Annex E: Annual Monitoring

1 Schools are responsible for annual monitoring of modules, programmes and student progress, determining action to be taken as a consequence and reporting on these matters to Faculty Boards. This section of the Code of Practice sets out detailed requirements in relation to such annual monitoring.

2 The purpose of annual monitoring is:
   - To address whether UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether Kent’s academic standards are being maintained.
   - To provide an opportunity for structured reflection on teaching provision.
   - To facilitate the communication of good practice within and between areas of responsibility for teaching.
   - To ensure that significant areas of concern within teaching provision are addressed, and that the effects of any changes made are monitored.
   - To affirm that programme specifications remain current and appropriate.
   - In addition for collaborative provision programmes, to comment on the management of any risks identified (and the current risk status) at the approval stage of the partner/programme, plus any additional risks identified since approval.

Annual monitoring is the formal reporting of, and response to, actions taken as a result of the ongoing review and evaluation of provision, aimed at enhancing the student learning process. Improvements to provision should not be delayed because of the reporting timetable described below.

3 Monitoring of Modules

3.1 The Board of Studies (or, as appropriate, the School Education Committee or School Graduate Studies Committee if there is no appropriate Board of Studies) is responsible for assuring that each of the modules for which it is responsible is being delivered satisfactorily.\(^1\)

If any of the following conditions apply to a particular module, the Board of Studies should receive and consider, normally at its first meeting of the academic year, a report (prepared by the convenor) on delivery in the previous academic year of that module. The conditions are:

i. the module is new, or has been significantly changed\(^2\) since previously delivered (possibly as the result of a previous report);

ii. significant issues have been raised at the Board of Examiners, or by external examiners, or by review panels (e.g. internal periodic review, or professional/statutory bodies), including any indication that academic standards are not being met;

\(^1\) It should be noted that ensuring the effective monitoring of modules taken primarily as part of an undergraduate programme is the responsibility of the School Education Committee. Ensuring the effective monitoring of modules taken primarily as part of a postgraduate programme is the responsibility of the School Graduate Studies Committee.

\(^2\) i.e. has required Faculty re-approval.
iii. significant issues have been raised by students (e.g. through module evaluation or at Staff-Student Liaison Committee meetings);

iv. There is a poor progression or completion rate (i.e. when, after an initial resit attempt where permitted, 15% or more of the students taking a module fail to achieve the pass mark required for the module);

v. Where otherwise requested by the Director of Studies (or, as appropriate to the module, the School Director of Education or School Director of Graduate Studies).

Any such reports which are considered to be unsatisfactory (e.g. because there are significant areas of concern which are not addressed) should be referred back for revision.

3.2 The report should include a record of, and comments on, significant areas of good practice and concern in:

3.2.1 **The student experience of the module.** This will be informed by: student feedback on the module (whether via internal questionnaire, Staff-Student Liaison Committees, or other methods), by the distribution of marks awarded (especially the proportion of students failing the module), any comments made by external examiners or Boards of Examiners, the outcomes of assessment (including any significant differences between cohorts or campuses), and any issues relating to adjustments to the module made to facilitate access by disabled students.

3.2.2 **The content and delivery of the module.** Including issues of teaching and learning resources. This section must include an evaluation of the effect of any changes made, either as a result of comments from External Examiners, or reports from previous years, or otherwise. It should also include a justification of any actions which will be taken (or are being taken already) to address any issues identified or still unresolved. See [http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/documents/quality-assurance/codes/taught/docs/copt-annexe-modulemonitoring-template.doc](http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/documents/quality-assurance/codes/taught/docs/copt-annexe-modulemonitoring-template.doc) for a template.

4 **Monitoring of Programmes**

4.1 The School Education Committee should receive and consider, normally at its first meeting of the academic year, a report on each undergraduate programme or group of cognate undergraduate programmes for which it is responsible.

Similarly, the School Graduate Studies Committee should receive and consider, normally at its first meeting of the academic year, a report on each taught postgraduate programme or group of cognate taught postgraduate programmes for which it is responsible.

4.2 The reports should be prepared by the appropriate Director of Studies. Any such reports which are considered to be unsatisfactory should be referred back for revision. These reports should include:

4.2.1 Confirmation that satisfactory reports have been received for all modules where a report was necessary. Any major issues identified in these module reports (i.e. those which require action across modules or any indication that academic standards are not being met on particular modules) should be highlighted in the programme report, along with a description of any resulting action which is to be taken (or is being taken). This should include a description of the changes that have been made to programme specifications in response to revisions made to modules that are compulsory on the programmes of study in question, and a confirmation that, as appropriate, the programme specifications have been submitted for re-approval as per Annex C.
4.2.2 A record of, and comments on, significant areas of good practice and concern in the student experience of the programme(s). This will be informed by: student feedback on the module (whether via internal questionnaires, the National Student Survey, Staff-Student Liaison Committees or other methods); any comments made by external examiners or review panels on the programme(s) as a whole; statistical data on applications, student progression and achievement (including any significant differences between cohorts or campuses) and student employability, and any issues relating to adjustments to the programme made to facilitate access by disabled students.

4.2.3 A record of, and comments on, significant areas of good practice and concern in the content and delivery of the programme(s). Including issues of teaching and learning resources. Any planned changes to the programme(s) and the effect of any changes made, either as a result of comments from external examiners or review panels, or reports from previous years, or otherwise, must be explicitly addressed.

4.2.4 In addition for collaborative provision programmes, the report should include a commentary on the management of any risks identified (and the current risk status) at the approval stage of the partner/programme, plus any additional risks identified since approval.

Notes:
1. Statistical and student evaluation data should not be included in programme monitoring reports, but must be made available to the School Education Committee or the School Graduate Studies Committee, as appropriate to the programme, to assist in its evaluation of those reports.

2. Where more than 5% of the students in a given year of study taking a programme or group of programmes withdraw, this should be seen as requiring investigation and comment. Similarly, if more than 5% transfer to other programmes or if more than 5% fail, this should be investigated and addressed in the report.


5 School Annual Monitoring Report for Undergraduate Programmes

5.1 School Education Committees should submit an annual monitoring report to the Faculty Education Committee, normally at its first meeting in the Spring term, comprising:

5.1.1 Confirmation that the School has received satisfactory reports for all of the programmes (or groups of programmes) for which it is responsible. Or, if not, explaining why not and when they are expected.

5.1.2 Confirmation that threshold academic standards and Kent’s academic standards for awards above the threshold are being met for the programmes concerned;

5.1.3 A record of significant issues raised in those reports, or at School level from external examiners’ reports, Periodic Programme Review, PSRB accreditation reports, and the results of NSS, ISS and PGT surveys.

---

3 For the purposes of this Code, the integrated masters programme is regarded as an undergraduate programme.
5.1.4 Comments and authorisation of any commentary regarding the management of any risks identified at, or since, the approval stage of collaborative partnerships/programmes.

5.1.5 A description of the action(s) the School has taken or will take in response to the issues noted above.

5.1.6 An evaluation of the effect of those actions identified in the previous year’s report.

5.1.7 A description of the mechanism(s) the School uses to identify, disseminate and import good practice and of any improvements/initiatives put in place which will enhance the student learning experience.

This report should normally be no more than two pages in length. See http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/documents/quality-assurance/codes/taught/docs/copt-annexe-school-template.docx for a template.

5.1.8 Where all of the UG programmes offered by a School represent a single cognate group of programmes and there is but a single Director of Studies and Board of Studies, the programme level annual monitoring report may be submitted by the School Education Committee to the Faculty Education Committee in lieu of the School Annual Monitoring Report for Undergraduate Programmes.

5.2 Where the Faculty Education Committee approves a School Annual Report for Undergraduate Programmes, the School should be so informed by the Faculties Support Officer.

5.3 Where the Faculty Education Committee does not feel able to approve a School Annual Report for Undergraduate Programmes, the School should be informed by the Faculties Support Officer of the reasons for this and asked to submit a revised report by a specified date.

5.4 The Faculty Education Committee should report to the Faculty Board on its consideration of the School Annual Reports for Undergraduate Programmes, drawing attention to those not submitted by the due date, those referred back for revision and those considered to be examples of good practice.

5.5 The Faculty Board should report to the Education Board:

5.5.1 on whether all School Annual Reports for Undergraduate Programmes have been received and considered and on whether or not they are considered to be satisfactory;

5.5.2 on whether UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether Kent’s academic standards are being maintained;

5.5.3 in the case of reports which the Faculty Board considers to be unsatisfactory: the action taken by the Faculty Board;

5.5.4 examples of good practice arising from the reports on undergraduate programmes which the Faculty Board considers to be worthy of dissemination;

5.5.5 issues identified in its consideration of School Annual Reports for Undergraduate Programmes which require action at the University level.

6 School Annual Monitoring Report for Taught Postgraduate Programmes

6.1 School Graduate Studies Committees should submit an annual monitoring report to the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee, normally at its first meeting in the Spring term, comprising:

---

4 For the purposes of this Code, Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas are regarded as postgraduate programmes.
6.1.1 Confirmation that the School has received satisfactory reports for all of the programmes (or groups of programmes) for which it is responsible. Or, if not, explaining why not and when they are expected.

6.1.2 Confirmation that threshold academic standards and Kent’s academic standards for awards above the threshold are being met for the programmes concerned;

6.1.3 A record of significant issues raised in those reports, or at school level from External Examiners’ reports, Periodic Programme Review, PSRB accreditation reports, and the results of NSS, ISS and PGT surveys.

6.1.4 Comments and authorisation of any commentary regarding the management of any risks identified at, or since, the approval stage of collaborative partnerships/programmes.

6.1.5 A description of the action(s) the School has taken or will take in response to the issues noted above.

6.1.6 An evaluation of the effect of those actions identified in the previous year’s report.

6.1.7 A description of the mechanism(s) the school uses to identify, disseminate and import good practice and of any improvements/initiatives put in place which will enhance the student learning experience.

This report should normally be no more than two pages in length. See http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/documents/quality-assurance/codes/taught/docs/copt-annexe-school-template.docx for a template.

6.1.8 Where all of the PGT programmes offered by a School represent a single cognate group of programmes and there is but a single Director of Studies and the Board of Studies, the programme level annual monitoring report may be submitted by the School Graduate Studies Committee to the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee in lieu of the School Annual Monitoring Report for Taught Postgraduate Programmes.

6.2 Where the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee approves a School Annual Report for Taught Postgraduate Programmes, the School should be so informed by the Faculties Support Officer.

6.3 Where the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee does not feel able to approve a School Annual Report for Taught Postgraduate Programmes, the School should be informed by the Faculties Support Officer of the reasons for this and asked to submit a revised report by a specified date.

6.4 The Faculty Graduate Studies Committee should report to the Faculty Board on its consideration of the School Annual Reports for Taught Postgraduate Programmes, drawing attention to those not submitted by the due date, those referred back for revision and those considered to be examples of good practice.

6.5 The Faculty Board should report to the Graduate School Board:

6.5.1 on whether all School Annual Reports for Taught Postgraduate Programmes have been received and considered and on whether or not they are considered to be satisfactory;

6.5.2 Confirmation that threshold academic standards and Kent’s academic standards for awards above the threshold are being met for the programmes concerned;

6.5.3 in the case of reports which the Faculty Board considers to be unsatisfactory: the action taken by the Faculty Board;

6.5.4 examples of good practice arising from the reports on postgraduate programmes which the Faculty Board considers to be worthy of dissemination;
6.5.5 issues identified in its consideration of School Annual Reports for Taught Postgraduate Programmes which require action at the University level.

7 Quality Enhancement and Annual Monitoring

7.1 Annual monitoring, as it is described here, is largely separate from ideas of quality enhancement, and of capturing and disseminating good practice (but see section 5.1.7 above). Although elements of good practice may well be revealed by annual monitoring, there is a need for schools to develop separate mechanisms for capturing and disseminating good practice from its own provision, and for importing good practice from elsewhere in the University and beyond.

7.2 Section 5.1.7 identifies this activity as the responsibility of the School Education Committees and the School Graduate Studies Committees, the owners of the report of which 5.1.7 is a part. Appropriate mechanisms will vary depending on the size and structure of the school, and on the extent to which the school is engaged with external structures (PSRBs, etc.). Given that the University has separate reporting structures for the annual monitoring of UG and PGT programmes, schools may wish to consider the benefits of creating an overarching forum where the enhancement of learning and teaching on taught programmes may be considered holistically.