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Annual Monitoring, Periodic Review and Internal Audit
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# INTRODUCTION

Annual Monitoring, Periodic Review and Internal Audit are the principal mechanisms by which the University ensures the continuing standards and quality of its academic provision. The processes described below are fully aligned with the Conditions of Registration for Quality and Standards B1-B5 of the Office for Students’ (OfS) Regulatory Framework[[1]](#footnote-2) thereby underpinning the key indicators upon which the University is measured. Processes also informed by the supporting Advice and Guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation contained within the UK Quality Code[[2]](#footnote-3) (published November 2018).

**Annual Monitoring** considers comprehensive quantitative and qualitative evidence on programme performance and the students’ academic experience and alerts the Academic Quality Enhancement Committee (AQEC)[[3]](#footnote-4) - and through it, the Academic Board - to any internal or external factors that could place academic provision including academic partnerships[[4]](#footnote-5) at risk. It provides an opportunity to look holistically at performance data, typically from the preceding academic year, and because it is carried out at a fixed point each year[[5]](#footnote-6), allows us to identify any emerging trends.

Annual Monitoring confirms that:

* academic standards, as set at validation, remain secure;
* the students’ academic experience is being evaluated and enhanced effectively; and,
* the department has the ability and capacity to identify and manage risk.

It also enables the identification of good practice for wider dissemination within the University for the purpose of quality enhancement[[6]](#footnote-7). Outputs from departmental annual monitoring are used to inform the University’s academic planning[[7]](#footnote-8) and budget-setting processes.

The purpose of **Periodic Review** is to review and evaluate all taught curriculum within an academic department or other grouping of cognate programmes in the context of its performance, aims and aspirations in a broader University, regional and national context. Each academic department undergoes Periodic Review once every five years.

The purpose and process of **Internal Audit** varies according to particular requirements and may *risk-focused*, e.g., Departmental Risk Assessment or Extraordinary Audit; or *enhancement-focused*, e.g. Developmental Enquiry.

## ANNUAL MONITORING

Annual monitoring is based on the premise that:

* Staff at all levels of the Institution are responsible and accountable for maintaining standards and enhancing the quality of students’ learning opportunities.
* Shared responsibility and accountability require frank and open exchanges between departments, Faculties, support services and the University (Directorate).
* The processes by which both opportunities and threats to standards and quality are defined, identified and assessed should draw fully on a range of expertise and experience from within and outwith the University’s executive and deliberative structures.

Key features of Annual Monitoring (see figure 1) are that it is:

* **Evidence-based** – this typically includes staff and student feedback (e.g. module leader reports, Student Pulse Surveys, minutes of Programme Boards and Student-Staff Consultative Fora (SSCFs)[[8]](#footnote-9) and other evidence of feedback as appropriate); reports of external examiners[[9]](#footnote-10) and Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs); statistical data on recruitment[[10]](#footnote-11), retention[[11]](#footnote-12), progression[[12]](#footnote-13) , degree outcomes[[13]](#footnote-14), the National Student Survey (NSS)[[14]](#footnote-15) and Graduate Outcomes[[15]](#footnote-16).
* **Risk-based[[16]](#footnote-17)** - drawing upon the experience and expertise of staff and other stakeholders[[17]](#footnote-18) to identify and evaluate potential opportunities and threats, and to propose targeted and proportionate actions to *mitigate* risk. In helping AQEC to form a view about a department’s ability and capacity to manage risk, Annual Monitoring plays an important part in confirming confidence in the University’s managers and staff.
* **Enhancement-focused[[18]](#footnote-19)** – enabling the systematic identification and evaluation of good practice that is suitable for general dissemination for the purpose of enhancing quality across the Institution.

**Figure 1: Key Features of Annual Monitoring**

The Annual Monitoring process described in this chapter is focused primarily on academic departments, however the engagement of Faculties and academic-related professional support services enables full and holistic consideration of issues affecting academic standards and quality at Institutional level; for example, outputs from Annual Monitoring can be used to inform Directorate decisions on academic strategy and resources. The minuted discussions of Faculty Boards (or their sub-committees) and AQEC help assure staff and students that issues raised by them during Annual Monitoring have received appropriate consideration. While fixed-point Annual Monitoring provides a clear focus for identifying and resolving risks, monitoring itself is continuous[[19]](#footnote-20). It is inevitable that some matters will require action outside the annual reporting cycle. To this end, all staff are made aware of their responsibility to alert managers to any issues affecting standards and quality that require the immediate attention of the Directorate, PVC Deans of Faculty, the Governance, Quality Assurance and Student Casework unit, AQEC or other relevant Academic Board committees.

### Annual Monitoring of modules[[20]](#footnote-21) and programmes

Academic departments are responsible for the detailed evaluation of module performance and holistic consideration of issues affecting standards and quality at programme level. Faculties have oversight of module and programme monitoring occurring within departments[[21]](#footnote-22) - **as a minimum**, this considers:

* Module first-time and overall pass rates[[22]](#footnote-23);
* Student Pulse Survey data[[23]](#footnote-24) and module and programme evaluations;
* Retention, progression and degree outcomes data disaggregated by relevant protected characteristics, where appropriate[[24]](#footnote-25);
* External examiner reports and programme teams’ responses[[25]](#footnote-26)

### Departmental Annual Monitoring

Departmental Annual Monitoring is informed by programme-level monitoring and assesses an academic department’s ability and capacity to manage risk associated with academic standards and the quality of students’ learning opportunities. The annual monitoring process at department level is managed centrally by the Governance, Quality Assurance and Student Casework unit and consists of a Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) of Academic Standards and Quality for all departments listed in Table 1 below:

#### Table 1: Departmental Planning Units (updated October 2021)

| **Planning Unit** | **Department** |
| --- | --- |
| Faculty of Arts and Sciences | 1. Biology
2. Business School[[26]](#footnote-27)
3. Computer Science
4. Creative Arts[[27]](#footnote-28)
5. Edge Hill Language Centre[[28]](#footnote-29)
6. English, History and Creative Writing
7. Geography and Geology
8. Law and Criminology
9. Psychology
10. Social Sciences
11. Sport and Physical Activity
 |
| Faculty of Health Social Care and Medicine[[29]](#footnote-30) | 1. Allied Health Professions
2. Applied Health and Social Care
3. Medical Education
4. Nursing and Midwifery Education[[30]](#footnote-31)
5. Social Work
 |
| Faculty of Education | 1. Primary and Childhood Education
2. Early Years Education
3. Secondary and Further Education
 |

A factual DBA report summarising the Department’s performance during the previous academic year is prepared in partnership with the Head of Department and a representative from the Strategic Planning and Policy Unit (SPPU).

**In confirming that standards** remain secure, the DBA report will consider:

* + - * academic and professional benchmarking;
			* PSRB Reports (where applicable and available)
* external examiners’ reports.

**In assessing indicators of quality** the report reviews 3-year data against Key Performance Indicators[[31]](#footnote-32) for:

* Recruitment i.e., the conversion rate and enrolments at programme level including any programmes that failed to recruit;
* A list of Programme modifications undertaken in the preceding year;
* Instances of academic malpractice;
* Student academic outcomes (e.g., module pass rates (first-time and overall), progression, retention and degree outcomes;
* Student satisfaction – National Student Survey and internal survey data; and,
* Graduate Outcomes – employment, highly skilled employment or further study.

**In assessing departments’ ability and capacity to manage risk**, the report considers:

* The content of the department’s ‘strategic-level’ Quality Enhancement (action) Plan, separated by programme as necessary, based on *the department’s* evaluation[[32]](#footnote-33) of the above indicators of Quality.
* A progress update on the previous year’s Quality Enhancement Plan.

#### Affirmation of Standards and Quality

DBA reports contain a judgement on threshold Standards and Quality[[33]](#footnote-34). Reports are required to affirm, based on consideration of the evidence, that the Department continues to meet the ongoing conditions for Quality (B1 – B4) and Standards (B5), as follows:

* B1: Deliver well designed courses that provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student’s achievement to be reliably assessed.
* B2: Provide all students, from admission through to completion, with the support that they need to succeed in and benefit from higher education.
* B3: Deliver successful outcomes for all of its students, which are recognised and valued by employers and/or enable further study.
* B4: Ensure that qualifications awarded to students hold their value at the point of qualification and over time, in line with sector recognised standards.
* B5: Deliver courses that meet the academic standards as they are described in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications at level 4 or higher.

Judgements are reached by triangulating external examiner reports and responses, PSRB reports (where available) and ‘contextualised’ performance data. Beyond threshold, comparisons are made between programme performance data and a set of Institutional benchmarks set by the Directorate. Any data which falls below Institutional benchmark is contextualised and commented upon by the Head of Department as part of the DBA process and actions formally recorded in a Quality Enhancement Plan (below).

#### Quality Enhancement Plans

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is divided into two sections:

1. Agreed actions in response to indicators of Standards and Quality (performance data); and
2. A summary of good practice linked to evidenced improvements/ exemplary performance against Institutional benchmarks.

In part 1 of the QEP, Heads of Department state concisely what is being done and / or will be done to improve performance (in the spirit of SMART action planning). This means that actions are linked directly to programmes or areas where performance has fallen below the benchmark set by the University. Actions are set at an appropriate, departmental level and need not contain operational details.

Part 2 of the QEP provides a summary of specific features of good practice with the potential for wider dissemination across departments and/ or Faculties. Good practice citations are linked to external examiners’ reports, previous validation and/ or periodic review reports, evidenced improvements in performance data between academic years or programmes/ subject areas which show exemplary performance against Institutional benchmarks.

Faculties consider if the issues raised by the data have been addressed sufficiently within the report and in the QEP. Where this is deemed not to be the case, reports and / or plans are referred back for further work. Completed reports (including the QEP) are submitted to the GQASC for ‘in principle’ approval. Final approval is granted by AQEC[[34]](#footnote-35).

Part 1 of the QEP is considered a live document which can be updated by departments at any time during the academic year when data becomes available, or progress has been made. Faculties monitor progress against the actions contained within part 1 of the QEP. Faculties receive updated plans for discussion, exploring where updates have not been provided or if updates require more detail. All progress updates are expected to be completed by the end of the academic year. The Governance, Quality Assurance and Student Casework unit (GQASC) uses the final versions of the QEPs as part of the evidence for the next Annual Monitoring round.

**Departmental Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs) comprise a Desk-Based Assessment Report and a Quality Enhancement Plan.**

Department AMRs are made available to staff and students via the AQDU Wiki page[[35]](#footnote-36) and Programme and/ or Faculty Boards[[36]](#footnote-37) respectively.

GQASC produces an overview document which highlights key themes from departmental annual monitoring. As well as providing the basis of discussion by AQEC[[37]](#footnote-38), this overview also informs production of the University Annual Monitoring Report (below).

### Annual Monitoring for PSRBs

Programmes that are regulated by Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) may be required to submit external monitoring reports to meet their specific requirements. These will normally be received for approval by Faculty Boards (or their committees) but should be referred for additional consideration by AQEC where any issues requiring University level attention are identified.

**For further details on the annual monitoring process, please contact the Governance, Quality Assurance and Student Casework unit. For specific queries on the quantitative data used, please contact the Strategic Planning and Policy Unit.**

### Annual Review of Academic Partnerships

Edge Hill University develops academic partnerships with a wide range of third-party organisations, from UK-based employers, colleges and awarding bodies to overseas higher education providers, for the delivery of modules or programmes leading to the award of University credit or qualifications; or the provision of student learning opportunities including work placements, international exchanges and arrangements for entry with advanced standing (articulation). The Annual Review of Academic Partnerships operates in conjunction with Departmental Annual Monitoring but is a separate process reflecting the level of risk associated with partnership working. Full details are provided elsewhere in this Handbook[[38]](#footnote-39), however for partnerships in Category C and above including Higher and Degree Apprenticeships this entails the completion of an **Annual Review Form** at the start of each new academic year for any provision delivered in the previous academic year. This is usually completed by the Academic Partnership Liaison Tutor with support and input from the Faculty Partnership Lead, and supporting evidence includes external examiner reports, retention and other performance data, and student feedback. Annual Review may also revisit current programme Delivery Plans, due diligence, online marketing materials and staffing arrangements. Completed forms receive Faculty-level scrutiny and approval[[39]](#footnote-40) prior to their submission to AQEC[[40]](#footnote-41), which:

* assesses, on the basis of the evidence provided, the ability and capacity of the partner organisation (working with the University) to identify and manage academic risk;
* provides feedback to Faculties, departments and partners or, where necessary and appropriate, requests additional information from them; and
* considers any additional scrutiny and/ or support for a partner or host University department that may be indicated by the Annual Review Form or other relevant evidence.

GQASC produces an overview document[[41]](#footnote-42) which highlights key themes from annual monitoring of academic partnerships. As well as providing the basis of discussion by AQEC[[42]](#footnote-43), this overview also informs production of the University Annual Monitoring Report (below).

### University Annual Monitoring Report

The University Annual Monitoring Report, which is received by AQEC[[43]](#footnote-44) and approved by the Academic Board[[44]](#footnote-45), assesses and evaluates the key risks identified through the annual monitoring of departments and their programmes including the annual review of academic partnerships. It is presented in the context of Faculty Academic Development Plans[[45]](#footnote-46) and the outcomes of annual budget-setting in so far as these impact the delivery and quality of both current and planned provision. Drafted by GQASC on behalf of the PVC (Student Experience) & University Secretary[[46]](#footnote-47), the University AMR highlights issues for attention by the Academic Board, Faculties and professional support services, giving particular emphasis to the longer-term and strategic implications of its assessment of risk in the context of external market and regulatory conditions. The University AMR is a key mechanism in promoting a culture of mutual accountability for the maintenance of standards and enhancement of quality and in so doing addresses the following audiences:

* **Academic departments and academic partner organisations**, which expect to see the broad concerns raised by them through the Annual Monitoring process have been considered and responded to; and
* **AQEC and Academic Board**, which require assurance that the University’s academic governance is being managed appropriately.

### Academic Assurance Report

The Academic Assurance Report (AAR) is authored by GQASC on behalf of Academic Board and it is informed by the University AMR. It provides supporting evidence of the maintenance of standards and quality for the Board of Governors’ annual accountability return to the Office for Students ([[47]](#footnote-48))￼. The AAR maps current Institutional processes and outcomes to the OfS’s General Ongoing Conditions of Registration, specifically Conditions B1-5 for Quality and Standards. A draft AAR is approved by Academic Board[[48]](#footnote-49) with the final version received for consideration by the Board of Governors.

## PERIODIC REVIEW

The purpose of Periodic Review is to review and evaluate all taught curriculum in a particular department or other cognate grouping of programmes (planning unit[[49]](#footnote-50)), in order to:

* Confirm that the academic standards set at programme validation remain appropriate and are being demonstrated by students through assessment and achievement of their awards.
* Confirm that the quality of the student learning experience is being maintained and enhanced.
* Address, in an holistic way, any issues concerning curricula, teaching, learning and assessment, student support, staffing and resources, course organisation and quality assurance that apply to the department’s whole provision.
* Consider the department’s academic strategy and direction in the context of the University’s mission, provision and students as well as national and regional agendas, exploring new areas for programme development or the re-focusing or closure of existing provision[[50]](#footnote-51).
* Consider trends in student recruitment, retention, progression and completion, including graduate employment, across the whole of the department’s portfolio from sub-degree to Masters level.
* Capture the ‘voices’ of current students, employers and alumni (through focus groups).
* Use evidence of standards and quality to support continued approval of the department’s programmes and awards.

Periodic reviews are programmed on a five-year cycle, the schedule and any changes to it being confirmed annually by AQEC (see table 2).

An Institution-level panel drawn from the membership of the Validation and Audit Standing Panel[[51]](#footnote-52) makes judgements on the overall academic health of the department and its programmes based on its reading of review documentation and separate discussions held with staff, students and employers. Periodic Review reports are received by AQEC where the review panel’s recommendations are considered and continued approval of all validated programmes normally confirmed although individual programmes may be referred to the host Faculty for modification or re-validation before the next student intake.

#### Table 2: ‘*Edge Hill University Periodic Review Cycle’* (updated October 2021)

| **Year no. in cycle** | **Academic Year** | **Faculty** | **Unit of periodic review** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **2021-2022** | FAS | Computer Science – hybrid event incl. Re-val |
|  |  | FAS | Geography and Geology[[52]](#footnote-53)  |
|  | FAS | Social Sciences[[53]](#footnote-54) |
| FHSCM | Medical Education[[54]](#footnote-55) |
| **2** | **2022-2023** | FAS | Biology[[55]](#footnote-56) |
| FAS | Business School[[56]](#footnote-57) |
| FAS | English, History and Creative Writing[[57]](#footnote-58) |
| FAS | Law and Criminology |
| FOE | Early Years Education[[58]](#footnote-59) |
| FOE | Primary and Childhood Education[[59]](#footnote-60)  |
| **3** | **2023-2024** | FAS | Creative Arts[[60]](#footnote-61) |
|  |  | FAS | Edge Hill Language Centre[[61]](#footnote-62) |
|  |  | FAS | Psychology |
|  |  | FHSCM | Applied Health and Social Care |
|  |  | FHSCM | Allied Health Professions |
| **4** | **2024-2025** | FAS | Sport and Physical Activity |
|  |  | FOE | Secondary and Further Education |
|  |  | FHSCM | Nursing and Midwifery Education[[62]](#footnote-63) |
| **5** | **2025-26** | FAS | Business School |
| FAS | Computer Science |
| FAS | Engineering |
| FAS | Geography and Geology |
| FAS | Social Sciences |
| FOE | Early Years Education |
| FHSCM | Medical Education |
| FAS | Law and Criminology |
| FOE | Primary and Childhood Education |

Periodic Review considers any programmes delivered by or with third-party organisations (academic partners) for the purpose of continuing programme approval, however these are also reviewed individually as part of a separate five-year cycle of partner and delivery re-approval[[63]](#footnote-64).

Faculties are advised against instigating standalone re-validation in the year of, or year before, a department’s scheduled Periodic Review, although circumstances may make this unavoidable, such as the need to implement revised PSRB standards. Where a programme’s re-validation[[64]](#footnote-65) is scheduled ***in same year*** as Periodic Review, the requirement for a Critical Review document is replaced by the standard validation documentation and the DBA completed in the same year as part of the Annual Monitoring process. If scheduled separately, Periodic Review and re-validation events should ideally be held three months apart to allow some opportunity for the review’s outcomes to inform the validation process.

WherePeriodic Reviewis scheduled for***the year following re-validation*** the review process is determined by the re-validation’s scope, for example:

* where the majority of the department’s programmes were re-validated the previous year, the requirement for a Critical Review document is replaced by the DBA, which supports continuing programme approval; or,
* where a minority of programmes were re-validated, a standard periodic review is completed.

Application to AQEC for **deferment of a scheduled Periodic Review** is normally supported by a Departmental Risk Assessment (see below). Reviews may be deferred for one year only.

#### Programme Transfers between Departments

Where programme transfer between departments creates the risk of individual programmes not being reviewed within a five-year period, the DBA process, carried out at the next available monitoring point, supports continuing programme approval.

**A full description of the periodic review process and associated documentation is contained in** [**‘*Preparing for Periodic Review: A Guide for Panels and Departments’***](https://go.edgehill.ac.uk/display/aqdu/Key%2BGuidance%2BDocuments)***.***

## INTERNAL AUDIT

Internal audits are commissioned by AQEC, the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) or the Directorate and may be prompted by:

1. The University’s strategic imperatives;
2. reports of external examiners, Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies, annual monitoring, validation or periodic review; or,
3. by specific request of Academic Board committees, the Directorate, Faculties or professional support services.

Internal audits are serviced by staff of GQASC who convene panels, distribute documentation, minute meetings and produce final reports according to timescales set by the commissioners (c, above). Whilst panels are normally constituted by members of the VASP, additional specialist expertise may be co-opted which could include external contributors.

### Developmental Enquiry

Thematic and enhancement-focused by nature, Developmental Enquiries (DEs) explore specific aspects of the learner experience; recent DEs have focused on cross-Faculty approaches to managing placement-based learning, the joint honours student experience and developing students’ assessment literacy. Written and oral evidence is taken from key Institutional stakeholders and the report, which is normally received by LTC, contains recommendations for development as well as highlighting good practice for wider dissemination. LTC decides upon any action to be taken in response to the report’s recommendations and progress is monitored through separate update reports, the timing and frequency of which are determined by the committee.

### Extraordinary Audit

An Extraordinary Audit may be convened at very short notice and enables a rapid response to a specific presenting issue, incident or set of circumstances, for example an adverse external examiner’s report. An Institutional panel chaired by a senior manager is convened and considers written and oral evidence with a report submitted to AQEC and the Directorate within two to six weeks of commissioning.

### Departmental Risk Assessment

Whether or not academic provision is deemed to be at risk depends on the interaction between the internal or external threats to which it is exposed and its owner’s capacity to manage these, resulting in an evaluation of net risk; thus a department operating in a high-risk environment may be assigned a rating of medium or even low net risk based on its perceived ability to manage those risks. Departmental Risk Assessment is a useful tool for confirming the continuing academic health of a department or programme, enabling swift conclusions to be drawn and any immediate support needs identified.

Commissioned by AQEC and conducted by the Governance Quality Assurance and Student Casework unit, Departmental Risk Assessments normally comprise the department’s most recent Annual Monitoring Report and updated QEP, accompanied by the reporting officer’s summary estimation of net risk. Departmental Risk Assessment may also be used to support an application to defer a scheduled Periodic Review which is considered by AQEC at its next available meeting (reviews may be deferred for one year only).

1. [www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/regulation/conditions-of-registration/](http://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/regulation/conditions-of-registration/). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/monitoring-and-evaluation](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/monitoring-and-evaluation). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. For AQEC’s constitution and terms of reference see Chapter 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. See Chapter 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Departmental annual monitoring typically takes place in Semester 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. See Chapter 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. See Chapter 4 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. See QMH Chapter 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. See Quality Management Handbook Chapter 2 [www.edgehill.ac.uk/documents/files/02-external-examiners.pdf](http://www.edgehill.ac.uk/documents/files/02-external-examiners.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Data may be disaggregated by entry qualification and protected characteristic where possible. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. The **Retention Rate** is the % of students registered on the programme who returned to the University the following academic year (however briefly), including those who are repeating the year, interrupting or transferring to another programme. This measure is not meaningful for finalists so it is only calculated for non-finalists. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. The **Progression Rate** is the % of students who ‘pass’ the year and are eligible to progress to the following year, or who have completed the programme (if they are finalists). Any students who do not have a result yet because they have interrupted, or are referred or deferred, are excluded from the calculation. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. **Completion** is where a student has finished a programme of study and been awarded a university qualification. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. [www.thestudentsurvey.com/](http://www.thestudentsurvey.com/). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Graduate Outcomes Progression Rate is the proportion of graduates in professional employment, further study, or who are retired, travelling, or caring. [www.graduateoutcomes.ac.uk](http://www.graduateoutcomes.ac.uk). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. For a more detailed description of the University’s approach to academic risk management see Chapter 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Who may include: relevant academic and professional communities; external examiners; regulatory bodies; collaborative partners; employers; service users and carers; and graduate alumni. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. For further details of the University’s approach to quality enhancement see Chapter 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. For example, programme performance data is made available to academic departments via Tableau and AQEC receives updates on progress against departments’ Quality Enhancement Plans during the academic year, typically through the receipt of Faculty quality committee minutes. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Programmes in Health, Social Care and Medicine that follow a non-modular structure consider this evidence as it relates to each Year of Study. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. See Chapter 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. The first-time pass rate includes students who have passed a module in their first attempt at the final assessment point. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. See Chapter 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. [www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/equality-act/protected-characteristics](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/equality-act/protected-characteristics). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. External examiners confirm that the standards set at validation meet or exceed national threshold (pass) standards and are comparable with similar provision of other UK higher education providers - See Chapter 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Also includes the PGCert Teaching in Higher Education delivered out of the Centre for Learning and Teaching. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Formally the departments of Media and Performing Arts. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Current credit-bearing provision comprises the University Foundation Certificate International Foundation Programme, the Stem Foundation Year, the level 3 Fastrack programme and foreign Language Study modules. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. A new School-based structure was introduced in the Faculty in 2019-20 however departments retain their individual identities for monitoring and review purposes. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Merged department w.e.f. 2020-21. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Key Performance Indicators are defined by the University’s Directorate (senior management team). [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Heads of Department are provided with detailed datasets disaggregated by relevant protected characteristics to enable a full evaluation of their portfolio. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. I.e., whether programmes have met or not met the national Expectations for Standards and Quality as set out in the OfS’s Regulatory Framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. Normally at the February meeting. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. <https://go.edgehill.ac.uk/display/aqdu> [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. Or delegated committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. At its February meeting. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. See Chapter 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. With representatives of partner organisations attending by invitation. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. At its February meeting. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. Jointly authored by the AQDU and Faculties. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. At its February meeting. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. At its June meeting. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. At its July meeting. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. See Chapter 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. Also the Chair of AQEC. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. For more detail on the Office for Students and associated sector regulation see Chapter 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. At its November meeting. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. See Chapter 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. Informing discussions that will take place during Departmental Academic Planning – see Chapter 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
51. See Chapter 4, also <https://go.edgehill.ac.uk/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=71188453>. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
52. Extraordinary DBA mechanism to grant continuing approval. Next scheduled review in 2025-26. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
53. Extraordinary DBA mechanism to grant continuing approval. Next scheduled review in 2025-26. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
54. Extraordinary DBA mechanism to grant continuing approval. Next scheduled review in 2025-26. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
55. Deferred from 2021-22. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
56. To include the PGCert Teaching in Higher Education. Deferred from 2021-22. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
57. Deferred from 2021-22. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
58. Deferred from 2021-22. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
59. Formerly the department of Children, Education and Communities [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
60. Formerly the departments of Media and Performing Arts. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
61. Credit-bearing provision comprises the University Foundation Certificate International Foundation Programme, the Stem Foundation Year, the level 3 Fastrack programme, and foreign Language Study modules. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
62. Combined department from 2020-21. Includes programmes transferred from the Partnerships and Practice Learning Unit in September 2019. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
63. See Chapter 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
64. See Chapter 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)