B   Quality Assurance and Enhancement Processes

> **This section of the regulations is informed by the following:**
>
> Applications for the grant of taught degree-awarding powers, research degree-awarding powers and university title: Degree Awarding Powers in England, Handbook for Applicants (December 2015)
>
> Sections of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education:
> - The Expectations and Practices in the revised Quality Code (November 2018)
>
> The following themes in the QAA UK Quality Code Advice and Guidance section:
> - Course Design and Development
> - Student Engagement
> - Monitoring and Evaluation

B1   Programme (Re)Validation (Approval, Review and Modification)

B1.1   Taught Degree Awarding Powers

B1.1.1   The Privy Council grants taught degree awarding powers (TDAP) for a fixed term period of six years to those non-publicly funded institutions who have applied and been successful in their application. The QAA states the criteria for the renewal of TDAP are that the organisation has:

(a)   subscribed for the duration of those six years to the QAA (or such other external quality assurance organisation as may be specified);

(b)   been subject to an external audit by the QAA; and

(c)   received a judgement of confidence in the organisation made by the QAA at the time of the audit. Organisations which fail to obtain such a judgement will be given reasons for this by the QAA and will be required to prepare and carry out an action plan agreed between the organisation and the QAA. Completion of this action plan to the satisfaction of the QAA will be a criterion for the renewal of the organisation's TDAP.

B1.2   Reviews by the Quality Assurance Agency

B1.2.1   Regent's University London, as a degree awarding body, is subject to Institutional Review by the QAA. The QAA has introduced a common review framework for all subscribers in England and Northern Ireland through a gradual transition in 2014-2015. Details can be found on the QAA website.

B1.3   Definition of Terms

B1.3.1   For Regent's University London the following terms are applicable:

B1.3.2   Accreditation

- A process for verifying and approving a higher education institution (HEI) or higher education programme by an authorised external institution/body.

B1.3.3   Validation

- Regent's University London or an external accreditation authority deeming a programme of study offered by Regent's University London to be academically viable and of an appropriate standard to be offered in the public domain.

B1.3.4   Revalidation

- Regent's University London or an external accreditation authority deeming a programme of study already validated being academically viable and of an appropriate standard to continue to be offered in the public domain.

B2   Summary of the Processes of Accreditation, Validation and Revalidation

B2.1   Accreditation

B2.1.1   Some programmes have professional accreditation which is outlined in the background document for the validation of a new degree or revalidation of an existing degree. This enables the degree to be more marketable to students and adds significant value to the programme. The process for accreditation should be initiated at a Content Area level. Proposals for accreditation should then be presented to the Vice Chancellor's Executive Team (VCET) or its nominated/equivalent body to ensure it is consistent with institutional strategy.

B2.1.2   Usually, accreditors will wish to visit the University to undertake a review before accrediting the institution for a period of years. The University will then need to undergo periodic review at the end of this cycle to maintain accreditation. The accreditation process usually involves sending documents to an accreditor and then undergoing review and audit and responding to any conditions set by the accreditor within a timeframe detailed within a report resulting from the review.

B2.2   Validation of New Degrees

B2.2.1   When the need for a new degree is identified, a programme proposal is drafted for discussion by the Vice Chancellor's Executive Team (VCET) or its nominated/equivalent body. The proposers, in consultation with the Head of Registry, seek approval for appropriate resources to support the development of the proposed degree through consultation where appropriate with the and the Vice Chancellor. Following this discussion and the incorporation of any amendments, formal approval is sought from VCET or the nominated/equivalent body. Once approval is obtained the proposer and Head of Registry implement internal

processes and procedures for the review and subsequent validation of the degree. The procedure is to:

(a) identify a viable Programme Development Leader;

(b) identify external panel members to assist with programme development;

(c) establish a Programme Team;

(d) prepare documentation for the Validation Event;

(e) present the programme to the validation panel members.

B2.2.2 The Programme Development Leader should contact the Quality Office for the Validation Organisation Guidelines and more information on the process.

B2.2.3 All relevant documentation is reviewed before and after the Validation Event by the Programme Development Leader, working closely with the Director of Content or equivalent.

B3 Summary of Arrangements for Validation/Revalidation of Programmes of Study by Regent's University London

B3.1 Validation of a New Programme of Study

B3.1.1 To allow adequate time for the development, validation and marketing of new degree programmes, a new programme must be approved by VCET, or its nominated/equivalent body, with an appropriate lead-in time before it is implemented. The Head of Registry and representatives from Enrolment Management should be consulted when determining the appropriate lead-in time.

B3.2 Revalidation of an Existing Programme of Study

B3.2.1 To allow adequate time to prepare for the revalidation of a degree programme, programme development must begin before the end of the currently validated period. The content of each individual revalidated programme is informed by a series of Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs), over the preceding years.

B3.3 Procedures and Practices

The validation and revalidation schedule is organised by the Head of Registry and Quality Office in consultation with the Quality Committee.

B3.3.1 The validation and revalidation schedule for the following academic year is submitted to the Quality Committee in the preceding academic year.

B3.3.2 The Senior Quality Officer, Associate Provost, Director of Content, and the Head of Registry work closely during all (re)validation events. The Associate Provosts or equivalent assures the academic content of all programmes proceeding to the (Re)Validation Event. The Senior Quality

Officer advises the academic colleagues on the dates and administrative procedures of the (Re)Validation process. The Head of Registry ensures that all (re)validation matters are effectively audited on behalf of the University.

B4   Roles of Key Participants

B4.1   Director of Content/Programme Development Leader

B4.1.1   The Programme Development Leader will lead a new programme of study through its development to the (Re)Validation Event, in consultation with the Associate Provost.

B4.1.2   The Director of Content/Programme Development Leader will lead a current programme of study through the revalidation process, in consultation with the Associate Provost.

B4.1.3   The Associate Provost will select a programme team from across the institution in consultation with the Director of Content/Development Leader or their equivalent.

B4.1.4   The Director of Content/Programme Development Leader or their equivalent will lead the programme team based on the intended content and delivery of the proposed programme.

B4.1.5   The Director of Content/Programme Development Leader or their equivalent will be administratively supported by the Registry.

B4.2   Programme Team

B4.2.1   The Programme Team is responsible for designing and developing the programme in its content, delivery and assessment, and it takes responsibility for producing the programme documentation in preparation for the (Re)Validation Event.

B4.2.2   The Programme Team consists of all or a selection of the following personnel:

(a) Director of Content/Programme Development Leader or their equivalent

(b) Associate Provost or their equivalent

(c) Appointed external panel members

(d) Academic members of staff who will teach on the programme or supervise dissertations

(e) Other internal or external colleagues who have contributed to the development of the programme

B4.2.3   Further staff and individuals will be consulted and may be invited to appropriate meetings where necessary. These may be drawn from:

(a) External consultants

(b) Director of Business Intelligence & Digital Transformation

(c) Head of Academic Operations

(d) A specialist in Learning and Teaching

(e) Learning Resource Representatives

(f) Head of Student Immigration & Compliance

(g) Student Support & Welfare representative

(h) Representative of Partnerships

(i) Representative of Graduate Outcomes

(j) Head of Alumni

(k) Representative of Marketing, Digital & Brand

(l) Representative of Admissions & Recruitment

(m) Representative of the Library

(n) Representative of IT Services

(o) Representative of Media Services

B4.2.4   The Programme Team will conduct a series of minuted development meetings in preparation for the presentation of the programme to the (Re)Validation Event. Such comments will be included in the programme documentation.

B4.3   University Management Team

B4.3.1   The University Management Team consists of senior University management staff. Its role is to discuss the rationale of the programme and its place within the University's Strategic Plan, and to respond to issues of support and quality assurance for the programme across the University's systems and services.

B4.3.2   Common constitution of the University Management Team is as follows:

(a) Associate Provost or their equivalent

(b) Director of Content/Programme Development Leader or their equivalent

(c) Director of Enrolment Management, their equivalent or nominee

(d) Head of Academic and Educational Development or nominee

(e) Other staff may be invited to attend where required

B4.4   Constitution of the (Re)Validation Panel

B4.4.1   The (Re)Validation Panel will consist of the following individuals:

(a) Chair (independent from the Programme, being either a Director of Content, Director of People or nominated external Chairperson);

(b) A minimum of two external panel members, who have been involved in the programme's development;

(c) Two internal academic panel members (not subject specialists);

(d) Senior Quality Officer;

(e) Secretary from the Registry;

(f) A student representative not associated with the programme;

(g) A Regent's University London observer.

B4.4.2   The members of the (Re)Validation Panel are approved and confirmed by the Registry.

B4.4.3   The observer is not a member of the panel but will be present throughout the (Re)Validation event.

B4.4.4   The (Re)Validation Panel will be considered valid in the absence of the observer and/or the student representative.

B4.5   External Panel Members

B4.5.1   Selected by the Registry from nominations of subject specialists proposed by the Director of Content/Programme Development Leader. The external panel members will be experts in the field or fields covered by the programme. Their remit is to assist with programme development, consider and evaluate the draft programme documentation, engage in the (Re)Validation Event as members of the panel, and finally to contribute to writing the report with any commendations, recommendations and conditions.

B4.5.2   The external panel members will collectively have:

(a) experience covering the subject area(s) of the programme being (Re)Validated;

(b) experience of being a member of a programme approval and/or review panel.

B4.5.3   The external panel members must not be associated with the programme being (re)validated or have been associated with the programme in the past.

B4.5.4   The Director of Content/Programme Development Leader must send external panel member nominations to the Registry as soon as the programme proposal has been approved by VCET or its nominated/equivalent body.

B4.6   Student representative on the panel

B4.6.1   The student representative for a (Re)Validation panel will be selected by the Registry from suitable nominations proposed by the Student Union.

B4.6.2   The student representative's remit is to consider and evaluate the programme documentation on issues relating to student experience,

such as learning resources, teaching support, support for study period abroad, assessment, modular structure etc.

B4.6.3   The student representative is a full member of the (Re)Validation panel, however the panel is able to proceed in the absence of the student representative.

B4.6.4   The student representative must be a current Regent's University London student.

B4.6.5   The student representative on an undergraduate programme (Re)Validation panel must be a current second or third year undergraduate student. The student representative on a postgraduate programme (Re)Validation panel must be a postgraduate student.

B4.6.6   The student representative must be independent of the programme being (Re)Validated.

B4.6.7   The student representative must attend a training session facilitated by the Registry, before participating on a (Re)Validation panel. Student representatives selected by the Registry who do not attend a training session will not be able to act as a student representative.

B4.6.8   The student representative will be remunerated for their participation on a (Re)Validation panel as per the fees agreed by the Registry at the beginning of each academic year.

B5   (Re)validation process

B5.1   (Re)Validation Event

B5.1.1   The (Re)Validation Event will examine the proposed programme in detail. It will conduct separate meetings with the University Management Team and the Programme Team, and examine the rationale and positioning of the programme within the University's portfolio and the support and quality systems available to the programme, together with details of module content, delivery and assessment.

B5.1.2   Following detailed examination of the programme and exploration of the relevant support and quality systems, the panel will decide to either recommend approval or rejection of the proposed programme to the Quality Committee. The panel may set conditions and/or recommendations for the programme team to meet.

B5.1.3   In exceptional circumstances, where the scope of the (Re)Validation is not extensive, the (Re)Validation Event may be held digitally/by correspondence. Requests for a (Re)Validation Event to be held digitally/by correspondence should be submitted to the Quality Office and will be reviewed on a case by case basis.

B5.2   Documentation for (Re)Validation Event

B5.2.1   The Programme Team prepares the programme documentation for the (Re)Validation Event (available on the Registry intranet pages), which includes:

(a) the programme specification; including a curriculum map, an assessment map and the module descriptors;

(b) the module specification document

(c) a Programme Development Document, which includes a completed planning template plus a summary of its development, and CVs of the academics in the Programme Team. For revalidations this will also include a critical appraisal;

(d) the University's Academic Regulations (including policies and procedures of the University).

(e) a transitional arrangements document outlining teach-out arrangements (where there is an existing programme being revalidated).

B5.2.2   The documents include information on:

- Rationale and Programme/Level Learning Outcomes
- Admissions criteria as held by the Admissions Panel
- Programme Modules, include module learning outcomes
- Assessment
- Teaching and Learning
- Management of Programme/Pathways
- Resources
- Employability/alumni
- Internationalism/ Partnerships (if Study Period Abroad is applicable)
- Transitional arrangement plans (for revalidations only)

B5.2.3   Once signed off by the Director of Content/Programme Development Leader and the Associate Provost, the documents for the (Re)Validation Event will be submitted to the Registry for distribution to the (Re)Validation Panel at least four weeks in advance of the event. This allows Panel members to fully digest and reflect upon the programme proposal.

B5.2.4   The Programme Team will expect to receive an initial panel response, via the Secretary to the (Re)Validation Panel, prior to the (Re)Validation Event identifying issues to be addressed on the day.

B5.3   (Re)Validation Event

B5.3.1   The (Re)Validation Event includes a learning resources audit.

B5.3.2   It is conducted by the (Re)Validation Panel, minuted by the Secretary, and attended at various stages by:

(a)   the Programme Team

(b)   the University Management Team

B5.3.3   The (Re)Validation Event enables the Panel with the University Management Team to resolve any outstanding matters with regard to the rigour of the proposal and the ability of the institution to support it and deliver a good experience to students; and with the Programme Team to resolve any outstanding matters from programme development which have not been satisfactorily addressed in the documentation submitted. For example, the Panel may enter into meaningful academic dialogue on critical aspects such as:

- teaching and learning;
- the achievement of learning outcomes;
- curriculum content.

B5.3.4   The Registry and the Director of Content/Programme Development Leader will agree the various agendas for the day, however the Panel may wish to change the agenda on the day, where further information is being sought.

B5.4   Common (Re)Validation Agenda

B5.4.1   The likely agenda for a (Re)Validation Event (in no definitive order) will be as follows:
- private Panel Meeting;
- meeting with University Management Team;
- meeting with Programme Team;
- meeting with service deliverers e.g., library, IT, careers and Student Support & Welfare, (possibly as part of University Management Team);
- meeting with students;
- private Panel Meeting;
- Final Meeting with Programme and University Management Teams.

B5.5   Outcomes of the (Re)Validation Event

B5.5.1   The following approval recommendations are available to the panel at the end of the (Re)Validation Event:

B5.5.2   Full Term Approval

(a) A programme may be recommended for approval for a maximum of five years.

B5.5.3   Approval may be recommended for a shorter period. This may arise because, for example:

(a) the programme is a new field of study;

(b) the field of study is new to the University;

(c) changes to a programme are in prospect, possibly as a consequence of demands of a statutory or professional body.

B5.5.4 Conditions of approval

(a) Conditions of approval should be used for requirements which must be fulfilled in order to ensure the programme meets the University's regulations and the standard required for a Regent's University London validated award. Changes which are desirable in order to enhance the quality of the programme of study, but which do not affect the threshold standard, should be brought to the attention of the University as recommendations (see below).

(b) Conditions should be expressed precisely and have a specific and realistic date set for their achievement. Programme teams must be able to understand what is required from them.

B5.5.5 Non-approval

(a) The panel may decide to recommend to the Quality Committee that the programme should not be approved if it has major reservations about the proposals. In this case it will offer advice about the aspects of the proposals which require further consideration and, if appropriate, give guidance about the timing of a resubmission.

B5.5.6 Recommendations

(a) The panel may make recommendations for the Faculty/Institute to follow up, and a response will be required through the Annual Monitoring Report for the programme.

B5.6 The report on the panel's findings

B5.6.1 The final recommendation of the (Re)Validation panel is forwarded to the Quality Committee for final approval of the (Re)Validation panel's decision.

B5.7 Appeals

B5.7.1 The University will not consider appeals against panel judgements, but may consider appeals about the relevant process and conduct leading to a judgement. If a deficiency in procedure or conduct is substantiated, it does not necessarily call into question the judgement, as the impact of the deficiency would have to be considered. Consistency between the evidence base and the judgements made would be a key consideration.

B5.7.2 An allowable appeal might be about the work of a panel, individual members of a panel, or a member of staff of the University. Panel members are made aware of what is expected of them both in the content of their work and in the way they carry it out. In turn, the University expects that Programme Teams will treat panel members with the respect, courtesy and professionalism necessary for a successful process.

B5.7.3   An appeal against a decision made by a (Re)Validation panel should be made in writing by the Director of Content/Programme Development Leader in agreement with the Associate Provost or equivalent to the Head of Registry clearly detailing the grounds of the appeal with any supporting evidence. The Head of Registry will then raise the appeal for discussion at the next meeting of the Quality Committee, who will make a final decision. The Associate Provost as a member of the Quality Committee will notify the Director of Content/Programme Development Leader of the result of the appeal.

B5.7.4   The following decisions are available to the Quality Committee:

(a) Amend a condition set by the (Re)Validation Panel;

(b) Annul the decision made by the (Re)Validation panel and order a new (Re)Validation of the programme with a completely new Panel, or replace individual Panel Members;

(c) Reject the appeal.

B5.7.5   The decision made by the Quality Committee will constitute the final stage of the University's procedures in the appeals process.

B5.8   Failure to recruit students after validation

B5.8.1   If a programme fails to recruit students for three successive years after validation, then the programme will be required to undergo a new validation. The programme will be unable to admit any students until successfully revalidated.

B6   Modifications to Programmes

B6.1   Scope

B6.1.1   Changes to either a module or a programme as a whole is subject to approval before it can be implemented. The purpose of such approval is to ensure that any changes will maintain and where possible improve the standard of education offered through the programme concerned. In addition, modifications to a module or programme are subject to consultation with the relevant external examiner(s) as detailed below. Prior to approval, changes to a programme, existing module or the introduction of a new module is agreed by the Director of Content in liaison with the relevant Associate Provost and, where required, the appropriate external examiner. The Director of Content and Associate Provost are responsible for ensuring that the cumulative impact of small/incremental changes do not amount to a major change in a programme of study. 'Changes after approval should require modification through the formal process' (QAA UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance, Course Development and Design) detailed below.

B6.2   Changes to Modules

B6.2.1   Academic staff should read the 'Programme and Module Change Process' (located on the Registry pages of the Regent's University London Intranet) before requesting any changes to modules.

B6.2.2   Changes to modules are defined as changes to:

(a) Aims of a module;

(b) Pre-requisites / co-requisites;

(c) Learning outcomes (provided the change does not affect the overall programme learning outcomes);

(d) Learning and teaching strategy;

(e) Assessment weightings (e.g. 50% to 40% of the total module mark), assessment strategy, assessment methods (e.g. exam to presentation)

(f) New arrangements for collaborative provision

B6.2.3   To request a change the requisite 'PPP Request' form must be completed and submitted to the Quality Office

B6.2.4   External examiner approval must be sought for all changes.

B6.3   Introduction of a New Module

B6.3.1   Academic staff should read the 'Programme and Module Change Process' (located on the Registry pages of the Regent's University London Intranet) before requesting the introduction of a new module.

B6.3.2   A proposal for the introduction of a new module is to be initiated by the relevant Director of Content or their equivalent in consultation with the relevant departments and Associate Provost and approved by the external examiner.

B6.3.3   To request the introduction of a new module, the 'PPP Request' form must be completed and submitted to the Quality Office.

B6.4   Changes to Programmes

B6.4.1   Academic staff should read the 'Programme and Module Change Process' (located on the Registry pages of the Regent's University London Intranet) before requesting any changes to modules.

B6.4.2   Programme changes are defined as changes to:

(a) Programme structure;

(b) Educational aims and objectives;

(c) Programmes' relationship to other programmes and awards;

(d) Programme learning outcomes;

(e) Level learning outcomes;

(f) Changes to the learning and teaching strategy / assessment methods (non-regulatory);

(g) Distinctive features of the programme and other key information;

(h) Support for students and their learning;

(i) Opportunities for personal development planning for students within the programme;

(j) Award criteria;

(k) Programme specific methods for evaluating and improving the quality and standards of teaching and learning.

B6.4.3   A proposal for a change to a programme is to be initiated by the relevant Director of Content or their equivalent in consultation with the relevant departments and Associate Provost or equivalent, and approved by the external examiner. The requisite 'PPP Request' form must be completed and submitted to the Quality Office

B6.5   Changes to Programme Titles

B6.5.1   Where it does not involve a fundamental change to the nature of a programme or modification to programme content, changes to programme titles may be approved by PPP. Requests to change a programme title cannot be considered at the same time as other modifications to a programme.

B6.5.2   Changes to a programme title should only be made in consultation with the appropriate colleagues from VCET, Enrolment Management and Registry. Changes should be minimal and must accurately reflect the content of the programme. If the nature or content of the programme will be affected by a title change, a full revalidation is required.

B6.5.3   A proposal to change a programme title is to be initiated by the relevant Director of Content or their equivalent in consultation with the relevant departments and Associate Provost, and approved by the external examiner. The requisite 'Programme Title Change' request form must be completed.

B6.6   Programme Modification Process

B6.6.1   The process for requesting a change to a programme or module is as follows:

B6.6.2   The Director of Content or their equivalent completes and signs the 'PPP Request' form. The Director of Content will consult with the relevant Associate Provost or equivalent, and external examiner(s) and seek their approval.

B6.6.3   The proposal is received by the Quality Office who will ensure that all the appropriate information has been included in the proposal.

B6.6.4   Where changes are minimal, the Quality Office will review the proposal and decide whether to approve or reject the proposal subject to the appropriate conditions.

B6.6.5   Where further scrutiny is required, the proposal is received by the Chair of the Programme Planning Panel (PPP), who is the Deputy Head of Registry (or nominee). The Senior Quality Officer will be Secretary and a Quality Officer will be minute taker. The PPP will verify that due process has been followed and that the modification(s) conforms to programme, University, and where appropriate the validating authority's regulations.

B6.6.6   The Quality Office or PPP will either:

(a) Approve the proposal;

(b) Approve the proposal subject to conditions which will need to be met within a set timeframe;

(c) Reject the proposal;

(d) Request further clarification or amendment of the proposal within a set timeframe.

B6.6.7   PPP also receives a report of the module and programme changes approved by the Quality Office between PPP meetings.

B6.6.8   If approved, the change is reported at the Quality Committee.

B6.6.9   If the programme is externally validated, the form will be sent to that body for approval.

B6.6.10   The completed form with all required documentation must be received by the Quality Office by the deadline set by the Registry. Proposals submitted will be for implementation at the start of the following academic year.

B6.7   Definitive Documents for All Programmes

B6.7.1   Following the validation of a new programme or module, or revision to an existing programme or module, the Faculty/Institute sends definitive programme documentation to the Registry.

B6.7.2   The definitive programme documentation after a (Re)Validation includes:

(a) Programme Development Document;

(b) Programme Specification;

(c) Module Specifications;

(d) Transitional arrangements (where an existing programme has been revalidated).

B6.7.3   After any changes to a programme or module(s) have been made subsequent to (Re)Validation, an updated Programme Specification and/or Module Specification must be submitted to the Registry.

B7   Programme Discontinuation/Suspension

B7.1.1   Approval of programme (or pathway) discontinuation and suspension is the responsibility of the Academic Committee. However, to ensure that full consideration of any proposal to discontinue or suspend a programme takes place at both all appropriate levels, responsibility for this procedure will be delegated to VCET or its nominated/equivalent body.. A decision to request discontinuation or suspension should align with the objectives of the relevant Institutional plan.

B7.1.2   The request must be supported by the Associate Provost. The discontinuation/suspension form, signed by the relevant Associate Provost is submitted to the Quality Office for approval from VCET or its nominated/equivalent body.

B7.1.3   Strategies for discontinuation/suspension (e.g. formal communication to students, support for students completing their studies, enabling students to transfer to a suitable alternative programme elsewhere to complete their award, and amendments to the University Prospectus and marketing) may not begin until the matter has been reported and approved by VCET or its nominated/equivalent body.

B7.1.4   VCET or its nominated/equivalent body will consider the request and will either:

   a) Approve the request and recommend the suspension/discontinuation;
   b) Refer the request to the Content Area and ask for further clarification;
   c) Reject the request, providing feedback.

B7.1.5   Following the appropriate approval, the request is forwarded to the Academic Committee for ratification.

B7.1.6   Following a programme discontinuation/suspension decision, recruitment to all levels of the programme will cease.

B7.1.7   The Programme Discontinuation/Suspension form is located on the Registry Intranet pages.

B8   Annual Programme Evaluation and Monitoring

B8.1 Purpose

B8.1.1 The purpose of annual monitoring is to ensure that programmes are being delivered in such a way as to meet their academic and professional aims and objectives in order that students have the opportunity to develop to the best of their ability. It provides an opportunity for the University and its faculties to examine how well programmes are operating in this context, and to review them in the light of the University's Hallmark Pedagogy.

B8.2 Annual Monitoring Report

B8.2.1 Part of the annual monitoring process is undertaken by Directors of Content through the preparation of critical Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs), templates for these reports and annual guidelines are supplied on the Registry intranet pages. Typically, each Annual Monitoring Report provides an action list for the forthcoming academic year and a report on actions taken in the previous academic year.

B8.2.2 The AMR is a summation of programme statistics including data such as:

- applications
- student progression
- student results
- reporting on protected characteristics, e.g. disability, ethnicity
- appeals and complaints.

B8.2.3 The AMR also contains all external examiners' annual reports and responses to those external examiners' reports. In particular, the AMR is informed by module monitoring forms and comments on the following:

- staff teaching on modules
- resources for modules
- changes and future developments to modules
- student module survey results
- student performance on modules.

B8.3 Approval Process

B8.3.1 Each year, AMRs are compiled and submitted for the previous academic year. Deadlines for the production of the reports are set by the Registry and circulated to all key stakeholders.

B8.3.2 The Directors of Content or their equivalent, on behalf of their programme teams, complete the Annual Monitoring Report. The report is then submitted to the Quality Office who will work with the Associate

Provosts and other academic colleagues to review, provide feedback and approve the AMRs..

B8.3.3   To be approved, AMRs must:

(a)   be prepared in line with the University template;

(b)   be of a publishable standard;

(c)   be delivered by the University deadline;

(d)   make recommendations that are within the boundaries of both the QAA Quality Code and the University regulatory framework.

B8.3.4   Following the submission of AMRs, feedback may be given to Directors of Content for further updating before the report can be approved and published.

Once all AMRs have been approved by the relevant Associate Provost, the Quality Office will prepare an overview report for submission to the Quality Committee. This report will confirm that annual monitoring has taken place in line with the University's processes, are of a publishable standard, and in line with the QAA Quality Code and University regulatory framework. It will also highlight any common or urgent issues requiring attention.

B9   Student Feedback Systems

B9.1   Introduction

B9.1.1   Students play a key role in the University's processes for enhancing the quality of both its educational provision and the broader student experience. This role is based on students providing feedback on their experience at the module level together with the active role of student representatives at the Programme Committee at institutional level.

B9.1.2   Students' views are seen as being important for informing judgements on the quality of the educational experience they obtain through studying at Regent's University London. At the module level, it is considered important to obtain information on the quality of students' learning. In addition, the University believes that students should be supported in expressing views and raising issues at the wider subject area and programme level, as well as, on aspects of institutional provision.

B9.2   Scope

B9.2.1   The effective involvement of students in quality systems depends upon processes which:

(a) facilitate students' confidence in providing open and frank feedback;

(b) ensure that the feedback is listened to and, where appropriate, acted upon;

(c) ensure that information is provided for students on how their views have been considered; action taken and, where appropriate, reasons why action is not taken.

B9.2.2 The process is two-way and students have a responsibility to:

(a) act responsibly and constructively in providing views;

(b) recognise that student views are one part of a wider integrated quality enhancement system;

(c) participate in the formal structures provided to elicit student comment;

(d) disseminate information to each other, initially, through the vehicle of student representatives.

B9.2.3 There are a number of processes designed to provide students with an opportunity to contribute to the assessment of the enhancement of quality:

(a) student feedback on learning at the module level;

(b) student feedback on facilities/resources supporting a learning environment;

(c) student consultation as part of proposals submitted to the Programme Planning Panel

(d) student representation on the Programme Committees;

(e) student representation on other University committees.

B9.3   Student Feedback at the Module Level

B9.3.1 All students are invited to provide feedback on each module that they take. The students are required to complete a questionnaire through the Student Feedback System which is managed centrally by the University.

B9.3.2 All module evaluation surveys should be normally distributed before teaching week nine of each term and be returned by the end of teaching week nine.

B9.3.3 The questionnaire reports are sent to the Module Leaders, Directors of Content and Associate Provosts or their equivalents to be reviewed as part of annual monitoring. Any module-specific issues will be dealt with by Module Leaders in collaboration with Directors of Content and Associate Provosts or their equivalents.

B9.3.4 The module leader should discuss the findings of the module survey with the students and provide a formal response to student feedback by the end of each term.

B9.3.5   The student feedback report will enable the Associate Provost to make informed judgements about academic staff development.

B9.3.6   The student feedback reports and forms are passed to the Associate Provost for generic scrutiny, to identify any outstanding indicators of either a positive or negative fashion. Issues arising from 'student feedback', identifying generic indicators of perceived student quality are addressed at the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee. This information also informs the AMR.

B9.3.7   Informal feedback can be sought at different times within a module and it is assumed that module leaders undertake this more frequently.

B9.3.8   Students will only recognise the value of providing feedback if they receive some response on how the feedback has been received and considered and whether any changes have been made as a result. In view of this, the Programme Committees and Heads of Programmes or their equivalent are an important part of the process and will be responsible for providing information to students on issues raised through the channel of:

(a) student representatives;

(b) student feedback systems.

B9.4   Student feedback at an Institutional Level

B9.4.1   The University invites students to complete the National Student Survey. The survey is aimed at final year undergraduates with the purpose of gathering feedback from all eligible students at the end of their studies.

B9.4.2   The NSS is conducted for three main reasons:
- To inform student choice - it provides the opportunity for current students to tell future students what they think about the quality of their course.

- To provide information to enhance the student learning experience - institutions use the results to help develop their courses facilities for future students

- To provide public assurance - the survey is also a mechanism for the general public to be provided with information about the quality of UK higher education.

B9.4.3   All eligible students will be contacted by Ipsos MORI, by email, telephone, or post.

B9.4.4   The NSS results will be made available to prospective students through the Unistats website, which is designed to help students when they are making decision about higher education. The results of the NSS will also be analysed at the relevant committee to identify what is going well but also where improvements can be made to the overall student learning experience.

B9.4.5　Students at Level 4 and Level 5 have the opportunity to complete the internal Regent's Student Satisfaction Survey, the questions mirror those on the National Student Survey. The survey is conducted in house using the EvaSys software linked to an online survey via Blackboard; results are considered at the relevant Senate level committees, where enhancements to current practise may be proposed.

B10　Peer Observation of Teaching

B10.1　Introduction

B10.1.1　Academics engage in observation of teaching practices as a facilitator of quality enhancement rather than quality management. The processes of induction, training and probation of new teaching staff, as well as those relating to performance development review are detailed in the relevant HR documents.

B10.1.2　Teaching Practice Development is a process whereby a third party observes, and provides feedback on, teaching, curriculum and assessment design, and learning support. Its purposes are to provide feedback to the staff observed, opportunities for staff to learn from each other, and to assist with staff development. The first guiding principle of observation is that it is developmental rather than judgmental (NAFTHE).[1]

B10.1.3　Teaching Practice Development is about giving academics the opportunity to reflect on their teaching practices and discuss them with colleagues in a formative and non-judgemental way. The needs of teaching staff at different stages in their career vary, so the scheme is not too prescriptive. These guidelines support active engagement in the process rather than impose a standard way of doing things and build on existing good practice identified across the University, thus enhancing the student learning experience.

B10.2　Aims

a)　to harness the considerable good practice present in our teaching, and disseminate this across the University.

b)　to create a culture of open dialogue around the constant improvement of teaching, making observation and reflection a routine element of practice.

c)　to promote the scholarship of teaching and learning.

d)　to widen the scope of observing practice to include more than classroom teaching, such as assessment, Blackboard use or supervision.

---

[1] National Association for Teachers in Further & Higher Education (NATFHE) Guidelines for Higher Education branches: Peer Review & Peer Observation of Teaching, May 2002.

B10.3 Principles

Teaching Practice Development is about:

(a) sharing good practice rather than evaluating the performance of academics;

(b) it should be confidential between the academic and the observer;

(c) it should be flexible in focus and not adopt an audit approach;

(d) it should be seen as a source for personal/professional development;

(e) it can be productive in enhancing the delivery of teaching and /or the content of learning;

B10.4 Procedures

B10.4.1 Annual Teaching Practice Development comprises is compulsory for all teaching staff.

B10.4.2 Teaching staff can choose to focus on any one of four areas of practice:

- TPD 1 Classroom observation (must be undertaken at least once every two years)

- TPD 2 Review of curriculum design and assessment practices (optional)

- TPD 3 Review of Blackboard use (optional)

- TPD 4 Observation/review of Dissertation supervision (optional)

B10.4.3 A record of each teacher's chosen area of focus will be kept by Learning and Development to check that classroom observation (TPD1) is undertaken at least once every two years.
The relevant forms, as well as guidance are available in each of the TDP options on the TPD home page within Regent's Teaching Exchange.

B10.4.4 The observer will be allocated by Academic and Educational Development based on compatibility (e.g. where linguistic competence or experience in dissertation supervision is required). The pool of observers comprises all current Fellows, Senior Fellows and Principal Fellows of the Higher Education Academy.

B10.4.5 Once the observation has taken place, both the observer and the teacher will complete a standard template and this is then forwarded to an educational developer from the Teaching Practice Development team in AED who will provide relevant feedback and any suggestions for further development or dissemination of good practice.

B11 Externally validated programmes

B11.1.1   In addition to offering its own degrees, Regent's University London offers a selection of programmes validated by external accreditation agencies. For these external programmes, the University operates robust systems of preliminary review for the institution or a programme prior to any final accreditation/validation event. The preliminary review outcomes are reported to the external validating authority before proceeding to final accreditation or validation, whichever is applicable. The accrediting/validating institution is provided with a succinct audit trail which informs the visiting panel of issues it may wish to address.

B11.1.2   Programmes which are externally validated must follow the processes laid out by the validating body in relation to:

(a) Validation/revalidation of a programme;

(b) modifications to the programme and modules;

(c) annual monitoring.

B11.1.3   The Director of Content /Programme Development Leader or their equivalent should consult with the Registry with regards to the requirements of the validating body in relation to the above processes.

B12 Collaborative Provision

B12.1.1   The University's Collaborative Provision Policy (informed by the University's Internationalisation Strategy) states that the University should only engage in the following types of collaborative arrangements;

(a) Articulation arrangements

(b) Dual/Double or multiple awards

(c) Jointly delivered programmes

B12.1.2   The University's regulations in conjunction with any specific programme regulations must be followed for all collaborative arrangements with the possible exception of joint awards where a common set of regulations may be agreed between the two collaborative partners.

B12.1.3   Students studying at Regent's University London are bound by the policies of Regent's irrespective of the type of arrangement that the University may have with another partner institution.

B12.1.4   The Register of Collaborative Arrangements can be found on the Registry Intranet page at the following link: https://www.regents.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2020-07/Collaborative%20Provision%20Policy%20-%20July%202020.pdf