Monitoring and Review

The University has a number of procedures to monitor and review academic provision and standards of awards.

Periodic Programme Review - with input from external expertise, confirms the academic standards of awards for the previous 5 years; evaluates student academic experience, quality of learning opportunities, and good practice; makes recommendations on enhancements.

External Reference Points - a range of external reference points and external expertise to assure the quality and standards of provision and awards.

Academic Governance - The University’s governance structure assures the value, and continued integrity of its awards.

Marking and Assessment - The University’s programmes enable a student’s achievement to be reliably assessed; and the marking process is reliable, consistent and transparent.

How do we assure standards?

Periodic Programme Review - with input from external experts, confirms the academic standards of awards for the previous 5 years; evaluates student academic experience, quality of learning opportunities, and good practice; makes recommendations on enhancements.

Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies - regular reviews to scrutinise relevant programmes and reaccredit, thereby confirming standards. 63% of undergraduate programmes have external accreditation.

Subject benchmark statements - clear expectation built into programme design and approval.

Programme learning outcomes - defined in programme specifications, aligned to FHEQ levels; must be met to achieve award, and mapped to PSRB requirements where appropriate.

FHEQ levels - Academic frameworks and regulations are aligned to FHEQ levels.

Panels of Examiners - confirm the integrity and fairness of the assessment process. SR4.43-45

Internal moderation - ensures that sound and consistent academic judgements are made during the marking process.

Extenuating Circumstances - ensures students are given equal opportunity to succeed even when unforeseen circumstances get in the way, whilst ensuring programme learning outcomes are met. SR4.37-42

Marking scheme/criteria - used to ensure parity between the judgements of different assessors.

Academic Integrity - Senate Regulation 6 defines the procedures for academic misconduct, and cases are reported annually to Senate.

Boards of Examiners - make appropriate decisions on the academic progression of students; and recommend awards to Senate, taking into account approved Extenuating Circumstances. SR4.43-50 and SR4.56-65

University Education Committee - responsible for the oversight of delivery, quality assurance, and enhancement, learning and teaching, and student experience of educational provision within the College.

Senate Regulations - defined by Senate. Senate Regulations 2 and 4 set out the main regulations and frameworks for all undergraduate awards of the University.

Senate - principal body responsible to Council for regulation, governance, and quality assurance of the academic work of the University.

Award rules - no discretion, condonation, or setting aside is permitted. Appendices in Senate Regulation 2.

Council - the governing body of the University ultimately responsible for all statutory compliance and amongst other things for the University’s strategic direction.

Academic Appeals - governed by Senate Regulation 12. Ensures academic appeals submitted by students are dealt with fairly without compromising standards.

Academic Integrity - Senate Regulation 6 defines the procedures for academic misconduct, and cases are reported annually to Senate.

University Grade Descriptors - used throughout assessment processes to underpin consistency in marking.

Academic Appeals - Governed by Senate Regulation 12. Ensures academic appeals submitted by students are dealt with fairly without compromising standards.