

06.1

PROGRAMME ENHANCEMENT PLANNING

(Please refer to Section 06.1A for the Guidance Notes on the PEP Procedure, and to Section 06.1B for the Undergraduate Template and Section 06.1C for the Postgraduate Template)

Introduction

- 1 The annual monitoring of programmes is the cornerstone of the University's quality assurance process and applies to all programmes offered by Cardiff Metropolitan University for which a formal, recognised qualification is awarded. Emphasis is placed on the identification of issues and action taken to address them, thereby promoting a quality enhancement approach. The evaluations are central to the monitoring of programmes and form a basis for each periodic and elective Programme Review. The evaluations may be scrutinised by External Examiners, external awarding bodies, reviewers and assessors.

Purpose

- 2 This process is intended to:
 - 1 provide a complete overview of quality enhancement for all programmes in a designated academic portfolio over a year of operation;
 - 2 provide an opportunity for programme teams to reflect on the operation of those programmes;
 - 3 encourage programme teams to work in a quality enhancement mode and to engender high quality and standards;
 - 4 allow an institutional overview of the academic health of Cardiff Metropolitan University;
 - 5 provide a high-quality record, as part of the Cardiff Metropolitan University quality assurance system, for relevant external bodies;
 - 6 ensure and reflect links with institutional and School plans.

Procedure (Guidance Notes which expand upon the procedure are in Section 06.1A)

- 3 The process is centred around the completion by each Programme Director (and programme team) of an annual evaluation.
- 4 Whilst the evaluation itself may be compiled by the programme team at identified engagement points via an appropriate Programme Committee meeting, the work will take place throughout the academic year with which the evaluation is associated. Much of the evaluation merely requires reporting on what issues have been identified as requiring attention - from student evaluations and meetings with students, recommendations from validations, periodic and elective reviews and modifications, professional body and other accreditations, External Examiner reports, and what action has been taken or set in train as a result of their identification. The evaluation also includes a reference to where evidence of discussion and solution can be found (e.g. Programme Committee minutes).
- 5 The following evidence should be drawn on in support of the evaluation:

- .1 applications, admissions, progression, award and career destination statistics;
 - 2 External Examiners' reports and the programme team's responses thereto;
 - .3 professional, statutory or regulatory body reports, if applicable;
 - 4 national student survey feedback;
 - .5 student evaluations (including module evaluations, programme evaluations and work-based learning, if appropriate);
 - .6 moderators' reports/link tutor reports, if applicable;
 - .7 employer engagement and feedback;
 - .8 feedback from former students;
 - .9 programme committee minutes;
 - .10 recommendations from Cardiff Metropolitan University validation event or most recent periodic review event, which must be included in the PEP Action Plan and classified as a major issue;
 - .11 if the programme is articulated with an external programme for the purposes of advance standing, the most recent annual critical self-evaluation report.
- 6 Statistical data and associated comments/observations are also required for completion of the evaluation. Much of the statistical data is supplied from the central student and academic information system.
 - 7 Partner institutions should submit PEPs that are separate from the "home" Cardiff Metropolitan University provision.
 - 8 The programme team is required to produce an action plan to be addressed during the coming year, which is based on the information in the evaluation. Actions might be addressed by the programme team, they may need to be passed on to the School Planning and Management Team, or they may need to be reported at the Learning, Teaching and Student Engagement Committee (LTSEC) or Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC) for consideration. The current action plan must evidence continuity with the plan for the previous year, including the carrying forward of any unaddressed actions.
 - 9 In parallel, evaluations are scrutinised within Schools (by School Learning and Teaching Committee) and each School is required to produce a summary report which reflects the health of programmes within the School, identifies strengths and weaknesses, shortcomings, and a set of actions to be dealt with at School level during the new academic year. The School summary should identify any late or non-submissions, either giving

mitigation or detailing the actions being taken to chase-up. A separate School summary report should be produced for its programmes delivered through collaborative provision, such as franchises.

- 10 All evaluations and School summaries must be submitted to the Quality Enhancement Directorate in accordance with a timetable agreed by Academic Quality and Standards Committee. The current timetable is available on the QED webpages at:

<https://outlookuwicac.sharepoint.com/sites/QED/SitePages/Programme-Enhancement-Plans.aspx>.

Late submission and non-submission must be authorised by Academic Quality & Standards Committee.

- 11 Part of both programme evaluations and School summaries is devoted to the identification of actions completed from the previous evaluation, and actions still to be completed.
- 12 The Academic Quality and Standards Committee receives an annual summary of evaluations and presents any relevant findings to the LTSEC.
- 13 Each academic portfolio is reviewed annually unless an exemption is granted by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee.
- 14 An annual “enhancement” event takes place to support the dissemination of the good practice identified in the evaluations.
- 15 An annual theme with specific questions may be identified by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee with input from the LTSEC, on which all reports reflect and evaluate.