1. Introduction

1.1. Divisions are responsible for the **Annual Monitoring** of modules, courses and student progress, determining action to be taken as a consequence and reporting on these matters to the Education and Student Experience Board (in respect of undergraduate and postgraduate taught courses). Annual monitoring seeks to assure the quality standards of taught provision.

1.2. Divisions are also responsible for undertaking an **Annual Course Portfolio Review** of their undergraduate and postgraduate taught courses and modules. The intention of this review is to ensure that courses remain sustainable, to identify actions to be undertaken to address any areas of concern, and to identify areas of good practice.

1.3. This Annex of the Code of Practice sets out detailed requirements in relation to both:

1.3.1. **Annual Monitoring** for the purpose of assuring quality standards and meeting the requirements and expectations of the Quality Assurance Agency¹;

1.3.2. **Annual Course Portfolio Review** for ensuring course provision is sustainable, fit for purpose and attractive to applicants.

1.4. The timelines for both **Annual Monitoring** and **Annual Course Portfolio Review** processes occur simultaneously in order to ensure that the outcomes of annual monitoring usefully feed into the Annual Course Portfolio Review, thus ensuring maximum efficiency of the process.

This parallel process of reflection and action is set out in a four-step process below.

2. Purpose and Aims

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 (see section 3).

2.2. As indicated in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education\(^2\), effective monitoring and evaluation aims to contribute to sustaining successful standards in relation to courses and modules because it can aid the development of clear objectives, promote ownership from relevant stakeholders, help to assess student satisfaction and influence long-term strategic decision making.

2.3. The purpose of **Annual Monitoring** is to:

2.3.1. address whether UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether Kent’s academic standards are being maintained.

2.3.2. reflect upon the Division’s ability to ensure that students have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK universities.

2.3.3. provide an opportunity for structured reflection on teaching provision.

2.3.4. facilitate the communication of good practice within and between areas of responsibility for teaching.

2.3.5. ensure that significant areas of concern within teaching provision are addressed, and that the effects of any changes made are monitored.

2.3.6. affirm that course specifications remain current, well-designed and appropriate, providing a high quality academic experience and enabling student achievement to be reliably assessed.

2.3.7. review the progress of students on the course(s), both generally and with regard to various aspects of student success (retention, attainment gaps, etc.);

2.3.8. reflect and report on the performance of the courses as disaggregated in relevant data and league tables throughout the year (e.g. UG: NSS, TEF metrics; PGT: Complete University Guide, PTES);

2.3.9. in addition for collaborative provision courses, to comment on the management of any risks identified at the approval stage of the partner/course, plus any additional risks identified since approval, in order to provide an assessment of the current risk status.

2.4. The purpose of **annual course portfolio review** is to:

2.4.1. assess whether all courses remain sustainable, attractive to potential applicants and of educational worth;

2.4.2. identify action to be taken by course owners to address any areas of concern;

2.4.3. identify courses that are performing particularly well, and, therefore, to commend subject areas and learn from their good practice.

\(^2\) Refer to https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/monitoring-and-evaluation
3. Timeframe and Deadlines

3.1. Divisions should undertake Annual Monitoring and Annual Course Portfolio Review every academic year. The following table shows the recommended deadlines that Divisions should adhere to in order to ensure that outcomes can be actioned within timeframes prescribed by other University deadlines and quality assurance requirements, for example, withdrawing a course as per Annex C.³

3.2. Divisions should adhere to the following deadlines for Annual Monitoring and Annual Course Portfolio Review:

³ https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/ga/codes/taught/annexc.html
### 4. Responsibilities

4.1. Boards of Studies are responsible for undertaking the process of **Annual Monitoring** of modules, courses and student progress, determining action to be taken as a consequence, ensuring that quality standards are met and
reporting on these matters to their Divisional Education and UG Student Experience Committee (DESEC) (in respect of undergraduate courses) and the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee (DGSSEC) (in respect to postgraduate taught courses).

4.2. Boards of Studies are responsible for reflecting on how satisfactorily the courses and modules it delivers meet the University's requirements for success and sustainability in order to inform the Divisional Annual Course Portfolio Review.

4.3. The Divisional Education and UG Student Experience Committee (DESEC) (in respect of undergraduate courses) and the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee (DGSSEC) (in respect to postgraduate taught courses) are responsible for overseeing the process of Annual Monitoring of modules, courses and student progress, determining action to be taken as a consequence and reporting these matters to the University's Education and Academic Standards Committee.

4.4. The DESEC (in respect of undergraduate courses) and the DGSSEC (in respect to postgraduate taught courses) are responsible for overseeing the process of the Annual Course Portfolio Review to ensure that courses remain sustainable, to identify actions to be undertaken to address any areas of concern, and to identify areas of good practice.

4.5. The DESEC (in respect of undergraduate courses) and the DGSSEC (in respect to postgraduate taught courses) are responsible for ensuring that outcomes of the Annual Course Portfolio Review are actioned within timeframes prescribed by other University deadlines and quality assurance requirements, for example, withdrawing a course as per Annex C or informing the Central Student Administration Office of module amendments prior to module registration.

4.6. The Director of Division (or nominee) is responsible for Chairing the Annual Course Portfolio Review and has overall responsibility for ensuring that courses remain sustainable, identifying actions to be undertaken to address any areas of concern, identifying areas of good practice, and reporting these matters to the Academic Strategy, Planning and Performance Board.

5. The Annual Monitoring and Annual Course Portfolio Review Process

5.1. The following sections provide detailed information on the Annual Monitoring and Annual Course Portfolio Review process. The responsible Board, Committee or individual for each step of the process are described in section 4 and deadlines are described in section 3.

5.2. There are four steps to the process:

5.2.1. **Step 1**: Annual Monitoring and reflection on sustainability of courses and modules by the Board of Studies, for report to DESEC, DGSSEC and input into the Annual Course Portfolio Review;
5.2.2. **Step 2**: Oversight and consideration of Annual Monitoring by the DESEC and DGSSEC (see Annexes H\(^4\) and I\(^5\)) for reporting to EASC;

5.2.3. **Step 3**: Annual Course Portfolio Review by the Director of Division (or nominee);

5.2.4. **Step 4**: Actioning of outcomes within timeframes prescribed by University deadlines and quality assurance requirements, and report to EASC or Academic Strategy, Planning and Performance Board.

6. **Step 1: Annual Monitoring and consideration of sustainability of Modules and Courses by the Board of Studies**

6.1. **Step 1: Modules – Annual Monitoring (Quality and Standards))**

6.1.1. The Board of Studies is responsible for assuring that each of the modules for which it is responsible is being delivered satisfactorily.

6.1.2. The Board of Studies Divisional Education and UG Student Experience Committee (DESEC) (with reference to undergraduate courses) and the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee (DGSSEC).

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

6.1.3.1. the module is new, or has been significantly changed\(^6\) since previously delivered (possibly as the result of a previous report);

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

6.1.3.3. significant issues have been raised by students (for example, through module evaluation\(^7\) or at Student Voice Forum meetings);

6.1.3.4. 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);

---


\(^6\) i.e. has required re-approval by the Division

\(^7\) Including the feedback of students returning from a work-based/placement learning experience, see Annex Q, section 7 at [https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/annexq.html](https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/annexq.html).
6.1.3.5. where otherwise requested by the Director of Studies (or, as appropriate to the module, the Divisional Director of Education and UG Student Experience).

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

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

6.1.5.1. **The student experience of the module.** This will be informed by: student feedback on the module (whether via internal questionnaire, Student Voice Forum, or other methods), by the distribution of marks awarded (especially the proportion of students failing the module), any relevant 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.

6.1.5.2. **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.

6.1.5.3. A reflection on the module in question in the context of the module 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 Director of Division (or nominee).

6.1.5.4. See the Annual Module Monitoring Report template

6.2. **Step 1 (continued): Modules – consideration of module portfolio sustainability**

6.2.1. The **Board of Studies** is responsible for reflecting on how satisfactorily the modules it delivers meet the University’s requirements for success and sustainability in order to inform the Divisional **Annual Course Portfolio Review**.

6.2.2. Whilst undertaking Annual Module Monitoring, the Board of Studies should simultaneously reflect on the sustainability of its module portfolio.

6.2.3. The intention of this review is to ensure that module portfolios remain lean, fit for purpose and wholly supportive of the Division’s objectives and the principles set out in the University Curriculum Policy.

---

8 [https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/ga/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexe-mod-monitor-template.docx](https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/ga/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexe-mod-monitor-template.docx)
6.2.4. The Director of Division (or nominee) shall receive a report from the Board of Studies on its reflections on the sustainability of its undergraduate and postgraduate module portfolio, normally by the end of February.

6.2.5. Where it is determined that a module is no longer sustainable, withdrawal should be recommended (refer also to Annex B\(^9\) section 14 of the Code of Practice).

6.2.6. Boards of Studies should refer to the expectations on the Division that it will take action where the review indicates any of the following:

6.2.6.1. The module has a high failure rate: as stated in section 6.1.3.4, 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, Divisions may wish to set their own failure rate indicator, up to 15% as set out below.

6.2.6.2. The module’s average recruitment is regularly below the Division’s acceptable minimum. Divisions 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.

6.2.6.3. If the module is not anticipated to run in the future, it should be withdrawn.

6.2.6.4. 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 courses of study, the module should be withdrawn.

6.2.6.5. The module is found to have a point of high risk of non-delivery\(^10\): 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.

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

6.2.8. See the Annual Course Portfolio Review template\(^11\). The Board of Studies should complete Section 1 for its subject area.

6.3. **Step 1 (continued): Courses – Annual Monitoring (Quality and Standards)**

6.3.1. The **Board of Studies** is responsible for assuring that each of the courses for which it is responsible is being delivered satisfactorily.

---

\(^9\) [https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexb-modules.pdf](https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexb-modules.pdf)


\(^11\) [https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexe-course-portfolio-review-template.docx](https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexe-course-portfolio-review-template.docx)
6.3.2. The Divisional Education and UG Student Experience Committee (DESEC) (with reference to undergraduate courses) and the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee (DGSSEC) should receive and consider, normally by the end of February, a report on each undergraduate and postgraduate taught course of study or group of cognate courses of study for which it is responsible.\footnote{For the purposes of this Code, the integrated Master’s course is regarded as an undergraduate course.}\footnote{For the purposes of this Code, Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas are regarded as postgraduate taught courses.}

6.3.3. Reports should be prepared by the appropriate Director of Studies and are considered in the first instance by the relevant Board of Studies. Any such reports which are considered by the DESEC or DGSSEC to be unsatisfactory should be referred back to the Board of Studies for revision. Reports should include:

6.3.3.1. 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 course monitoring 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 course specifications in response to revisions made to modules that are compulsory on the course(s) of study in question, and a confirmation that, as appropriate, the course specifications have been submitted for re-approval as per Annex C.

6.3.3.2. A record of, and comments on, significant areas of good practice and concern in the student experience of the course(s). This will be informed by: student feedback on the modules (whether via internal questionnaires, the National Student Survey, Student Voice Forum or other methods); any comments in reports from external examiners or review panels on the course(s) as a whole; Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditation reports, feedback from other stakeholders such as employers, 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 course made to facilitate access by disabled students.

6.3.3.3. A record of, and comments on, significant areas of good practice and concern in the content and delivery of the course(s). Including issues of teaching and learning resources. Any planned changes to the course(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.
6.3.3.4. A review of the progress of students on the course(s), both generally and with regard to various aspects of student success (retention, attainment gaps, etc).

6.3.3.5. To reflect and report on the performance of the courses as disaggregated in relevant data and league tables throughout the year (UG: NSS, TEF metrics; PGT: Complete University Guide, PTES).

6.3.3.6. A commentary confirming that the course as a whole addresses Kent’s Graduate Attributes\textsuperscript{14}.

6.3.3.7. A commentary confirming that the course as a whole addresses Kent’s Strategic Objective in respect of ‘Education’\textsuperscript{15}.

6.3.3.8. A commentary informed by the discussions and outcomes of the course portfolio review of the previous academic year. The report should set out what actions the Division 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 Director of Division (or nominee);

6.3.3.9. For collaborative provision courses, 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/course, plus any additional risks identified since approval, including the actions taken or to be taken in response to those risks.

6.3.4. See the Annual Course Monitoring Report template\textsuperscript{16}.

6.3.5. \textbf{Notes}:

6.3.5.1. Statistical and student evaluation data should not be included in course monitoring reports, but must be made available to the Education and UG Student Experience Committee, as appropriate to the course(s), to assist in its evaluation of those reports.

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

6.3.5.3. A Guide to Preparing Annual Monitoring Data is available at \url{http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/guidance/data.html}.

\textsuperscript{14}Kent’s Graduate Attributes are: Confidence; Creativity and Innovation; Critical Reflection; Global/Cultural Awareness; Integrity and Accountability; Intellectual Curiosity; and Resilience. For details see \url{https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/grad-goals}

\textsuperscript{15}The relevant Strategic Objective is “Kent provides an excellent education, delivered by world class researchers”. This is achieved through a number of Strategic Aims. For details see the Strategic Plan 2015-20, pages 8-9 at \url{https://www.kent.ac.uk/ovc/vc/documents/university-plan-2015-2020%20(1).pdf}

\textsuperscript{16}\url{https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexe-course-monitor-template.docx}
6.4. **Step 1 (continued): Courses – consideration of course portfolio sustainability**

6.4.1. The **Board of Studies** is responsible for reflecting on how satisfactorily the courses it delivers meet the University's requirements for success and sustainability in order to inform the Divisional **Annual Course Portfolio Review**.

6.4.2. Whilst undertaking Course Annual Monitoring, the Board of Studies should simultaneously reflect on the sustainability of its course portfolio.

6.4.3. The intention of this review is to ensure that courses remain sustainable, to identify actions to be undertaken to address any areas of concern, and to identify areas of good practice.

6.4.4. The Director of Division (or nominee) shall receive a report from the Director of the Board of Studies on its reflections on the sustainability of its undergraduate and postgraduate taught course portfolio, normally by the end of February. The relevant Head of School shall also receive a copy of the report.

6.4.5. Where it is determined that a course is not sustainable, withdrawal should be recommended (refer also to Annex C, section 8 of the Code of Practice, on course withdrawal).

6.4.6. When reflecting upon the sustainability of its portfolio, the Board of Studies should refer to the requirements of the Divisional **Annual Course Portfolio Review**:

6.4.6.1. Annual Course Portfolio Review should lead to a determination of whether or not each course of study is sustainable, attractive to prospective students and of educational worth. Such discussions should be informed by:

6.4.6.1.1. an examination of the metrics for each course (see Appendix A for the metrics);

6.4.6.1.2. consideration of other relevant reporting and monitoring information, for example results and comments from the National Student Survey and Undergraduate Student Survey;

6.4.6.1.3. consideration of the results of the Division's review of its module portfolio (see section 6.1);

6.4.6.1.4. consideration of the results of the student module evaluation (see Annex M: **Student Evaluation**¹⁷, section 3);

6.4.6.1.5. the University's Curriculum Policy;

6.4.6.1.6. any other relevant information and factors influencing the delivery of learning and teaching in the Division.

---

6.4.7. See the Annual Course Portfolio Review template\textsuperscript{18}. The Board of Studies should complete Section 1 for its subject area.

7. **Step 2: Oversight of Annual Monitoring by the Divisional Education and UG Student Experience Committee or Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee**

7.1. The Divisional Education and UG Student Experience Committee (in relation to undergraduate courses) and the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee (in relation to postgraduate taught courses) should receive and consider, normally at its spring term meeting, a report on each undergraduate and postgraduate taught course of study or group of cognate courses of study for which it is responsible.\textsuperscript{19,20}

7.2. The purpose of the report is to provide the DESEC or DGSSEC assurance that quality standards for courses and modules are being met to the appropriate thresholds as laid out in section 2.

7.3. The reports should be prepared by the appropriate Director of Studies and are considered in the first instance by the relevant Board of Studies (see section 6). Any such reports which are considered by the DESEC or DGSSEC to be unsatisfactory should be referred back to the Board of Studies for revision.

7.4. Reports should include:

7.4.1. 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 course monitoring 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 course specifications in response to revisions made to modules that are compulsory on the course(s) of study in question, and a confirmation that, as appropriate, the course specifications have been submitted for re-approval as per Annex C.

7.4.2. A record of, and comments on, significant areas of good practice and concern in the student experience of the course(s). This will be informed by: student feedback on the modules (whether via internal questionnaires, the National Student Survey, Student Voice Forum or other methods); any comments in reports from external examiners or review panels on the course(s) as a whole; Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditation reports, feedback from other stakeholders such as employers, teachers, and employers.

\textsuperscript{18} https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexe-course-portfolio-review-template.docx

\textsuperscript{19} For the purposes of this Code, the integrated Master’s course is regarded as an undergraduate course.

\textsuperscript{20} For the purposes of this Code, Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas are regarded as postgraduate taught courses.
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 course made to facilitate access by disabled students.

7.4.3. A record of, and comments on, significant areas of good practice and concern in the content and delivery of the course(s). Including issues of teaching and learning resources. Any planned changes to the course(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.

7.4.4. A commentary confirming that the course as a whole addresses Kent’s Graduate Attributes\(^\text{21}\).

7.4.5. A commentary confirming that the course as a whole addresses Kent’s Strategic Objective in respect of ‘Education\(^\text{22}\).

7.4.6. A commentary informed by the discussions and outcomes of the course portfolio review of the previous academic year. The report should set out what actions the Division 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 Director of Division/their nominee.

7.4.7. For collaborative provision courses, 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/course, plus any additional risks identified since approval, including the actions taken or to be taken in response to those risks.

7.5. See the Annual Course Monitoring Report template\(^\text{23}\).

7.6. **Notes:**

7.6.1. Statistical and student evaluation data should not be included in course monitoring reports, but must be made available to the DESEC and DGSSEC, as appropriate to the course(s), to assist in its evaluation of those reports.

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

\(^{21}\) Kent’s Graduate Attributes are: Confidence; Creativity and Innovation; Critical Reflection; Global/Cultural Awareness; Integrity and Accountability; Intellectual Curiosity; and Resilience. For details see [https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/grad-goals](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/grad-goals)

\(^{22}\) The relevant Strategic Objective is “Kent provides an excellent education, delivered by world class researchers”. This is achieved through a number of Strategic Aims. For details see the Strategic Plan 2015-20, pages 8-9 at [https://www.kent.ac.uk/ovc/vc/documents/university-plan-2015-2020%20(1).pdf](https://www.kent.ac.uk/ovc/vc/documents/university-plan-2015-2020%20(1).pdf). To be updated when new plan published

\(^{23}\) [https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexe-course-monitor-template.docx](https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/documents/copt2020-annexe-course-monitor-template.docx)
7.6.3. A Guide to Preparing Annual Monitoring Data is available\textsuperscript{24}.

7.7. The DESEC and DGSSEC will report to the University-level Education and Academic Standards Committee (EASC). See section 9 for details.

8. **Step 3: Annual Course Portfolio Review by the Director of Division (or nominee) (Sustainability)**

8.1. Divisions shall undertake an annual review of their portfolios of undergraduate and postgraduate taught courses, to be carried out during March. The intention of this review is to ensure that courses remain sustainable, to identify actions to be undertaken to address any areas of concern, and to identify areas of good practice.

8.2. Where it is determined that a course is not sustainable, withdrawal should be recommended (refer also to Annex C, section 8 of the Code of Practice).

8.3. The portfolio review should be undertaken during March of each academic year. This will allow time for the review outcomes to be factored into the preparation of Divisional plans. The scheduling of Step 1 of the process during January/February will allow for the portfolio review to take place during March with detailed input from the Divisional Boards of Studies.

8.4. The portfolio review will be Chaired by the Director of Division (or nominee) and consist of relevant members of the Division plus any other required colleagues outside of the Division. Membership will include:

- Director of Division (or nominee): Chair
- Director of Operations
- Divisional Director of Education and UG Student Experience
- Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience
- Divisional Heads of Schools
- Divisional Quality Assurance and Accreditations Manager
- Director of Division (or nominee) from another Division: external input
- Student representative (from another Division)
- Member of the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office: advisory capacity

8.5. The portfolio review should lead to a determination of whether or not each course is sustainable, attractive to prospective students and of educational worth. Such discussions should be informed by:

8.5.1. an examination of the metrics for each course (see Appendix A for the metrics);

\textsuperscript{24} See [http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/guidance/data.html](http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/guidance/data.html)
8.5.2. consideration of other relevant reporting and monitoring information, for example results and comments from the National Student Survey and Undergraduate Student Survey;

8.5.3. consideration of the results of the Division’s review of its module portfolio (see section 4);

8.5.4. consideration of the results of the student module evaluation (see Annex M: Student Evaluation, section 3);

8.5.5. the University’s Curriculum Policy;

8.5.6. any other relevant information and factors influencing the delivery of learning and teaching in the Division.

8.6. Annual course portfolio review reports on undergraduate and postgraduate taught courses of study will be submitted to the Education and Student Experience Board via the Education and Academic Standards Committee (EASC) and to the Graduate and Researcher College Board for reports on postgraduate research courses of study.25

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

9. Step 4: Reporting to University Boards and ensuring outcomes are actioned within timeframes prescribed by University deadlines and quality assurance requirements

9.1. Step 4: Reporting to University Boards – Annual Monitoring (Quality and Standards)

9.1.1. The DESEC and DGSSEC will report the outcomes of the Annual Monitoring process to the University Education and Academic Standards Committee (EASC) for consideration during the summer term.

9.1.2. EASC will consider the following outcomes:

9.1.2.1. whether UK threshold academic standards are achieved and whether Kent’s academic standards for awards are being maintained;

9.1.2.2. confirm that students are given the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK universities;

9.1.2.3. whether all Annual Monitoring Reports for undergraduate/postgraduate taught courses have been received and considered and on whether or not they are considered to be satisfactory;

9.1.2.4. where the DESEC or DGSSEC consider a report to be unsatisfactory, the action taken to rectify the issue;

---

25 Refer to the Code of Practice for Research Courses of Study Annex E: Annual Monitoring at [https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/research/annexe.html](https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/research/annexe.html).
9.1.2.5. a summary of significant issues raised in the reports and the actions being taken to rectify such issues;

9.1.2.6. examples of good practice arising from the annual monitoring reports that the DESEC or DGSSEC consider to be worthy of dissemination, which may be to Division staff and/or students, as appropriate;

9.1.2.7. issues identified in its consideration of the annual monitoring reports that require consideration at the University level.


9.1.4. EASC will report the outcomes to the Education and Student Experience Board.

9.2. Step 4: Reporting to University Boards – Annual Course Portfolio Review (Sustainability)

9.2.1. The Director of Division (or nominee) will report the outcomes of the Annual Course Portfolio Review directly to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic Strategy, Planning and Performance within two weeks of the review meeting.

9.2.2. The Director of Division (or nominee) will also report outcomes of the Annual Course Portfolio Review the University Academic Strategy, Planning and Performance Board (ASPPB) for consideration during the summer term.

9.2.3. The DVC and ASPPB will consider the following outcomes:

9.2.3.1. whether all courses remain viable, attractive to potential applicants and of educational worth;

9.2.3.2. actions identified to be taken by course owners to address any areas of concern;

9.2.3.3. identification of courses that are performing particularly well, and, therefore, to commend subject areas and learn from their good practice.

9.3. Step 4: Ensuring outcomes are actioned – Annual Course Portfolio Review (Sustainability)

9.3.1. The Division is responsible for ensuring that actions arising from the Annual Course Portfolio Review relating to withdrawal/suspension/amendment to course and module specifications are actioned in accordance with Annexes B (Approval and Withdrawal of Modules) and C (Approval and Withdrawal of Taught Courses) of the Code of Practice.

9.3.2. All such actions referred to in section 9.7.1 must be approved and actioned by the end of July in order to minimise the impact upon existing students, recruitment, other University processes (for example, module registration and timetabling) and Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) requirements.
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9.3.3. The Division will also be responsible for notifying the relevant Central Student Administration Office, Data Quality Team, MORA and any other relevant stakeholders of any actions relating to their areas of work.

10. Data Protection

10.1. Those involved with annual monitoring must ensure that staff and student anonymity is maintained, both within reports and in the communication of findings.