University Code of Practice

Programme Monitoring and Review

Document reference:	QH:C12
Date first approved:	May 2019
Date coming into force:	September 2019
Date last reviewed:	September 2023
Date amended to current version:	August 2025
Current version no:	2.01
Approved by:	Academic Board
Responsibilities:	Programme Coordinators Director of Academic Programmes and Research Head of Academic Quality and Learning Module leaders and lecturers Students – academic and professional staff External Examiners Quality Enhancement Committee Academic Quality and Standards Committee
Application to collaborative provision:	**Mandatory**
Contacts:	Head of Academic Quality and Learning
Applications for exemptions to:	Academic Quality and Standards Committee
Report exemptions to:	Academic Board

Summary/ Description:

This Code sets out the University's approach to the monitoring and review of its academic programmes and their constituent modules. The process is designed to be streamlined and forward-looking in that its focus is on identifying opportunities to enhance the quality of learning opportunities provided to students and on identifying effective practice and innovation that can be shared across the University.

The process also has a key role in providing assurance to the University (Academic Quality and Standards Committee and Academic Board) and to students and external stakeholders that: programmes are current, relevant and meeting the objectives identified at the approval stage; and that the University's academic standards are being maintained and are comparable with other degree-awarding bodies (especially those in the UK).

The process brings together the ongoing evaluation of the provision at module and programme level and is founded on three key elements: engagement with students in a variety of ways; other sources of feedback (including staff, external examiners and external stakeholders); and the analysis of data relating to each module and the programme as a whole (including data from previous years). An important feature of the process is the partnership between staff and students to capture agreed ideas for enhancing the learning experience and that the effectiveness of initiatives and activities are continuously monitored.

The layers and different stages in the process culminate in a Programme Review and Enhancement Plan (PREP) completed by the Programme Coordinator at the end of each year. The PREP, which goes to Academic Quality and Standards Committee, ensures that there is an effective and annual overview of the performance of each academic programme and provides assurance that there has been effective evaluation (such as through student engagement) during the year. The PREP also provides the basis for identifying any major or minor amendments which will require the approval of the University (under the Code on Programme Approval (QH:C2)) or proposals to withdraw the programme (for example because it is not recruiting well, has become outmoded and/or is being replaced by another programme).

Academic Quality and Standards Committee is responsible for overseeing the process and for receiving for consideration the reports from all programmes. The Committee will also receive an overview report which provides a summary of the key issues, themes and risks emerging from the monitoring and review of each programme, and highlights notable examples of effective or innovative practice which merit sharing across the University. AQSC is responsible for alerting Academic Board to any risks to academic standards or the quality of learning opportunities identified through the process.

Further Guidance

See the Introduction to the Quality Handbook (QH:A1) for further guidance and explanations of:

- how the Handbook is designed to work and what it covers and does not cover
- how it is structured
- the 'external reference points' and established practice which have informed each of the Codes
- key concepts and themes
- some suggestions for further reading
- a quick guide to each Code, including definitions and things to watch out for.

This university Code has been written in accordance with the approach approved by the University to enhance clarity involving the following terminology: must = mandatory should = advisable may = desirable. Where these terms are used they are emphasised in bold.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of contents 3
Introduction 4
Authority 4
Scope of the Code 4
Application to collaborative provision 4
Principles 4
Confidentiality 5
Student engagement 5
Monitoring and review 5
Involving students 6
Module Evaluation and Enhancement Report 7
Programme Review and Enhancement Plan 8
Annual Report on Academic Standards, Quality Assurance and Enhancement 10
Flowchart of Annual Monitoring & Enhancement: Taught Programmes 11

INTRODUCTION

1 Monitoring and review is a process of critical reflection by staff responsible for the design and delivery of programmes as a means to assure the quality of provision, the maintenance of standards and to promote enhancement by reflecting on actions previously taken, identifying actions, and identifying and sharing effective practice. This forms part of the process of reflecting on the design and delivery of individual modules, reflecting on feedback from a range of sources – especially students and external examiners – and making effective use of data.

2 Through review at programme level the University is able to identify issues at cross-programme level especially examples of good practice which are worthy of sharing beyond an individual programme. It also helps the University assure itself, students and other stakeholders that programmes are achieving their aims as set out in the original approval, and provides the basis for the enhancement of the University's provision.

Authority

3 The Academic Quality and Standards Committee is the final arbiter of the application and interpretation of this code of practice.

Scope of the Code

4 This Code applies to programmes classified by Academic Board as taught and which lead to the award of the University's higher education qualifications (as set out in the Academic Regulations: Taught Programmes (QH:C1)).

Application to collaborative provision

5 Unless specified by the Academic Board, this Code applies to all provision referred to in paragraph 4 whether that provision is delivered by the University or another approved provider in accordance with a formal legal agreement.

PRINCIPLES

6 The University's processes for monitoring and reviewing modules and entire programmes are designed to reflect the following principles, that monitoring and review:

(a) is a process of engagement and reflection between academic staff who designed and deliver and assess the provision, students and professional services staff informed by appropriate quantitative and qualitative evidence
(b) is forward looking and focused on actions that can be taken to enhance the student learning experience and more effectively secure the academic standards of the award
(c) enables effective practice to be identified and where appropriate to be shared across the programme and University
(d) involves engagement with students directly and through their representatives (recognising that different students will engage in such a process in different ways)

(e) makes effective use of the expert opinions of external examiners
(f) provides assurance to students that their views are taken seriously by providing them with feedback on actions being taken and the reasons for not acting where that is the case
(g) takes place in ways which enable consideration of the detail of individual modules as well as the programme as a whole
(h) provides assurance to the University that the process is being implemented seriously and effectively
(i) provides assurance to the University that its provision is of high-quality and that its academic standards are secure or that where this is not entirely the case deficiencies are identified and improvements introduced.

Confidentiality

7 Feedback provided by students, staff and others **should** be shared with students as part of the process of reflection and consideration of possible actions.

8 Information should not be shared only where:

(a) sharing it would identify individual students (student feedback should be summarised where there are common themes)
(b) it has been provided in confidence.

Student engagement

9 The University's commitment to working with students as partners and valuing their engagement and contribution in decision-making is set out in the Code on Students as Partners (QH:F1). Students are encouraged to recognise the value to the University and to future students of giving feedback on their experience and suggestions for improvements even where those suggestions will not directly benefit them, for example because they have completed the module to which their feedback relates.

10 As indicated above student engagement means students:

(a) providing feedback on their experience of the module/programme
(b) making suggestions for improvements
(c) commenting on the suggestions of others (such as a draft action plan)
(d) being informed of the progress against the action plan.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

11 The streamlined process is designed to enable programmes and their constituent modules to be reviewed effectively, drawing on appropriate sources of information. The Programme Review and Enhancement Plan, completed at the end of the academic year, is also designed to be fluid in encouraging feedback and consideration of possible improvements throughout the year, especially at the module level. Ideas for improvements from whatever source are translated into enhancement plans at different points throughout the process, with responsibilities assigned and timelines for implementation agreed. The effectiveness of

planned actions is continuously monitored and evaluated so that adjustments can be made if necessary.

12 The process is also designed to encourage engagement with students at the module level so that discussion about improvements is not left until the end of the year but can occur during a module directly with students and through the scheduled meetings of the Student-Staff Liaison Committee.

Involving students

13 The effectiveness of the University's approach to monitoring and review depends significantly on ongoing dialogue with students in inviting their feedback on their experience, ideas for improvements, and their views on ideas presented by staff which are based on other sources of feedback.

14 Students **should** be provided with opportunities to be involved in a dialogue and to give feedback on both positive and negative perceptions of their experience in an atmosphere that enables them to feel free to express their views openly.

15 The University provides opportunities for student involvement through a variety of means. These include:

(a) Surveys
  (i) ad hoc or interim surveys (for example on a specific issue)
  (ii) module feedback
  (iii) end (or near end) of programme evaluation questionnaires

(b) Representation as members on committees:
  (i) Student-Staff Liaison Committee
  (ii) University committees

(c) Informal feedback. This may include, for example:
  (i) day-to-day conversations with lecturers, (face to face, email or virtually),
  (ii) confidential meetings with the external examiners
  (iii) complaints or appeals raised informally (as the first stage of the process)

16 Discussion with students will include issues raised by the external examiner(s) – provided to staff informally and in their annual reports – and by external organisations such as placement providers and applicable professional, statutory or regulatory bodies. Students will be provided via Canvas with access to the full report of each external examiner (see the Code on External Examiners (QH:C10)).

17 Discussion should, from time to time, also cover the effectiveness of the arrangements for dialogue, for example in terms of the methods used, their purpose and timing.

18 When engaging with students about possible improvements, staff need to make sure that students are informed about any limitations on changes – including relating to timing - to

modules and programmes; in particular that amendments have to be approved by the University (as set out in the Code on Programme Approval (QH:C2)). Major amendments require the written consent of registered students who will be affected by the proposed changes, and consultation with prospective students.

Other sources of feedback

19 The ongoing dialogue and evaluation of the programme (including its constituent modules) **should** be based on the following additional sources of feedback:

(a) reflection by all members of staff involved in teaching and assessing the modules
(b) the advice of the external examiner(s) through their annual report and given informally
(c) from professional services staff (for example relating to the provision of learning resources or student support)
(d) issues raised in academic appeals or student complaints
(e) relevant professional, statutory or regulatory bodies through an approval or monitoring event or report
(f) external stakeholders such as the University's Key Advisory Groups (KAGs), placement providers, employers of graduates or other relevant external bodies.

Data

20 Data **should** be analysed to evaluate student performance against the University's Strategic goals at both module and programme levels of performance. At module level (Module Evaluation and Enhancement Reports), this includes an evaluation of each individual module, and at programme level (Programme Review and Enhancement Plan), a comparative view across all constituent modules.

21 Data analysis **should** include comparisons with the previous three years' data (where available), and include appropriate equality and diversity monitoring.

Module Evaluation and Enhancement Report

22 The Programme Coordinator oversees the completion of Module Evaluation and Enhancement Reports (MEER) by the module leader or responsible teaching staff member.

23 In completing Module Evaluation and Enhancement Reports, module leaders **must** ensure that external examiner feedback is taken into account and incorporated into the enhancement plans as appropriate.

24 The MEER **must** provide:

(a) a statistical analysis and evaluation of student performance and achievement data with corresponding enhancement action plan covering:
    (i) student profile and mode of study;
    (ii) admission, retention, progression and achievement data;
    (iii) mitigating circumstances cases;
    (iv) interruptions of studies;
    (v) instances of academic misconduct

(vi) attendance/submission records and responses to non-attendance/submission

(b) an update on the outcomes and effectiveness of actions taken in previous enhancement plan.

(c) the module leader/lecturer's evaluation and reflective commentary and, where required, enhancement actions on:

(i) matters relating to learning, teaching and assessment;
(ii) student satisfaction and issues raised by students using student feedback from a variety of sources, (see above section 'Involving Students')
(iii) resource-related issues;
(iv) effective or innovative practice which might be implemented in other modules and programmes and therefore help to stimulate university-wide enhancement.

25 Module Evaluation and Enhancement Reports **must** be saved in the relevant Module Box which is kept up-to-date and available at all times for audit proposes. Module boxes must be available during external examiner visits.

26 Module Evaluation and Enhancement Reports **must** be an item for discussion at Student-Staff Liaison Committees as a means for discussing new items (especially those generated from discussions and feedback which will not have featured students), monitoring the implementation of agreed actions, and evaluating the effectiveness of changes implemented.

Programme Review and Enhancement Plan

27 Programme Coordinators are responsible for completing a Programme Review and Enhancement Plan (PREP) at the end of each academic year.

28 In completing the Programme Review and Enhancement Plan, module leaders **must** ensure that feedback from external examiners and external stakeholders (such as Key Advisory Groups (KAGs)) is taken into account and incorporated into the enhancement plans as appropriate.

29 The PREP **must** provide:

(a) a statistical analysis and evaluation of student performance and achievement data with corresponding enhancement action plan covering:
(i) student profile and mode of study;
(ii) admission, retention, progression and achievement data for the programme as a whole
(iii) mitigating circumstances cases;
(iv) interruptions of studies;
(v) instances of academic misconduct;
(vi) monitoring of academic appeals and outcomes;
(vii) attendance/submission records and responses to non-attendance/submission

(b) an update on the outcomes and effectiveness of actions identified in previous enhancement plan

(c) the Programme Coordinator's reflective commentary and, where required, enhancement actions on:
    (i) matters relating to learning, teaching and assessment at programme level;
    (ii) student satisfaction, issues and complaints raised by students via the various channels and outcomes from the programme perspective;
    (iii) resource-related issues;
    (iv) effective or innovative practice which might be implemented in other modules and programmes and therefore help to stimulate university-wide enhancement;
    (v) graduate employment data

30 The PREP should demonstrate that there has been effective consideration of each of the modules within the programme.

31 The PREP must also make reference to peer observations conducted in relation to the programme by:

(a) confirming that all staff on the programme have participated in the required number of observations for the year (including as observers and observees)
(b) summarising cases of particularly effective and/or innovative practice considered worthy of sharing beyond individual colleagues and reports on how this has been disseminated (if that is the case)
(c) highlighting any issues arising from the process, including suggestions for enhancing it.

32 One PREP **should** be produced for each programme including any variants of the programme, such as where it is also offered in part-time or on-line modes, or where there is the option for a placement or year abroad. In such cases the report **should** include a specific focus on those differences, especially in reflecting on the quality of the learning opportunities compared with students on the full-time version.

33 The purposes of the Programme Review and Enhancement Plan are to:

(a) ensure that a programme level overview is being taken once a year
(b) provide assurance to the University that its academic standards are being maintained and that students are being provided with high-quality learning experiences
(c) ensure that university-level issues are being identified, including effective or innovative practice, so that changes which might be needed at university level can be addressed (for example in the provision of resources, facilities and services, or in the University's procedures for managing quality and standards)
(d) provide assurance that processes for module and programme evaluation and enhancement, including the involvement of students and the use of data in those processes, are working effectively.

34 Programme Review and Enhancement Plans provide the basis for submitting an application for major or minor amendments to the programme (under the Code on Programme Approval

(QH:C2)), or where appropriate for making recommendations to the University that the programme be withdrawn or recruitment suspended. PREPs also inform the Periodic Review of the programme (see the Code on Periodic Review (QH:C13)).

Annual Report on Academic Standards, Quality Assurance and Enhancement

35 The Head of Academic Quality and Learning will compile an Annual Report on Academic Standards, Quality Assurance and Enhancement which provides institutional oversight of the key issues, themes and risks emerging from the monitoring and review of each programme. The report, which must be signed off by the Vice Chancellor, will confirm compliance with the University's processes, and provide assurance to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee and to Academic Board that:

(a) programmes are being delivered in accordance with what was approved
(b) programmes are meeting their objectives and remain current and relevant
(c) programmes continue to meet UK threshold standards.
(d) the academic standards of the awards continue to be maintained as defined in the University's Academic Regulations: Taught Programmes (QH:C1) and supporting Codes.

36 The overview report will also highlight any notable examples of effective or innovative practice which merit sharing across the University.

Consideration at AQSC

37 The University's Annual Report on Academic Standards, Quality Assurance and Enhancement is considered by the Quality Enhancement Committee prior to its submission to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC).

38 The Academic Quality and Standards Committee's consideration of the Annual Report on Academic Standards, Quality Assurance and Enhancement will be reported to Academic Board. AQSC will draw Academic Board's attention to any programme (or constituent module) where there is concern that academic standards or the quality of the student learning experience appear to be at risk. It will also draw Academic Board's attention to very notable examples of effective or innovative practice.

Submission to University regulator

39 Following approval of the Annual Report on Academic Standards, Quality Assurance and Enhancement by the Academic Board, it is submitted to the Board of Governors, and subsequently to the University's regulator, the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority no later than 31 December.

Flowchart of Annual Monitoring & Enhancement: Taught Programmes

	STUDENT SURVEY & ENGAGEMENT	MODULE EVALUATION & ENHANCEMENT REPORT (MEER)	PROGRAMME REVIEW & ENHANCEMENT PLAN (PREP)	ANNUAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC STANDARDS, QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT	VICE CHANCELLOR'S ANNUAL REPORT TO THE BOG AND GRA
Frequency	**Every semester & annually**	**Every semester**	**Annually**	**Annually**	**Annually**
Timing	• Programme dependent: Interim survey/s done at earliest suitable time • Programme dependent: End of module surveys towards the end of the module • Programme dependent: Student meetings/focus groups • SSLC meets each semester	Start the report at the beginning of semester. Complete by the end of module, finalise after module board approves marks. Revisit, if necessary, after reassessment board. Upload to Programme Monitoring & Review system (PMRS) and Module Box within 3 weeks.	Start the report at the beginning of academic year, work through and complete by end of year. Draft version to be completed by programme board. Revisit after reassessment board, if necessary. Submit final version to AQLM via the PMRS within 3 weeks of Programme Board.	This oversight report is compiled from PREP and other incoming data sources and submitted to AQSC meeting 1 each year (early November).	The Annual Report on Academic Standards, Quality Assurance and Enhancement is submitted to Academic Board meeting 1 each year (early December) and, upon approval to the Board of Governors and, before 31 December each year, to the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority.
Forms & Links	• Where a programme uses surveys, these are distributed by the Quality Office through Qualtrics to the students' UniGib email. • Programme Coordinator responsible to ensure survey requirements are sent to Quality Office with adequate notice. • Anonymised results sent to module leaders & programme coordinators.	**MEER** uses data from collected student feedback and the Student Information System (i.e., TRIBAL). Link to electronic MEER template is on Canvas (Quality Handbook).	**PREP** uses data from MEERs (composite modules), the Student Information System (i.e., TRIBAL) and other sources. Link to electronic PREP template is on Canvas (Quality Handbook).	The Annual Report on Academic Standards, Quality Assurance and Enhancement uses data from PREPS and other internal reports and sources.	
Roles & input – Who's involved?	**Students** evaluate their experience on courses and provide feedback through questionnaires or focus groups. Students also engage in discussions at programme Staff Student Liaison Committees. **Quality Assurance Office** • administers the survey process while motivating, encouraging participation. •	**Admissions Office** provides data and statistic. **Module leader / teaching team** discuss and evaluate course performance, student feedback, instructor feedback on learning, teaching & assessment, and resources, capturing good practice as well as commonly occurring issues. **External examiners** (**EE**) are consulted as moderators of	**Programme coordinator** reviews and evaluates program performance, identifying any common issues, both positive and negative and develops a cohesive action plan to enhance the programme at next delivery. **External Examiner reports** - **c**omments & recommendations are recorded and appropriately addressed in action plans. **Quality Enhancement Committee c**onsiders EE reports and responses.	**Head of Academic Quality and Learning** extrapolates programme data to provide institutional oversight and a critical analysis of performance and trends with appropriate actions and recommendations for enhancing the student experience. **Quality Enhancement Committee** reviews and	**Vice Chancellor** adds key assurances to the Annual Report on Academic Standards, Quality Assurance and Enhancement and signs off the Report prior to submission to the Quality Enhancement Committee.

	Programme Coordinators & Module teaching team • motivate and encourage participation in survey as well as verbal, informal feedback. • review results and comments, discuss and agree actions to be taken (e.g., SSLC). • feeds back to students on actions taken and responses	assessment and marking. EE reports also inform action plan.	**Academics / teaching staff** and others involved in supporting the module are consulted as needed. **Students** are consulted via the different mechanisms in place, (e.g., surveys, Staff Student Liaison Committee, etc)	approves the report for submission to AQSC **Programme Coordinators** and key **Administrative Staff** are consulted as required. **Quality Assurance Office** informs and updates students on actions taken via **You Said … We Did**

< end of document>