

QUALITY MANUAL: CONTINUOUS QUALITY MONITORING

Continuous quality monitoring enables the University to monitor whether courses and modules are meeting their stated objectives and to facilitate the ongoing enhancement of provision where students are not meeting the intended learning outcomes

1.1 Purpose

- 1.1.1 The purpose of continuous quality monitoring is to primarily enable the University to monitor whether courses and modules are meeting their stated objectives and to facilitate the ongoing enhancement of provision where students are not meeting the intended learning outcomes.
- 1.1.2 The continuous quality monitoring process is therefore a continuous improvement and evidence-based approach, which enables academic staff, Heads of Schools and managers to easily identify aspects of provision with poor outcomes and therefore take action at the appropriate time in the year to improve quality and standards.
- 1.1.3 Continuous quality monitoring is therefore achieved by:
- (i) School Boards of Study, which facilitate the ongoing monitoring and enhancement of the quality of teaching, learning and student experience at course and module level.
 - (ii) Course Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP) to record and evaluate the impact of action taken to improve course and module outcomes throughout the year and course validation cycle.
 - (iii) School and Faculty portfolio performance reporting which enable the University to take a risk-based approach to monitoring the effectiveness of action being taken to address aspects of academic provision with poor outcomes. As well as identify and remedy short comings in the student learning experience at the appropriate level.
 - (iv) Academic Management Information (AMI) dashboard using MS Power BI which allows for an evidence-based analysis of course and module performance so as to identify areas of provision which require further action.
- 1.1.4 The continuous quality monitoring process relates to all undergraduate and postgraduate taught 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.

1.2 Boards of Study

Purpose and objectives

- 1.2.1 Boards of Study are responsible for managing, monitoring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning and the student experience, within course and individual module provision. They provide a forum for structured reflection on teaching, learning and the student experience, between academic staff, Heads of School, managers and students and facilitate the dissemination of good practice.
- 1.2.2 Objectives for Boards of Study include:

- Review course and module performance data in relation to:
 - Withdrawals and interruptions
 - Continuation and progression rates per year group
 - Outcomes from Staff Student Liaison Minutes
 - Annual metrics i.e., NSS, PTES and Guardian League Table
 - Approving course modifications and recommend to FQC for approval
 - Module evaluations
 - External Examiner reports and approving subsequent responses
 - Key module data, including includes attendance, attainment and assessment submission rate.
- Discuss and recommend course change and new module proposals to Faculty Quality Committee for approval.
- Approve the priorities, actions and overall direction of every course team's CCIP in response to course and university data at the start of each academic year.
- Monitor and evaluate the impact of improvement activity to ensure that CCIPs are being used effectively to address course and University priorities throughout the year.
- Review school and course induction, transitions, and in-year academic support.

Reporting Structure

- 1.2.3 Boards of Study report to the Faculty Quality Committee (FQC). The Head of School will analyse the impact of action taken from the previous academic year to address ongoing areas of concern within the portfolio. As well as identify short-medium- and long-term enhancement strategies to be implemented to address areas within the portfolio where little, to no impact has been seen. The Faculty Quality Committee is required to ensure the Faculty addresses matters which cannot be resolved by School and course teams alone. Where an issue cannot be resolved by Faculties alone, then the Faculty is required to report these issues to the University's Quality Monitoring Review Sub Committee for resolution.

Oversight and Operation

- 1.2.4 The Faculty Executive team are responsible for the effective oversight and operation of Boards of study to ensure they are carried out in line with the University's expectations and deliver ongoing improvements to the quality of teaching and learning and student experience at course and module level. This is achieved by:
- Faculty Registrars ensuring appropriately constituted Boards of Study are in operation within schools and at partners. Except where that function is explicitly allocated to IP&D or UKP, as part of a multi-faculty arrangement;
 - Faculty Directors of Learning and Teaching providing support and guidance to schools and course teams which enables appropriate learning and teaching outcomes to be achieved in line with the University's learning and teaching strategy.
 - Faculty Directors of Quality providing strategic advice on quality matters and monitoring the outputs of Boards of study to ensure that they deliver suitable progress in course and module performance and a good student experience.
 - All ensuring the effective communication of issues to the wider Faculty and University arising from Boards of Study.
- 1.2.5 Heads of School are responsible for the schedule and composition of all Boards of Study 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.
- 1.2.6 There must be a minimum of three Boards of Study spread evenly across the academic year.

- 1.2.7 All collaborative partners are expected to participate in Boards of study and manage their own Course Continuous Improvement Plans. Partners will either run their own Boards of Study at their campus or participate in the School Boards.
- 1.2.8 Where partners run their own Board of Study, the appropriate nominee at the partner institution is responsible for the configuration with the support from IPAD / UKP (where relevant), Academic Link Tutor (ALT). Approval should be sought from the relevant Head of School (if single School partner) or IPAD / UKP if multi-faculty.
- 1.2.9 For operational best practice, the appropriate partner nominee for Chair should be encouraged to attend the relevant University Board of Study, either in person or via video link, in order to learn how Boards of study are effectively run, as well as share insights and student feedback related to the curriculum with the course team.
- 1.2.10 Where partners attend School Boards of Study, the ALT is responsible for ensuring the schedule is made known to the appropriate nominee at the partner so that they can attend.
- 1.2.11 All school and partner Boards of Study minutes and Course Continuous Improvement Plans must be made available to members of the Faculty Executive team throughout the academic year to enable them to routinely monitor that course teams are addressing ongoing areas of concern within the course.

TNE Partners

- 1.2.12 TNE partners offering validated provision will be expected to run their own Boards of Study at their campus using the partner course CCIP template to address their own course improvement priorities. It is anticipated that these will be held close to the School Boards of Study schedule so as to enable ALTs to communicate outputs from the partner Boards of study and CCIP to the School Boards and identify improvement actions where needed.
- 1.2.13 TNE partners who deliver franchised provision will also be expected to run their own Boards of Study at their own campus and manage their own partner CCIP. However, unlike Boards for validated provision, the partner course team should look to align their CCIP with the priorities of the parent course where appropriate to ensure issues can be addressed as a whole.
- 1.2.14 The final schedule and configuration of TNE partner Boards of study should be agreed between the partner, IPAD, ALT and the Head of School. Faculty Managers of Quality (FMQs) and IPAD are responsible for ensuring the schedule is published and all stakeholders are aware.

UK Partners

- 1.2.15 UK partners who deliver franchised provision will be expected to attend the School Board of Study. They will also be expected to manage their own CCIP, which is aligned as closely as possible to the priorities of the parent course.

Multi-faculty provision

- 1.2.16 UK partners that offer provision which spans across more than one Faculty will be expected to hold their own Board of Studies at their own campus with support from the relevant ALTs.
- 1.2.17 UKP/ IPAD are responsible for ensuring that all multi-faculty partners hold Boards of study and that they fully engage with the CCIP as part of the University's continuous improvement quality assurance process.

Agenda and membership

- 1.2.18 Boards of Study 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.
- 1.2.19 The standard agenda will be split into unreserved and reserved sections. It is expected that most issues pertinent to the ongoing improvement and development of 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. Heads of School / Chairs will decide whether an item is reserved or unreserved business.
- 1.2.20 Boards of Study 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
 - Professional Support Staff, i.e. Course Support Officers or Course Administrators
 - Student Representatives
 - Board of Studies Administrator (minute taker)
 -
- 1.2.21 Where appropriate the Head of School may also invite:
- Members of the Faculty directorate (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

- 1.2.22 Every Board of Study, at both school and partner level, is expected to include student representatives, ideally from every course being considered and from each year of student. Heads of School should consider the availability of students when planning the timing of Boards.
- 1.2.23 Ideally, a minimum of three students needs to be present and they can attend either in person or via video link.
- 1.2.24 It is expected that the University's Student Union will be responsible for recruiting and training School Boards of Study student representatives and ensuring that they attend meetings when appointed.

1.3 The Course Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP)

Purpose

- 1.3.1 The CCIP is a live document used by course teams throughout the academic year to record and evaluate the impact of action taken to improve aspects of teaching, learning and student experience within the course. It is a standard template used by all course teams.

Operation

- 1.3.2 The CCIP asks teams to focus their ongoing course specific improvement actions within specific overarching priorities. These overarching priorities are directly informed by Faculty and University strategic priorities.
- 1.3.3 In some cases, it might be more appropriate for teams to select their own overarching priorities. But they must be able to demonstrate to the Head of School that their course consistently delivers year on year, all of the following:
- Positive student retention and attainment across all levels
 - No marked difference in attainment between students from different cultural backgrounds.
 - 90% of graduates from the course are in employment or further study relevant to their subject of study within 15 months after graduation.
 - The majority of the student cohort reports positively that their voice is heard as part of their learning experience.
- 1.3.4 The CCIP requires course teams to evaluate the impact of their actions by analysing data and making necessary improvements throughout the course of the academic year and course validation cycle.
- 1.3.5 Course teams should use the following quantitative and qualitative data to inform their CCIP priorities from the following sources:
- University data from internal reports and AMI dashboard as available on MS Power BI
 - Outcomes from previous action plans, including areas of good practice
 - Discussions and outputs from Boards of study, Staff Student Liaison Meetings and Course team meetings
 - Module evaluations
 - External Examiner, PSRB and placement reports (where applicable)
 - National student survey and other survey outcomes.
 - Graduate outcomes surveys
- 1.3.6 Throughout the year, course teams evaluate the impact of their actions, adjusting existing or introducing new actions where needed. As part of this ongoing review and evaluation activity, course teams will need to:
- Check University MS Power BI reports during key points within the academic year to inform progress of actions and understand what further adjustments are needed.
 - Consider discussions in BoS, team meetings and SSLMs to inform actions.
 - Consider feedback from module evaluations and module outcomes in order to make changes.
 - Consider feedback from External Examiner reports in order to make changes.
 - Use the CCIP RAG rating system to evaluate the progress of an action and whether it has had the desired outcome and impact.
- 1.3.7 A partner CCIP has been developed to allow flexibility if the partner does not share the same University strategic priorities. The partner CCIP allows partners to focus on addressing different priorities that align more with the University's priorities for its partners, rather than directly for its home courses. The following is noted:
- i. Partners delivering franchised provision should use their own CCIP for their courses. They should align their priorities with those of the parent course to ensure issues can be addressed as a whole across all provision. But they may wish to consider regional differences that may impact on delivery and student experience.

- ii. Partners offering validated provision should use their own CCIP to address priorities within the course relevant to their students and delivery style.
- iii. The relevant ALT is responsible for assisting partner Course Directors with the development and effective use of their CCIP.
- iv. The ALT is responsible for ensuring that any issues identified in the partner CCIP are made known to the School Board of Studies. This includes working with the School Course Director to coordinate actions to be taken on partner and School CCIP's to support the continued development and performance of the course as a whole.
- v. It is expected that every partner course will use their CCIP, whether it be the school or partner version, in the same way as University course teams so as to ensure a general standard of practice across all provision.

Operating the CCIP with Boards of Study

- 1.3.8 Every Board of Study will monitor and evaluate the progress and impact of improvement action detailed on each team's CCIP to assess how well it is meeting its overarching course and University priorities. This will take place through a standing agenda item 'CCIP Updates' and the CCIP's RAG-rated system. The Board will also recommend adjustments to actions where it feels insufficient progress or improvement is being made, or a better outcome could be delivered.
- 1.3.9 Team members responsible for a particular action will be expected to provide detailed updates in the 'CCIP updates' section of every Boards of study in order to ensure a team approach to course and module improvement.
- 1.3.10 CCIP Updates discussions will include the following: -
 - (i) Verbal evaluation from either PD or Lead(s) responsible of the current progress and impact of the actions currently being taken to address priority areas.
 - (ii) Use of the RAG-rating (either by HoS, PD or Lead(s) Responsible) to highlight where: -
 - Actions have had or are on course to have the desired impact (Green).
 - actions either need more time to assess impact or, have not had quite the desired Impact and may need adjusting (Amber).
 - Actions have not been completed on time and have not had a positive impact toward addressing the overall priority area (Red).
 - (iii) Close examination of actions which have been highlighted either amber or red. Chair to ask teams to provide explanation for these actions, as well as explore with members alternative actions or adjustments that can be made to improve progress.
 - (iv) Discussions should conclude with the team adjusting either amber or red actions with updated time scales, as directed by the Chair.

1.4 Reporting on Course Performance

- 1.4.1 At the start of each academic year, Heads of School will carry out a performance review of the schools' course portfolio and submit an Annual Portfolio Performance Report to the

Faculty	Quality	Committee	(FQC).
1.4.2	The Annual Portfolio Performance Report will assess the impact of action taken in the previous academic year and identify short-, medium- and long-term enhancement strategies to address ongoing areas of concern within the portfolio. The report will also identify areas which require further discussion at Faculty and University level in order to identify areas of further support to ensure the school can reasonably achieve its enhancement strategies.		
1.4.3	Reports will be submitted to the Faculty Director of Quality	for consideration by the Faculty Quality Committee.	
1.4.4	The Faculty Quality Committee (FQC) will convene three times per academic year.		
1.4.5	The Faculty Quality Committee will consider school portfolio performance reports at the first meeting of the academic year. The Committee will assess whether schools are making suitable progress in addressing ongoing areas of concern within the portfolio and where further support is required at Faculty and University level to ensure schools can continue to address ongoing areas of concern within the portfolio.		
1.4.6	After the first Faculty Quality Committee, the Faculty Director of Quality will write and submit a Faculty Portfolio Performance report to the University's Quality Monitoring Review Sub-Committee. The Faculty portfolio performance report will confirm the Faculty's strategic priorities in response to school portfolio performance reports, and summarise the impact of action taken at Faculty level to ensure schools address ongoing areas of concern within their portfolios. The report will also identify areas where the Faculty require further support from the institution to enable it to support schools continue to deliver high-calibre courses with a good student experience.		
1.4.7	An Organisation and Management Report of all non-academic issues identified, including recommendations, as part of the continuous improvement process for course monitoring, will be produced by the Quality and Standards Office based on the summary reports of issues. This will be considered by the Professional Services Quality Committee and will enable the sharing of information between Faculties and Professional Services. Individual courses, subject areas and faculties should continue to liaise with Professional Services directly about such matters.		
1.4.8	Annual Faculty Portfolio Performance Reports will be considered by the January meeting of the Quality Monitoring and Review Sub-Committee. The meeting will also consider an Overview Report of the Annual Professional Service Monitoring process.		
1.4.9	The Quality Monitoring and Review Sub-Committee 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.		