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, sustainable 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.

2.1 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.

Modules

3 Annual Module Portfolio Review

3.1 Schools should undertake an annual review of their portfolios of undergraduate and postgraduate taught modules. The intention of this review is to ensure that module portfolios remain lean, fit for purpose and wholly supportive of the School objectives and the principles set out in the University Curriculum Policy.

3.2 Where a module is determined to be no longer sustainable, withdrawal should be recommended (refer also to Annex B, section 14 of the Code of Practice, on module withdrawal).

3.3 The relevant School should take action where the review indicates any of the following:
   - The module has a high failure rate.

   As stated in subsection 4.2 (iv) below, a failure rate of 15% or more is one of the annual monitoring conditions. It is appreciated that this limit may not support the identification of performance outliers for some modules and, therefore, Schools may wish to set their own failure rate indicator, up to 15% as set out below.

   - The module’s average recruitment is regularly below the School’s acceptable minimum.

   Schools should set an acceptable minimum recruitment for their modules. Modules that fail to meet this minimum should be reviewed, and withdrawn if actions fail to address the poor recruitment.

   - The module is not anticipated to run in the future.
If the module is not expected to run in the future it should be withdrawn.

- The module does not contribute to the School’s aims and objectives.

If the School determines that a module does not/no longer contributes to the achievement of its aims, or is no longer required in order to deliver the learning objectives of its programmes of study, the module should be withdrawn.

- The module is found to have a point of high risk of non-delivery.¹

If the School determines that a module has, or is likely to have, a high risk of non-delivery the School must take steps to ensure this is addressed as quickly as possible.

3.4 Validated Institutions and Partner Colleges are not required to undertake the module portfolio review.

4 Annual Module Monitoring Reports

4.1 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.²

4.2 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 changed³ 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;

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.

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

---

² 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.
³ i.e. has required Faculty re-approval.
4.3.1 **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.

4.3.2 **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. For a template, 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).

4.3.3 **A reflection on the module programme portfolio review of the previous academic year.** The report should set out what actions the School has taken or is planning to take as a result of the portfolio review, including any arising from a formal action plan, if one was agreed with the Dean/their nominee.

**Programmes**

5 **Annual Programme Portfolio Review**

5.1 Schools should undertake an annual review of their portfolios of undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes of study, to be carried out in advance of the planning round. The intention of this review is to ensure that the programmes of study remain sustainable, to identify actions to be undertaken to address any areas of concern, and to identify areas of good practice.

5.2 Where a programme of study is determined to be not sustainable, withdrawal should be recommended (refer also to Annex C, section 8 of the Code of Practice, on programme withdrawal).

5.3 The portfolio review should be undertaken in March of each academic year. This will allow time for the review outcomes to be factored into the preparation of School and Faculty plans.

5.4 Schools need not undertake the portfolio review in the academic year that they are subject to Periodic Programme Review.

5.5 The portfolio review should be undertaken by relevant members of School staff and the Dean of the Faculty (or their nominee) plus any other relevant colleague. It should lead to a determination of whether or not each programme of study is sustainable, attractive to prospective students and of educational worth. Such discussions should be informed by:

- an examination of the metrics for each programme (see Appendix A for the metrics);
- consideration of other relevant reporting and monitoring information, for example results and comments from the Undergraduate Student Survey;
- consideration of the results of the School review of its module portfolio (see section 4);

---

4 As per Annex F
• the University’s Curriculum Policy;
• any other relevant information and factors influencing the delivery of learning and teaching in the School.

5.6 The Faculties Support Office will be responsible for arranging and servicing the reviews. This will include the provision of documentation and compiling an overall report for each Faculty. Faculty reports will be reported to Education Board via the Academic Standards and Quality Committee and Graduate School Board.

5.7 Validated Institutions and Partner Colleges are not required to undertake the programme portfolio review.

6 Annual Programme Monitoring Reports

6.1 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.

6.2 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:

6.2.1 Include 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.

6.2.2 Include 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.

6.2.3 Include 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.

6.2.4 Be informed by the discussions and outcomes of the programme portfolio review of the previous academic year. The report should set out what actions the School has taken or is planning to take as a result of the portfolio review, including any arising from a formal action plan, if one was agreed with the Dean/their nominee.
6.2.5 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.


7 **School Annual Monitoring Report for Undergraduate Programmes**

7.1 School Education Committees should submit an annual monitoring report to the Faculty Education Committee, normally at its first meeting in the Spring term, and after the School’s annual programme portfolio review meetings have been held, to enable the content and outcomes of the review to inform the report. Reports should comprise:

7.1.1 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.

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

7.1.3 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.

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

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

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

7.1.7 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.

7.1.8 This report should normally be no more than two pages in length. For a template, see [http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/documents/quality-assurance/codes/taught/docs/copt-annexe-school-template.docx](http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/documents/quality-assurance/codes/taught/docs/copt-annexe-school-template.docx).

---

5 For the purposes of this Code, the integrated Master’s programme is regarded as an undergraduate programme.
UNIVERSITY OF KENT
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7.1.9 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.

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

7.3 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.

7.4 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.

7.5 The Faculty Board should report to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC):

7.5.1 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;

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

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

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

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

7.6 ASQC will report the outcomes to the Education Board.

8 School Annual Monitoring Report for Taught Postgraduate Programmes

8.1 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, comprise:

8.1.1 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.

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

8.1.3 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.

---

For the purposes of this Code, Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas are regarded as postgraduate programmes.
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8.1.4 Comments and authorisation of any commentary regarding the management of any risks identified at, or since, the approval stage of collaborative partnerships/programmes.

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

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

8.1.7 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.

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

8.1.9 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.

8.2 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.

8.3 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.

8.4 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.

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

8.5.1 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;

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

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

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

8.5.5 issues identified in its consideration of School Annual Reports for Taught Postgraduate Programmes which require action at the University level.

9 Quality Enhancement and Annual Monitoring

9.1 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 7.1.7 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.

9.2 Section 7.1.7 identifies this activity as the responsibility of the School Education Committees and the School Graduate Studies Committees, the owners of the report of which 7.1.7 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.