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Drivers for Change

- Changing nature of UK national quality assurance framework
  - Increased emphasis on data to evidence impact and outcomes e.g. the Teaching Excellence Framework
  - Changing regulatory requirements
- More explicit link to University Key Performance Indicators at programme level
- Flexible framework to facilitate changing requirements over time
- Remove separation (and duplication) between ‘quality assurance review and monitoring’ and ‘enhancement’ monitoring and action planning
  - More holistic approach
- Reduce bureaucracy and timescales, simplify process and reporting
- Process that facilitates different emphasis based on level of programme performance
Old v New

• **Previous Process**
  - ‘Continuous Monitoring of Taught Academic Provision’
  - Very detailed guidance note
    - 8 additional appendices
  - Bureaucratic - long commentaries, action plans and review reports
  - Large number of sources and types of monitoring evidence to review
  - Provided consistent data but no consistent approach to data analysis
    - Did not facilitate comparison across Department/Faculty/University
  - Difficult to ‘measure’ impact of actions
  - Time taken to complete process

• **New Process**
  - ‘Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review’ (AMER)
  - Based on review of programme performance against Data Dashboard
  - Dashboard drawn together from existing data sources
    - Presented in one format
  - Simple, concise guidance and templates
    - Guidance on maximum length
  - Additional focus on Department level review and scrutiny
    - Ownership
  - Shorter timeline by 2-3 months
Department level review stage

**CORE DATA 2016/17**
- National Student Survey
- Progression and retention
- Degree outcomes
- Unit Monitoring (including pass rates)
- Destination of Leavers in HE (DLHE)
- External Examiner reporting

**ADDITIONAL DATA (from 2017/18)**
- Linked to strategic initiatives/priorities
  - E.g. Fair Access targets, Student Mobility

---

**DEPARTMENT DASHBOARD**
- Sent to Head of Department for review and dissemination

**PROGRAMME ACTION PLAN**
- Programme team develop Action Plan
- Concise template also captures innovation/good practice

**DEPARTMENT SUMMARY AND ACTION PLAN**
- Head of Department reviews dashboard and approves all Programme Action Plans
- Writes concise Department Summary overview

---

- **August**
  - Head of Department dashboard has programme by programme breakdown

- **September**
  - Response required proportional to dashboard performance - light touch for high performing programmes, targeted actions and structured programme of support for lower performing programmes
Faculty level review stage

Review takes place at each Faculty Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee.

Deputy Dean Education prepares brief Faculty Summary.
Summary identifies cross-Departmental and any Faculty level actions.

Deputy Dean Education review may include review of additional data at Faculty level.

Regular review of Department and Faculty Action Plans.
Central Academic Quality team prepare over-arching summary report.

Draws out cross-institutional themes and issues, including good practice.
University level review stage

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE (ASC)
REVIEW AND APPROVAL
Approval of Faculty Summary and Action Plan

ASC also receives copies of Department Summaries, all Action Plans and Dashboards

- Focused review of Faculty level Summaries and Action Plans
- Overview prepared by Academic Quality team
- Identify any further institutional level actions
Initial Feedback and Next Steps

• General support for new process
• Implementation timescale short
  - Drop-in sessions helpful
• Templates generally easy to use but could be refined further
• Concerned not to lose richness of review from qualitative sources of monitoring evidence
• Enhancements for 2017/18
  - Refinements to templates and Data Dashboard
    - Possible inclusion of ‘additional’ metrics
  - Consideration of Postgraduate Research provision