

Quality Manual: Course Monitoring and Continuous Improvement

This University uses a process of continuous monitoring and improvement to monitor courses and modules to ensure they are meeting their stated learning objectives and delivering positive student outcomes.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. BOARD OF STUDIES.....	2
3. BOARD OF STUDIES WITH COLLABORATIVE PROVISION.....	4
4. THE COURSE PERFORMANCE PLAN (CPP)	6
5. COURSE PERFORMANCE PLANS WITH COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS.....	6
6. SCHOOL AND FACULTY PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE REPORTING	7
7. COURSE PERFORMANCE PLANS AND THE PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE	7
8. PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE ANNUAL REPORTS	8

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The University uses an approach of continuous monitoring and improvement to assure itself, stakeholders, students and external bodies of the quality and value of its academic provision.
- 1.2. Continuous monitoring enables the University to monitor whether courses and modules are meeting their stated learning objectives and delivering positive student outcomes. It is an important tool in facilitating the ongoing enhancement of academic provision for delivery of an excellent student experience.
- 1.3. Continuous monitoring and improvement is achieved by:
 - (i) **Board of Studies** meetings at school level which monitor the student outcomes and the quality of teaching and learning experience within courses and individual module provision.
 - (ii) **Course Performance Plans (CPP)** which facilitate smart action-planning and target setting to monitor and enhance course performance against institutional and subject level priority metrics.
 - (iii) **School and faculty portfolio performance reporting** on the effectiveness of action being taken to address aspects of academic provision with poor student outcomes, as well as identifying and remedying short comings in the student learning experience at the appropriate level.
 - (iv) **The University Portfolio Performance Committee (PPC)** providing strategic oversight of portfolio performance through institutional-level target setting and intervention for underperforming courses.
 - (v) **The University's Academic Management Information (AMI) dashboard** (MS Power BI) to facilitate evidence-based analysis of course and module performance and inform action-planning.
- 1.4. The continuous monitoring process relates to all undergraduate and postgraduate courses leading to a Canterbury Christ Church University credit or award. This includes all courses taught through collaborative partnership and those which form part of a Higher or Degree Apprenticeship.

2. BOARD OF STUDIES

Purpose and objectives

- 2.1. Board of Studies are responsible for monitoring student outcomes within course and individual module provision.
- 2.2. Objectives for Board of Studies include:
 - Agree the KPI targets and actions for each Course Performance Plan
 - Monitor course progress and evaluate performance within CPP's throughout the year.
 - Consider course and module performance data in relation to:
 - Withdrawals and interruptions
 - Continuation, completion and progression rates per year group
 - Key module data, including attendance, attainment and assessment submission rates.

- NSS results in key strategic areas i.e., quality of teaching, assessment and feedback and academic support
- League tables i.e. The Guardian
- Quantitative student feedback: e.g., module evaluations, Student Voice Forum (formerly SSLM) minutes
- Consider course change proposals to ensure they are academically appropriate and will deliver a good student learning experience.
- Review school and course activity for induction, transitions, and in-year academic support.

Oversight and Operation

- 2.3. The Faculty Portfolio Planning Executive (FPPE) oversee Board of Studies to ensure they effectively monitor the performance of student outcomes and take appropriate action where low performance is recognised.
- 2.4. Faculty Registrars are responsible for ensuring appropriately constituted Board of Studies are in operation within schools and at partners. Except where that function is explicitly allocated to IPAD or UKP, as part of a multi-faculty arrangement. They are also responsible for ensuring that appropriate structures are in place to enable the storing and monitoring of Board of Studies documentation and CPP's by FPPE and FQC.
- 2.5. Faculty Directors of Learning and Teaching are responsible for providing support and guidance to schools and course teams for enhancing the student learning experience which ensure positive student outcomes, in line with the University's learning and teaching strategy.
- 2.6. Faculty Directors of Quality are responsible for providing strategic advice on quality matters and monitoring the outputs of Board of Studies.
- 2.7. All courses must be considered by a Board of Study and there must be a minimum of at least two Board of Studies spread evenly across the academic year.
- 2.8. Heads of School are responsible for the schedule and composition of all Board of Studies within their school at the start of each academic year. This includes ensuring the schedule is communicated to faculty, school, and partner staff where appropriate.
- 2.9. Chairs should be encouraged to attend other Board of Studies in order to share best practice on effective operation, as well as gain insights from students on their experience of relevant shared modules.
- 2.10. Where partners attend school Board of Studies, the Academic Link Tutor is responsible for ensuring the schedule is made available to the appropriate nominee at the partner so that they can attend.
- 2.11. All school and partner Board of Studies minutes and Course Performance Plans must be monitored by the Faculty Executive team throughout the academic year to ensure they are being used effectively to enhance course performance, particularly where University KPI's are not being met.

Agenda and Membership

- 2.12. Board of Studies meetings are informed by standard agenda and minutes templates and supported by a designated administrator to formally record discussions and outputs. All associated actions should include realistic timeframes within which they will be completed.

- 2.13. The standard agenda maybe divided into unreserved and reserved sections. It is expected that most issues pertinent to the ongoing enhancement of the course should be discussed within the unreserved agenda, with students being invited to contribute and lead on particular areas where relevant. Students are not permitted to attend the part of the meeting where reserved matters are discussed. Chairs will decide whether an item is reserved or unreserved business.
- 2.14. Board of Studies secretaries should use the templates provided to capture the minutes of the meeting to enable accurate onward reporting to the Faculty Quality Committee.
- 2.15. Board of Studies membership must include:
- Chair - Head of School or nominee
 - Suite / Subject leads
 - Course Directors
 - Module leaders & Academic Link Tutors (ALTs)
 - Partner Course Director / appropriate nominee (where required)
 - Year or Tutor Group Leads
 - Student Representatives
 - Board of Studies Secretary (minute taker)
- 2.16. Additional stakeholders may also include:
- Members of the Faculty Executive (FDLT, FDO, FDQ)
 - Industry or PSRB stakeholders
 - Wider partner representatives
 - Academic Developers
 - Learning Developers
 - Learning and Research Librarian
 - Employability Lead for the course/s
 - Faculty Digital Academic Developer

Student Representatives

- 2.17. All Board of Studies, at both school and partner level, will include student representatives, ideally from every course being considered and from each stage of the degree.
- 2.18. The University's Student Union is responsible for recruiting and training Board of Studies student representatives and ensuring that they attend meetings when appointed.

3. BOARD OF STUDIES WITH COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

- 3.1. All partners are expected to use Board of Studies and manage their own Course Performance Plan (CPP) as part of the University's approach to continuous monitoring and improvement of course performance. Partners will either run their own Board of Studies at their campus or be members of the School's Board of Studies.

TNE Partners

- 3.2. TNE partners offering validated and franchised provision will be expected to run their own Board of Studies at their own campus/site.

UK Partners

- 3.3. UK partners who deliver franchised provision will be expected to attend the School Board of Studies. UK partners who deliver validated provision will run their own Board of Studies at their own campus/site.

Multi-Faculty Provision

- 3.4. Where collaborative provision spans across more than one faculty, these partners will be expected to hold their own Board of Studies at their own campus, with support from the relevant ALTs.

Roles and Responsibilities for Managing Collaborative Partner Board of Studies

- 3.5. UK Partners (UKP) and International Partnership and Development (IPAD) teams are responsible for ensuring that all multi-faculty partners hold Board of Studies and manage their own Course Performance Plans, as part of the University's approach to managing course performance. Their responsibilities include:
- Agreeing the Chair of each partner Board of Studies. This normally should be a senior member of the partner staff.
 - Leading on discussions around the structure of Board, particularly for larger partners, seeking clarity from BoS Chair(s) or Faculty, if further information is needed.
 - Providing partners with the necessary Board of Studies guidance and CPP template.
 - Coordinating with Faculty Quality teams to ensure both schools and partners are aware of BoS schedules.
- 3.6. IPAD are also responsible for:
- Attending partner Board of Studies in order to ensure the Dean of International is updated on any partner issues. The Dean of International will appointment the member of the IPAD team to attend.
 - Liaising with Faculty and the partner to coordinate the scheduling of partner and school Board of Studies.
 - Communicate the final schedule for partner Board to all relevant stakeholders.
 - Maintain regular communication between ALT and Senior ALT to ensure oversight of partner and a collective awareness of partner CPP KPI's and outcomes throughout the academic year.
- 3.7. Academic Link Tutors (ALTs) are responsible for supporting partners to manage their Board of Studies and Course Performance Plan. The ALT is expected to:
- Attend all partner Board of Studies.
 - Act as the primary point of contact to support partners with the use of the CPP to ensure that it is being used effectively to address course or University priorities.
 - Support partners to set their own KPI targets where they have scope to do so.
 - Ensure that partner Course Directors have been provided with the School Board of Studies schedule and encourage them to attend these Boards as part of ongoing professional development, wherever possible.
 - Liaise with IPAD/UKP to ensure issues at University level relating to collaborative provision can be addressed.
 - Brief the partner on school plans for the course and curriculum developments if a partner is unable to attend a School Board of Studies.
 - For UK Franchise Provision, liaise with Chairs of BoS to ensure UK partners are included in the Board of Studies composition and are invited to attend.

4. THE COURSE PERFORMANCE PLAN (CPP)

Purpose and Operation

- 4.1. The purpose of Course Performance Plan (CPP) is to support course teams monitor and improve course performance against institutional and subject-level priority metrics e.g., NSS and OfS outcomes.
- 4.2. The Course Performance Plan should be used for all provision taught by the University and its collaborative partners.
- 4.3. Course teams are expected to use their CPP to record, monitor and evaluate the outcome of actions against KPI targets. Course teams will be expected to focus action planning on meeting specific University priority targets or on achieving targets set by themselves in accordance with their subject-level benchmarks.
- 4.4. Where courses show to be performing well in the majority of the University priority areas, teams may identify their own course priorities.
- 4.5. All Course Performance Plans must be agreed in the first Board of Studies in anticipation of formal sign-off by the Faculty Portfolio Planning Executive at the start of the academic year.
- 4.6. Course teams should use the following data/resources to inform their CPP actions:
 - Existing metrics tab within the CPP template. As well as additional University data from internal reports and MS Power BI AMI dashboard.
 - Discussions and outputs from Board of Studies, Staff Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs) and course team meetings
 - Module evaluations
 - External Examiner, PSRB and placement reports (where applicable)
 - Student Surveys e.g., UKES or PTES
 - Graduate outcomes surveys
- 4.7. Monitoring and evaluating the progress of course performance within a course team's CPP will take place primarily through a standing agenda item 'CPP updates' and the CPPs RAG-rated system. The Board should also recommend adjustments to actions where it feels insufficient performance is being delivered, or a better outcome could be achieved.
- 4.8. Course team members responsible for a particular action will be expected to provide detailed updates to the Board, so as to ensure a team approach to course and module improvement.

5. COURSE PERFORMANCE PLANS WITH COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS

- 5.1. See: <https://cccu.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards/Course-Monitoring-and-Continuous-Improvement.aspx>

6. SCHOOL AND FACULTY PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE REPORTING

- 6.1. Board of Studies report to both the Faculty Portfolio Performance Executive and the Faculty Quality Committee (FQC) via School Portfolio Performance Reports and Course Performance Plans.

7. COURSE PERFORMANCE PLANS AND THE PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE (PPC)

- 7.1. The PPC will consider institutional data on student outcomes to establish the University's priorities and KPI targets for the forthcoming year ahead as well as the courses that are underperforming.
- 7.2. The Portfolio Performance Committee (PPC) will meet periodically throughout the year to sample a range of course performance plans in order to monitor their progress toward achieving the institutional target KPI's. They will also decide on the appropriate intervention activity if a course is consistently performing below expectation.

Criteria for Identifying Underperforming Courses

- 7.3. The Portfolio Performance Committee will use the following criteria in its approach to identifying underperforming courses and appropriate areas for support. The approach is to ensure the Committee can swiftly identify courses that are a direct risk to the student experience and the University.
- At least one of the OfS thresholds for continuation, completion and progression has not been met.
 - The course has received at least six blue Subject TEF flags across the key metrics.
- 7.4. In addition, for the academic year 2022-23, the Portfolio Performance Committee will focus on courses within the top 5 subject areas with over 40 FTE students.
- 7.5. Courses which have a metric of at least as high as the benchmark will not be considered blue.

Reviewing Course Performing Plans

- 7.6. Courses that have been identified as underperforming will be considered by the first Portfolio Performance Committee of the academic year in October. Course teams will be expected to attend and take part in the review of their Course Performance Plans by the committee. The review process will be supportive and will:
- Review actions within Course Performance Plans to assess whether they are rigorous and effective enough to deliver continuous improvement to key metrics.
 - Provide recommendations to course teams to ensure they are planning improvement actions which are directly informed by institutional resources and strategies.
 - Identify specific intervention and support mechanisms with consideration of budget and resource.
- 7.7. Where it is not possible to review all Course Performance Plans at the start of the academic year, then course teams will be invited to meet with the Portfolio Performance Committee throughout the year. The Committee will identify courses for the October meeting in order of priority.
- 7.8. In addition to priorities set by the partner, partners should also include in their Course Performance Plans any KPI targets that have been agreed as part of the MOA.

- 7.9. Faculty Quality teams are responsible for ensuring that course performance plans approved by FPPE are submitted to the PPC, when requested.
- 7.10. The Quality and Standards Office will establish the schedule by when faculties are expected to submit approved course performance plans to the Portfolio Performance Committee. They will also manage the central Quality and Standards SharePoint site for CPP submission.

8. PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE ANNUAL REPORTS

- 8.1. Heads of Schools will submit their Annual School Portfolio Performance Report to the first Faculty Quality Committee of the year. Reports will analyse the impact of portfolio performance from the previous year as well as identify short-medium and long-term enhancement strategies to address areas of the portfolio where poor performance continues. They may also identify issues that require further action by the University so as to ensure the school can reasonably achieve its enhancement strategies.
- 8.2. Faculties should convene their Faculty Quality Committee (FQC) three times per academic year.
- 8.3. The Faculty Quality Committee will consider Annual School Portfolio Performance Reports in order to monitor whether schools are making suitable progress in addressing ongoing areas of concern. FQC is expected to use outcomes from school reports to inform the wider strategies for monitoring and enhancing portfolio performance. FQC will also identify areas where further support from the University is required to ensure they can address ongoing areas of concern within the portfolio.
- 8.4. The Faculty Director of Quality, on behalf of FQC, will submit the Faculty Annual Portfolio Report to confirm the faculty's strategic priorities for monitoring and improving portfolio performance to the University's Quality Monitoring Review Sub-Committee (QMRSC).
- 8.5. Annual Faculty Portfolio Performance Reports will be considered by the January meeting of the QMRSC.
- 8.6. QMRSC will identify any institution-wide issues or areas of good / innovative practice and ensure that they are reported to the February meeting of the Education and Student Experience Committee (after the Quality Monitoring and Review Sub-Committee) through a report produced by the Chair of the Quality Monitoring & Review Sub-Committee.

Document Information	Description of Document Information
Document Title	Quality Manual: Course Monitoring and Continuous Improvement
Department Owner	Quality and Standards Office
Web Address	https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/regulations-policies-and-procedures/quality-manual.aspx