressed university-wide.
* Report to ESEB and GRCB as relevant to provide university-wide assurance of compliance with the B conditions.
* Review the expectations and related data sets referred to in this annex and update where necessary.

## **Quality Assurance and Compliance Office (QACO)**

The Quality Assurance and Compliance Office supports Divisions in the implementation of continuous course monitoring. QACO provides advice and guidance on the process and on the interpretation of the Code of Practice.

QACO will regularly review and where necessary update this Annex based on feedback from the Divisions.

QACO also reviews the continuous course monitoring reports. QACO will check once per term whether reports have been progressed and will prompt the Divisional Quality Assurance Managers when a report is not being compiled for any specific course.

# **Approach and suggested timeframes**

## **6.1. Risk based approach**

A key element of the risk-based approach to course monitoring is that it is informed by data. In practice this means that Divisions will be able to see from the data where their provision falls below the expectations. It is expected that the continuous monitoring then focuses on these areas, reflecting on the context of and the “story behind” the data. These will then inform action plans where necessary.

Where the data shows that expectations are met, there is not usually a need for further analysis or action plans. However, it might be worthwhile reflecting on elements of good practice and further enhancement, particularly in working towards features of excellence.

## **6.2. Completing the report**

Continuous course monitoring is implemented throughout the academic year with several defined milestones which need to be completed.

In practice, this means that the continuous course monitoring report should be completed at various points throughout an academic year. This could ideally be three times per year to enable a spread of the workload.

The report template provides indicative dates of when data becomes available and links it to the corresponding requirements. It is important to note that it is neither expected that courses complete the whole report in one sitting nor immediately in each month when data is released. The workload can be managed according to the specific needs of the courses. Nevertheless, timeliness is encouraged to ensure actions can be implemented when necessary.

A template for the report is provided in Appendix 1. It can be filtered by data source or by condition.

Autumn term

This term is good to focus on student experience and assessment.

This means looking at applicant numbers, continuation rates from the previous academic year, and insights from assessment results.

External Examiner reports can also be analysed, if timings allow.

Spring term

During this term, it would be advisable to complete sections on the student experience, and resources. Data should be available from the module evaluations for autumn term modules.

Summer term

In the summer term, Divisions should reflect on feedback from the NSS survey. NSS results are usually made available to institutions at the beginning of July. Data should also be available from module evaluations for spring term modules.

External Examiner reports will usually be received four weeks after the Board of Examiner meetings. It is recommended that Divisions analyse them as soon as they come in, to also be able to provide a timely report to them (see Code of Practice for Taught Courses, Annex K for details[[4]](#footnote-5)).

## **6.3. Reporting to EASC**

When Divisions identify common areas of good practice, excellence or where there is room for improvement, this should be reported to EASC so that EASC can consider whether university-wide approaches or changes may be appropriate.

To allow this, a Divisional overview report is to be submitted to the last meeting of EASC of the academic year.

# **What do we need to review – Expectations for Courses**

The following table sets out the baseline requirements for courses based on the B conditions and the definitions of the conditions given by the Office for Students.

## **7.1. Student Outcomes (B3)**

| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Continuation | Extent to which, for each combination of mode and level of study, students achieve positive outcomes in respect of continuing in their studies. | OfS Dashboard | Above the OfS threshold per indicator, as relevant to the mode and level of study. |
| Completion | Extent to which, for each combination of mode and level of study, students achieve positive outcomes in respect of completing their studies. | OfS Dashboard | Above the OfS threshold per indicator, as relevant to the mode and level of study. |
| Progression | Extent to which, for each combination of mode and level of study, students achieve positive outcomes in respect of progressing into managerial or professional employment, or further study. | OfS Dashboard | Above the OfS threshold per indicator, as relevant to the mode and level of study. |

## **7.2. Course Design (B1)**

| **Baseline** | **Definition based on OfS B Conditions** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is up to date | * Representative of current thinking and practices.
* Appropriately informed by recent:
* subject matter developments;
* research, industrial and professional developments;
* developments in teaching and learning, including learning resources.
 | **Quantitative**:When was the curriculum last updated? When is the next update planned?How many modules within the course have been updated in the last/current academic year?**Qualitative**:Has PSRB accreditation been achieved, and is it still valid?What developments have been made in the subject area and when will they be implemented into the course? | Review and update when Subject Benchmarks are updated.Continuous accreditation where applicable. |
| Provides educational challenge | * No less than the minimum level of rigour and difficulty reasonably expected.
 | **Quantitative**: NSS Teaching on my course (questions 3,4)PTES (questions T3, T4) | Above benchmark |
| **Qualitative**: EE comment  | Positive comments |
| Is coherent | * Appropriate balance between breadth and depth of content;
* Subjects and skills are taught in an appropriate order and, where necessary, build on each other throughout the course; and
* Key concepts are introduced at the appropriate point in the course content.
 | Quantitative: NSS Learning Opportunities (questions 5, 6,)PTES (question T6) | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: EE comment | Positive comments |
| Effectively delivered | Taught, supervised and assessed (both in person and remotely) to ensure:* an appropriate balance between delivery methods, for example lectures, seminars, group work or practical study, as relevant to the content of the course; and
* an appropriate balance between directed and independent study or research, as relevant to the level of the course.
 | Quantitative: NSS learning opportunities (question 7, 8)PTES (question T5-T7)Student continuation rate within the course.Student pass rates on modules within the course.Number of appeals on course. | Above benchmarkAbove OfS continuation thresholdNeed to gather data year on year, then establish a PI |
| Qualitative:Any issues raise in Student Voice Forum | Action plans defined |
| Develop relevant skills | * Knowledge and understanding relevant to the subject matter and level.
* Other skills relevant to the subject matter and level including, but not limited to, cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills and professional competences.
 | Quantitative: NSS learning opportunities question 9)PTES (questions SD1-SD4)Graduate Outcome question (“I am utilising what I learned”): <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/graduates/table-8> | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative :EE comment | Positive comment |

## **7.3. Assessments (B4)**

| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Testing relevant skills  | * Knowledge and understanding relevant to the subject matter and level of the higher education course; and
* Other skills relevant to the subject matter and level of the higher education course including, but not limited to, cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills, and professional competences.
 | Quantitative: NSS Marking and assessment (question 12)PTES (question AF1-AF2, D6) | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: EE comment | Positive comment |
| Valid and Reliable | * Assessment in fact takes place in a way that results in students demonstrating knowledge and skills in the way intended by design of the assessment.
* An assessment, in practice, requires students to demonstrate knowledge and skills in a manner which is consistent between the students registered on a higher education course and over time, as appropriate in the context of developments in the content and delivery
 | Quantitative : NSS Marking and assessment (questions 11, 12)PTES (questions AF2, D5) | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: EE commentModeration process reports | Positive commentNo issues arisen |
| Effective  | * Assessed in a challenging and appropriately comprehensive way, by reference to the subject:
* providing stretch and rigour consistent with the level of the course;
* designed in a way that minimises the opportunities for academic misconduct and facilitates the detection of such misconduct where it does occur.
 | Quantitative: Number of pass, fail, resitFor apprenticeships: Timely completion of EPAsNumber of academic misconduct casesNumber of extension requestsNSS question 12, PTES D3, D5, SD1, SD6) | No increase in number of failsDecrease in case numbers over timeDecrease in request numbersAbove benchmark |
| Qualitative:EE comment on range of subject matter, assessment variety | Positive comments |
| Technical proficiency in English | * Effective assessment of technical proficiency in the English language in a manner which appropriately reflects the level and content of the course
 | Included in assessment criteria | Evidence of testing and marking |
| Feedback | * Feedback on students’ performance is given before a final essay or exam.
* Feedback is returned in time for students to learn from it before the next assessment.
 | Quantitative:NSS marking and assessment (questions 13, 14)PTES (questions AF3-AF4)Number of modules where feedback was not provided in due time | Above benchmarkNo such modules |
| Marking | * Marking is based on criteria in line with the sector-recognised standards for the relevant level of the course.
* Marking is in line with the Assessment Regulation Framework.
 | Quantitative:NSS marking and assessment (questions 10, 11)PTES (questions AF3-AF4) | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: EE comment on marking criteriaEE comment on consistency of markingpositive moderation reports | Positive comments |

## **7.4. Awards (B4, B5)**

| **Baseline** |  | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Credible | Relevant awards reflect students’ knowledge and skills:* The number of relevant awards granted, and the classifications attached to them, and the way in which this number and/or the classifications change over time and compare with other providers;
* Any actions taken that would result in an increased number of relevant awards, and/or changes in the classifications attached to them, whether or not the achievement of students has increased, for example, changes to assessment practices or academic regulations; and
* Reasons for any changes in the classifications over time or differences with other providers.
 | Quantitative:Proportion of Upper Seconds and First | No increase in classifications (unless explained) |
| Award at relevant level = Meets qualification descriptors | Defined in the sector-recognised standards[[5]](#footnote-6), part A.3. | Degree outcome data  | Trend towards level of 2018/19shows no unexplained inflation |
| Level 6 awards at right classification level |  | Qualitative: comment by EE that assessment criteria for level 6 achieved  | Positive comments |

## **7.5. Staff resources (B2)**

| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sufficient in number | * The larger the cohort size of students, the greater the number of staff and amount of staff time should be available to students:
* There is sufficient financial resource to recruit and retain sufficient staff;
* Appropriate financial resource allocated to ensuring staff are equipped to teach courses;
* Courses have an adequate number of staff, and amount of staff time;
* The impact on students of changes in staffing is minimal.
 | How many modules w/in a course could not be taught due to staff shortages?How many modules with only one staff to teach? | No such modulesNone, otherwise clear plan for cover |
| Appropriately qualified | Staff have and maintain:* expert knowledge of the subject they design and/or deliver;
* teaching qualifications or training, and teaching experience, appropriate for the content and level of the course
* required knowledge and skills as to effectively deliver their course.
 | Ratio of new, inexperienced teaching staff in any course.Participation of teaching staff in subject conferences, research. | To be defined by ASPP |
| Deployed effectively | n/a | Quantitative: students per pathway (Qlikview)How many sessions could be run as planned (how many sessions could not be run)NSS organisation and management (questions 17-18)PTES (OM1-OM5) | To be defined by ASPPAbove benchmark |
| QualitativeFeedback from students on course organisation | Positive feedback |

## **7.6. Physical and digital resources (B2)**

| **Baseline** |  | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sufficient physical resources | Sufficient teaching rooms, studios, laboratories etc. | Quantitative:NSS Learning resources questions 19-21PTES Learning resources questions LR1-LR4)No of rooms availableAny issues of labs > size of lab groups | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: feedback from SVF | Action taken for any identified issues |
| Sufficient library resources | Sufficient books and digital resources. | QuantitativeNSS question 20, PTES question LR1 | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: feedback from SVF | Action taken for any identified issues |
| Sufficient technical infrastructure | Sufficient computers, hardware and software. | QuantitativeNSS question 19, PTES question LR2 | Above benchmark |
| Qualitative: feedback from SVF | Action taken for any identified issues |
| Sufficient specialist resources | Sufficient specialist equipment, software and research tools. | NSS question 21, PTES question LR3 | Above benchmark |
| Feedback from SVFFeedback from module surveys | Action taken for any identified issues |

## **7.7. Student support (B2)**

| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic support | Support to help students with course content or on placements, to identify and address knowledge or skills gaps, and make decisions about future study choices, and support for disabled students. | Quantitative / qualitative: Participation rates in personal academic tutor meetings.NSS Academic support (questions 15-16)PTES (questions SD 6)Responses from induction survey.Indication of how students from different backgrounds are progressing (see also B3).Students contacting the Divisional Student Support Teams. Students referred to SSW, receiving ILPs. | Any recurring issues identifiedAbove benchmarkNumbers to be tracked year on year for comparison |
| Qualitative: comments from SVFIndication of different support for different student groups | Communication to students on Moodle, course handbooks |
| Support for teaching and learning | Including support to help students make best use of digital learning. | Quantitative:Number of support requests to library, IS, SLAS |  |
| Qualitative:Feedback through SVF, other surveys | Positive feedback |
| Support to avoid academic misconduct | Support relating to understanding, avoiding and reporting academic misconduct, including support for essay planning and accurate referencing, and advice about the consequences of academic misconduct. | Quantitative: Number of students doing module DP1025: Understanding and Avoiding PlagiarismNumber of referrals (from AMC app)Number of cases with penalty (from AMC app) | Any outlier modules identifiedDecrease in cases |
| Careers support | Information, advice and guidance students need to identify their capabilities and the way in which these may be suited to particular careers, and to articulate these in a way likely to result in successful job applications. | Quantitative: Number of engagements from careers staffPTES question SD6Students in professional employment from Graduate OutcomesProgression data from B3 | Engagement opportunity for all students on all courses documentedAbove thresholdAbove threshold |

## **7.8. Student Engagement (B2)**

| **Baseline** | **Definition** | **How do we know?** | **What do we expect?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Opportunities to provide survey responses | Opportunities, either individually or collectively, to provide feedback on their course and the way it is delivered.  | Survey response rates to NSS, PTESEngagement with module evaluationsNSS Student Voice (questions 22-24)PTES Student Voice (questions SV1-SV4) | Above 30% of the cohortAbove benchmark |
| Participation in course development | Student membership of, and effective contribution to, learning and teaching committees, or course-level committees, in a subject area, or department.  | Qualitative: Engagement in SVFEngagement in course development and course change processes | Participation in all processes |
| Membership in Divisional education committee and/or Board of Studies | Student membership of, and effective contribution to, committees responsible for academic governance and learning and teaching. | Qualitative: Evaluation of engagement in respective meetings | Participation in all meetings |

1. Higher education qualifications are defined by the [Sector-recognized Standards](https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/53821cbf-5779-4380-bf2a-aa8f5c53ecd4/sector-recognised-standards.pdf), Table 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. In line with Annex H, section 3 and/or Annex I, section 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Code of Practice, [Annex M Student Evaluation](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/documents/code-of-practice-taught/code-of-practice-taught-annex-m.docx). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. It is expected that the template for External Examiner reports will be updated in 2022/23 to reflect the new B conditions and to align better with continuous course monitoring requirements. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. [See the OfS Sector Recognised Standards](https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/53821cbf-5779-4380-bf2a-aa8f5c53ecd4/sector-recognised-standards.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)