

Heriot-Watt University's Mapping to the UK Quality Code

Monitoring and Evaluation

Contents

Terminology

Expectations and Practices

Guiding principles (with mapping from HWU practices)

Regulatory contexts for the Quality Code

The Expectations and Core practices of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Code) are mandatory for higher education providers in all parts of the UK. Common practices are mandatory in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and while providers in England may choose to work towards them, they are not required to do so as these are not regulatory requirements and will not be assessed as part of the OfS's regulatory framework. National regulators and QAA are not bound by the information in this advice and guidance and will not view it as containing indicators of compliance. This guidance does not interpret statutory requirements.

Terminology

Monitoring: The routine collection and analysis of information that focuses on an area of work, project or programme/course, undertaken while the area of work, project or programme/course is ongoing.

Evaluation: The periodic, retrospective assessment of an organisation, an area of work, project or course, that might be conducted internally or by external independent evaluators. Evaluation uses information from monitoring, current and historic, to develop an understanding and inform planning.

Providers: Any organisation involved in the provision of higher education to students and apprentices.

Degree-awarding bodies: Organisations empowered to award higher education awards under relevant UK statutes.

Expectations and Practices

The advice underneath the Expectations and Practices is not mandatory for providers but illustrative of a range of possible approaches.

Monitoring and evaluation of higher education is an essential process within providers, forming a fundamental part of the academic cycle. It can, and should, look at all aspects of the higher education experience. All higher education providers are involved in course monitoring and review processes as these enable providers to consider how learning opportunities for students may be improved.

EXPECTATIONS FOR STANDARDS		EXPECTATIONS FOR QUALITY	
<p>The academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.</p> <p><i>Monitoring and evaluation ensures that providers' academic provision enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes of courses. They evaluate student attainment of academic standards and allow providers to confirm that their portfolio aligns with their mission and strategic priorities.</i></p>	<p>The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards.</p> <p><i>Monitoring and evaluation is an essential process within a provider's internal quality assurance mechanisms, covering all provision that leads to their awards and assuring the standard of those qualifications. Relevant sector-recognised standards form a baseline for monitoring and evaluation systems.</i></p>	<p>Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Effective monitoring and evaluation allows providers to consider objectively whether their courses are in fact well-designed and high-quality, and can consider whether other systems and processes are effective in ensuring reliable assessment.</i> 	<p>From admission through to completion, all students are provided with the support that they need to succeed in and benefit from higher education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Monitoring and evaluation systems look at all stages of the student experience and consider the support provided to students.</i>
<p><i>HWU is able to confirm that it meets the above Expectations for Standards. Reference should be made to the detailed mapping provided against each of the Guiding Principles below, as well as the mapping documents to the 'Assessment', 'Enabling Student Achievement' and 'Research Degrees' themes</i></p>		<p><i>HWU is able to confirm that it meets the above Expectations for Quality. Reference should be made to the detailed mapping provided against each of the Guiding Principles below, as well as the mapping documents to the 'Course Design and Development', 'Admissions, Recruitment and Widening Access', 'Research Degrees' and 'Enabling Student Achievement' themes.</i></p>	
Core Practice (Standards)		Core Practice (Quality)	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications frameworks. <i>In practice, this means that providers refer to the relevant national qualifications framework when designing monitoring and evaluating policies and processes, and ensure they assess whether threshold standards are being achieved by their graduates.</i> The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers. <i>In practice, this means that providers collect and analyse data that allows for comparison and make appropriate use of externality and sector guidance on, for example, degree classifications and algorithms.</i> Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them. <i>In practice, this means that degree-awarding bodies ensure monitoring and evaluation arrangements are tailored to HE delivery in other organisations and learning environments, which may include satisfying themselves that those organisations' own monitoring systems are sufficient and feed in to their own appropriately.</i> 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses. <i>In practice, this means that providers routinely monitor their courses provision to allow objective assessment of whether this practice is being achieved.</i> The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes. <i>In practice, this means that providers ensure that the support given to their students is scrutinised through their monitoring activity.</i> The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience. <i>In practice, this means providers ensure effective collection, collation and analysis of student perspectives and feedback in monitoring and evaluation, and feed outcomes into strategic planning and course design as appropriate.</i> 	
Common Practice (Standards)		Common Practice (Quality)	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The provider reviews its core practices for standards regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement. <i>In practice, this means that providers have formal systems in place with the express purpose of using the outcomes from monitoring and evaluation activity as a mechanism for enhancing their provision beyond meeting threshold regulatory requirements.</i> 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The provider reviews its core practices for quality regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement. <i>In practice, this means that providers regularly review and enhance their provision, reflecting on a range of data sets as they relate to quality to ensure courses and wider services remain fit for purpose and to take account of changing circumstances, demands and pedagogical developments.</i> The provider's approach to managing quality takes account of external expertise. The provider engages students individually and collectively in the development, assurance and enhancement of the quality of their educational experience. <i>In practice, this means that providers identify and involve key internal and external stakeholders, including students and external examiners, to the design, implementation and operation of monitoring and evaluation, as well as the analysis and communication of findings.</i> 	
<p><i>HWU is able to confirm that it meets the above Core and Common Practices (Standards). Reference should be made to the detailed mapping provided against each of the Guiding Principles, as well as the mapping document to the 'Course</i></p>		<p><i>HWU is able to confirm that it meets the above Core and Common Practices (Quality). Reference should be made to the detailed mapping provided against each of the Guiding Principles below, as well as the mapping document to the 'Course</i></p>	

Design and Development’, ‘Research Degrees’, ‘Assessment’, ‘Partnerships’, ‘Learning and Teaching’ and ‘Enabling Student Achievement’ themes.

Design and Development’, ‘Research Degrees’, ‘Student Engagement’, ‘External Expertise’ and Learning and Teaching’ themes.

Guiding Principles with Mapping from HWU Practices

A 'Reference' document is available to use in conjunction with this mapping document.

The guiding principles given here are not mandatory for any provider. They are a concise expression of the fundamental practices of the higher education sector, based on the experience of a wide range of providers. They are intended as a framework for providers to consider when establishing new or looking at existing higher education provision. They are not exhaustive and there will be other ways for providers to meet their requirements.

Guiding Principles (Standards and Quality)	Heriot-Watt University Practice
<p>1. Providers agree strategic principles for monitoring and evaluation to ensure processes are applied systematically and operated consistently.</p> <p>Providers have strategic guiding principles that set out why monitoring and evaluation takes place and what it intends to achieve. They ensure that activities are relevant, useful, timely and credible. The processes used, and the results from monitoring and evaluation activity, are recorded clearly and are themselves reviewed periodically to ensure they remain fit for purpose.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic principles for monitoring and evaluation are approved by primary committees of the University on behalf of the Senate. Processes must be able to deliver relevant outcomes to allow efficient monitoring of the implementation of the University Strategy (2025), the Learning and Teaching Strategy (2018-2025) and the Research and Innovation Strategy. Some responsibilities of the Committees of the Senate are delegated to their sub-committees, and particularly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to all taught provision, the Student Learning Experience Committee (SLEC), being a sub-committee of the University Committee for Learning and Teaching (UCLT) In relation to all postgraduate research degree provision, the Research Degrees Committee (RDC), being a sub-committee of the University Committee for Research and Innovation (UCRI) Monitoring and review processes may be used to monitor the implementation of a new policy or procedure, and changes to processes may be recommended by the primary committees in order to meet changing priorities (internal, strategic and external). For example, in 2017/18 UCLT requested that the ALP, IDL and PGT student learning experience should be given particular attention during the 17/18 AMR process. The aims and objectives of monitoring and review processes such as External Examiners, AMR, Academic Review, Academic-Related Professional Services Review and Internal Audit are defined within Handbooks and guidance materials on the web. Academic Quality and Schools deliver timely briefing sessions, planning meetings and inductions. The aims and objectives of other monitoring and review processes, such as the monitoring of key performance indicators are clearly defined as part of the activity, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The University Committee for Learning and Teaching is responsible for monitoring a series of Institutional Key Performance Indicators. Activities will be led and monitored by the Committee and sub-committee (SLEC), ensuring that clear aims, objectives and priorities are communicated. The Student Survey Management Group manages and coordinates student survey processes, to ensure consistency of approach. The Group reports to the UCLT via SLEC, which helps to provide visibility to the process. In support of the work of the SSMG, a University-wide Student Survey Framework and Process is in place, which outlines clear objectives and provides a managed and co-ordinated approach to institution-wide surveys. On behalf of the University Committee for Research and Innovation, the Research Degrees Committee will consider and make recommendations in relation to the findings of surveys for Postgraduate Research students. The work of the Research Degrees Committee is supported by the "Research Administrators Forum - PGR" group. The Global Student Liaison Committee, is a committee of the Court which has institutional responsibility for the wider, non-academic aspects of the student experience and of student liaison, representation and feedback, across all modes and locations. The Committee enables the Court to consider the effectiveness of the University's global mechanisms and processes in place to review, monitor and continually enhance the student experience and ensure that appropriate levels of student feedback and representation are enabled and encouraged within the University in accordance with best practice. The Global Student Liaison Committee encourages joint working and partnership with the Student Union. As per the Postgraduate Research Degree Candidate Code of Practice Schools, through School Research Committees⁴ must review annually their performance against agreed targets (e.g. for School Review Meetings completed, Submission Rates, Completion Rates) and in response to appeals, complaints and student feedback, and report on this to RDC and the UCRI. With the formation of the Research Degrees Committee and revisions made to the Annual Monitoring and Review process to enhance consideration of the PGR student experience, a revised set of PGR data stats were considered by RDC for the first time in 2019. The RDC will continue to scrutinise and consider performance data annually³ - Recruitment: actuals; numbers of students going through progression; Thesis submission rates; Completion rates; PRES performance. Processes are designed and operated in such a way that allow outcomes to be raised in a timeous manner, providing early remedy for the improvement of the student learning experience, or informing higher-level monitoring and decision-making, for example, development and implementation of the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy and the Research and Innovation Strategy. All monitoring and evaluation processes are consistently applied and constantly monitored to ensure they are useful, timely and credible, and remain fit for purpose. Processes must produce outcomes that the University can use to improve organisational planning, performance, enhancement and decision making. Revisions are approved by a primary committee of the University on behalf of the Senate. For example, in 17/8 and 18/19 the AMR process was reviewed and revisions were approved by the University Committee for Quality and Standards. The University is represented on all major assurance and enhancement groups in Scotland, such as Universities Scotland's Learning and Teaching Committee and International Committee, Scottish Higher Education Enhancement Committee, SFC's Learning Enhancement and Skills Committee, Teaching Quality Forum and the Theme Leaders Group for Enhancement Themes. The Deputy Principal (Learning and Teaching) is a member of the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment (UKSCQA) and chairs the new sector group, Quality Arrangements in Scottish HE. The Principal chairs Universities Scotland's International Committee. Participation in standing fora and short-term groups enables the University to contribute to sector-wide developments and likewise learn from practice elsewhere when developing or revising HWU-specific policies and procedures. Monitoring and evaluation processes engage staff at all levels of the institution and at various stages of the processes. Outcomes and impact upon operational and strategic developments are considered at various forums and committees, providing opportunities to disseminate good practice and techniques. Information provided as part of monitoring and review activities is systematically recorded and the outcomes are summarised within annual reports to University committees: process-specific summary reports; a 'summary of summaries' report. Action plans are formulated for approval by, and progressing developments through, University committees. Further information on the monitoring and evaluation of the postgraduate research provision can be found within the mapping document to the Research Degrees theme.

2. Providers normalise monitoring and evaluation as well as undertaking routine formal activities.

Effective monitoring and evaluation is an ongoing activity incorporated into everyday, standard practice. Formal activities - such as periodic review of courses, annual monitoring and workshops - are set in place on a routine basis. Progress against plans developed in response to the outcomes of monitoring and evaluation is checked.

- Monitoring and evaluation processes operate at all levels (course, programme, discipline, School, University). They are consistently applied and constantly monitored to ensure they are useful, timely and credible, and remain fit for purpose. Processes must remain effective so as to produce outcomes that the University can use to improve organisational planning, performance, enhancement and decision making. AMR outcomes will be used to monitor the implementation of the University Strategy (2025), the Learning and Teaching Strategy (2018-2025) and the Research and Innovation Strategy.
- The University is represented on all major assurance and enhancement groups in Scotland, such as Universities Scotland's Learning and Teaching Committee and International Committee, Scottish Higher Education Enhancement Committee, SFC's Learning Enhancement and Skills Committee, Teaching Quality Forum and the Theme Leaders Group for Enhancement Themes. The Deputy Principal (Learning and Teaching) is a member of the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment (UKSCQA) and chairs the new sector group, Quality Arrangements in Scottish HE. The Principal chairs Universities Scotland's International Committee. Participation in standing fora and short-term groups enables the University to contribute to sector-wide developments and likewise learn from practice elsewhere when developing or revising HWU-specific policies and procedures.
- Monitoring and review processes may be used to monitor the implementation of a new policy or procedure, and changes to processes may be recommended by the primary committees in order to meet changing priorities (internal, strategic and external). For example, in 2017/18 UCLT requested that the ALP, IDL and PGT student learning experience should be given particular attention during the 17/18 AMR process.
- Monitoring and review activity is undertaken as part of routine day-to-day activity, and other cyclical activities are routine and set, which stand on their own as monitoring and review activities (formulating outcomes for action) but also feed into higher-level monitoring and review activities (such as Annual Monitoring and Review). Examples of each include:
 - Welcome Survey; Annual Survey; Course Feedback Surveys; National Student Survey; PTES; PRES
 - Feedback received from students eg during lectures, tutorials, personal tutoring sessions, student representation system, PGR portfolios and researcher development events.
 - Standard activities which monitor student performance and progression, following formative and summative assessments.
 - Student/Staff Liaison Committee meetings
 - Consideration of Key Performance Indicator data and PGR data
 - Examination Board processes (including consideration of grades, progression, awards, unusual results etc)
 - Outcomes from PSRB accreditations
 - Advisory Boards and Industrial links (taught and research)
 - Strategic Alliance Boards
 - Centres for Doctoral Training
 - Research Pools
 - Supervisors located in industry
 - Consideration of External Examiner reports (*for PGR, reports are submitted to RDC continually, rather than at a set point in time*)
 - External colleagues
 - University league tables
- Routine and standard monitoring and review activities naturally feed into higher-level formalised processes, for example, AMR and the monitoring of key performance indicators. Schools have in place processes for engaging staff and capturing outcomes that will feed into the School and University level processes. Standard practice is for Schools to use the School-level Review Report templates to capture outcomes from discipline level reviews, and incorporate in to the School summary which is then considered at a University level.
- Monitoring and Review activities take place routinely and at set points in the academic session, and Academic Reviews/Academic-Related Professional Services Review are undertaken on a five-year cycle.
- Roles and responsibilities for monitoring and review processes, such as External Examiners, AMR, Academic Review, Academic-Related Professional Services Review and Internal Audit are defined within Handbooks and guidance materials on the web. Timely briefing sessions, planning meetings and inductions, are delivered by Academic Quality and Schools.
- In addition to the support provided by Academic Quality, the Student Union provides training and support to students participating in quality processes such as Academic Review.
- The Student Survey Management Group manages and coordinates a University-wide Student Survey Framework and Process for all students across the institution. The Framework which outlines clear objectives and provides a managed and co-ordinated approach to institution-wide surveys. Surveys are undertaken in a timely manner and at an appropriate point in the academic session which allows actions to be taken as early as possible. Informal, classroom based surveys (such as Start/Stop/Continue) and Course Feedback Surveys, will allow some issues to be addressed quickly, whereas other survey results will be considered at a higher level by University committees.
- On behalf of the UCRI, RDC will consider and make recommendations in relation to the findings of surveys for Postgraduate Research students.
- For taught programmes a University-wide Academic Management Structure is in place at all campuses. The structure provides clarity around the roles and responsibilities of School Management structures, including School committees and key roles:
 - School Learning and Teaching Committee
 - School Studies Committee
 - Programme Board of Studies
 - Director of Learning and Teaching
 - Director of Academic Quality
 - Senior Programme Director of Studies/School Programme Director of Studies
 - Year Co-ordinator
 - Senior Course Leader/Course Leader
- For research degree programmes, the Postgraduate Research Degree Candidate Code of Practice sets out the responsibilities of research students, supervisors, as well as academic Schools and the wider University. Key bodies and personnel are:
 - University Committee for Research and Innovation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research Degrees Committee ○ School Research Committee⁴ ○ School Research Student Committee ○ Director of Research ○ Director of Postgraduate Research Study ○ Primary Supervisor ○ Secondary Supervisor(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These key roles have varying responsibilities, at the appropriate level, for ensuring staff engage in, and are guided on, monitoring and review activities. Dissemination of good practice and requirements to implement new or revised policies/practices, will take place through these formal structures. • For undertaking their responsibilities, key staff will receive guidance from those in a more senior role, eg: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Senior Programme Director of Studies will be guided by the Director of Learning and Teaching ○ Director of PGR Studies will be guided by the Director of Research and the Chair of RDC ○ Directors of Learning and Teaching, Directors of Academic Quality and Directors of Research will be supported in their roles by the Deputy Principal (Learning and Teaching), the Deputy Principal (Research and Innovation) and the Academic Quality Team. Direction will also be provided through the Committees upon which they represent their Schools (ie, UCLT/SLEC, UCQS, UCRI/RDC). • A Good Practice in Learning and Teaching: Institutional Approaches document provides an agreed, documented approach to identifying and sharing good practice through Schools, relevant Professional Services, the Student Representative Bodies and University committees. Through the framework of approaches specified, it is intended that local examples of practice can be disseminated more widely and converted more easily into institutional projects. • The Student Survey Framework and Process provides a managed and co-ordinated approach to institution-wide surveys, and one of its key objectives is to ensure that actions taken as a result of surveys are communicated to students as part of the process of closing the loop on student feedback. • Schools adopt a range of measures in response to the Course Feedback Survey. Such measures include publishing responses to student feedback on the University's VLE (Vision), class discussions in seminars and tutorials around issues raised by students, elevation of common issues observed across the Course Feedback Survey to School Learning and Teaching Committees on which there is student representation, class discussions with students in the successive academic year on the responses and actions resulting from the previous year's Course Feedback Survey. • During 2018/19 Closing the Feedback Loop for Course Feedback Surveys, was a funded research project as part of the QAA Enhancement theme which aimed to reflect the University's commitment to partnership-working by encouraging staff to communicate back to students actions being taken as a result of their feedback. The Project's report provides clear roles, timelines and dissemination for stakeholders involved in the process. • Students are involved in monitoring and review activities at all levels (from course to University-level). Opportunities to engage in the monitoring and evaluation of their courses are provided through various mechanisms, such as surveys, student-staff committees and representative structures (Sabbatical Officers, School Officers and Class Representatives) and Academic Review. • Staff will take opportunities to engage in monitoring and review activities at other institutions, for example: External Examiners (taught and research); participation in programme approval/validation events (taught and research); members of PSRB accreditation panels; members of QAA ELIR Teams. • The legal power of Heriot-Watt University as a UK degree-awarding body means that the institution is responsible for the academic standards of all credit and awards granted in its name. This responsibility is never delegated. For Approved Learning Partners and Articulations, Heriot-Watt University is the awarding body and is solely responsible for the academic standards of its awards. In the case of Joint Collaborative Partnerships, the University makes the award in conjunction with another Institution(s) (<i>COP Principle 3.1: Academic Standards in Partnership Programmes</i>). • Where programmes are delivered through, or in collaboration, with partner institutions, monitoring and review responsibilities are outlined within the partnership contract. The Annual Monitoring and Review process incorporates Partner Annual Monitoring and Review, which requires the collaborative production of annual reports and action plans by HWU and the partner institution. Responsibility for this resides with Professional Service staff within the School who will be guided by the Director of Learning and Teaching and/or Director of Academic Quality. • Information provided as part of monitoring and review activities is systematically recorded and the outcomes are summarised within annual reports to University committees: process-specific summary reports; a 'summary of summaries' report. Action plans are formulated for approval by, and progressing developments through, University committees, such as the University Committee for Learning and Teaching and its sub-committee, the Student Learning Experience Committee (SLEC). • Monitoring and review outcomes will inform the development of the Learning and Teaching Strategy and the Excelling in Research & Enterprise Strategy.
<p>3. Providers clarify aims, objectives, activities and actions, and identify the key indicators, issues, questions, targets and relevant information/data.</p> <p>Providers decide and prioritise what they will monitor and evaluate, fitting with internal and strategic priorities and external requirements, and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic principles for monitoring and evaluation are approved by primary committees of the University on behalf of the Senate. Processes must be able to deliver relevant outcomes to allow efficient monitoring of the implementation of the University Strategy (2025), the Learning and Teaching Strategy (2018-2025) and the Excelling in Research & Enterprise Strategy. • Monitoring and review processes may be used to monitor the implementation of a new policy or procedure, and changes to processes may be recommended by the primary committees in order to meet changing priorities (internal, strategic and external). For example, in 2017/18 UCLT requested that the ALP, IDL and PGT student learning experience should be given particular attention during the 17/18 AMR process. • All monitoring and evaluation processes are consistently applied and constantly monitored to ensure they are useful, timely, credible, and remain fit for purpose. Processes must produce outcomes that the University can use to improve organisational planning, performance, enhancement and decision making.

<p>within available resources, establishing systems which are ongoing and pre-emptive rather than simply reactive.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The University is represented on all major assurance and enhancement groups in Scotland, such as Universities Scotland's Learning and Teaching Committee and International Committee, Scottish Higher Education Enhancement Committee, SFC's Learning Enhancement and Skills Committee, Teaching Quality Forum and the Theme Leaders Group for Enhancement Themes. The Deputy Principal (Learning and Teaching) is a member of the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment (UKSCQA) and chairs the new sector group, Quality Arrangements in Scottish HE. The Principal chairs Universities Scotland's International Committee. Participation in standing fora and short-term groups enables the University to contribute to sector-wide developments and likewise learn from practice elsewhere when developing or revising HWU-specific policies and procedures. • Monitoring and evaluation processes operate at all levels (course, programme, discipline, School, University) across all locations and modes of study. As outlined above, some are undertaken routinely, on a day-to-day basis, whilst others are cyclical and take place at a set/scheduled period. • A series of institutional Key Performance Indicators (KPIs): entry scores; retention/progression; attainment; widening participation; graduate first destinations (employability); student satisfaction (National Student Survey), measure progress towards the strategic objectives, as well as towards national priority areas as specified in the Outcome Agreement. The indicators are benchmarked nationally and incorporate previous years' performance for comparison purposes. They are monitored by UCLT (which includes representatives from Schools, Professional Services and the student body) and considered by the Court, the University Executive (and its Boards). • As part of its role for developing and monitoring the implementation of the Learning and Teaching Strategy, the University Committee for Learning and Teaching is primarily responsible for monitoring the Institutional Key Performance Indicators. Activities will be led and monitored by the Committee and sub-committee (SLEC), ensuring that clear aims, objectives and priorities are communicated. • The Planning Office is responsible for the compilation and analysis of statistical data relating to learning and teaching and the student learning experience (including key performance indicators). The Planning Office provides Schools with the data they require to undertake relevant and timely analysis, for improving course design, learning and decision-making. Close liaison with Schools and Academic Registry takes place to ensure data collected, analysed and distributed is accurate, relevant, credible valid, reliable and timely. • The University continues to develop data sets and standard reporting templates for postgraduate taught provision at the institutional level, and specifically for the Dubai and Malaysia campuses. As regards the latter, fully benchmarked retention data is available and is considered alongside Scottish Campuses' data. However, development work continues for the entire suite of learning and teaching metrics. • With the formation of the Research Degrees Committee (a sub-committee of UCRI) and revisions made to the Annual Monitoring and Review process to enhance consideration of the PGR student experience, a revised set of PGR data stats were considered by RDC for the first time in 2019. The RDC will continue to scrutinise and consider performance data annually - Recruitment: actuals; numbers of students going through progression; Thesis submission rates; Completion rates; PRES performance. The work of the Research Degrees Committee is supported by the "Research Administrators Forum - PGR" group. • The Student Survey Management Group (which reports to SLEC) manages and coordinates a University-wide Student Survey Framework and Process for all students across the institution. The Framework which outlines clear objectives and provides a managed and co-ordinated approach to institution-wide surveys. Surveys are undertaken in a timely manner and at an appropriate point in the academic session which allows actions to be taken as early as possible. Informal, classroom based surveys (such as Start/Stop/Continue) and Course Feedback Surveys, will allow some issues to be addressed quickly, whereas other survey results will be considered at a higher level by University committees. • On behalf of the UCRI, RDC will consider and make recommendations in relation to the findings of surveys for Postgraduate Research students. • Students are involved in monitoring and review activities at all levels (from course to University-level). Opportunities to engage in the monitoring and evaluation of their courses are provided through various mechanisms, such as surveys, student-staff committees and representative structures (Sabbatical Officers, School Officers and Class Representatives) and Academic Review. The School Committee structures and Student representation systems provide opportunities for students to be engaged in the consideration of monitoring and review outcomes. • Sabbatical Officers represent students on the primary committees of the Senate where monitoring and review outcomes are considered (ie, UCLT, UCQS and UCRI/RDC). • Outcomes from review activities such as KPIs, Student Surveys and External Examiner reports, are managed through individual monitoring and review processes, overseen by UCLT, UCQS and UCRI/RDC but also inform other processes such as AMR, Academic Review and Academic-Related Professional Services Review. For example, AMR and Academic Review requires the analysis and reporting of KPIs, consideration of External Examiner reports and student feedback. • The AMR process requires Schools to report upon PGR progression, submission and award and other areas of the PGR student experience. Similarly the Academic Review process provides the same opportunities through the Reflective Analysis document but also discussions at Review Team meetings with PGR students. • Roles and responsibilities for monitoring and review processes, such as External Examiners, AMR, Academic Review, Academic-Related Professional Services Review and Internal Audit are defined within Handbooks and guidance materials on the web. Timely briefing sessions, planning meetings and inductions, are delivered by Academic Quality and Schools. • The Student Survey Framework and Process provides a managed and co-ordinated approach to institution-wide surveys, and one of its key objectives is to ensure that actions taken as a result of surveys are communicated to students as part of the process of closing the loop on student feedback. • Schools adopt a range of measures in response to the Course Feedback Survey. Such measures include publishing responses to student feedback on the University's VLE (Vision), class discussions in seminars and tutorials around issues raised by students, elevation of common issues observed across the Course Feedback Survey to School Learning and Teaching Committees on which there is student representation, class discussions with students in the successive academic year on the responses and actions resulting from the previous year's Course Feedback Survey. • During 2018/19 Closing the Feedback Loop for Course Feedback Surveys, was a funded research project as part of the QAA Enhancement theme which aimed to reflect the University's commitment to partnership-working by encouraging staff to communicate back to students actions being taken as a result of their feedback. The Project's report provides clear roles, timelines and dissemination for stakeholders involved in the process.
--	--

<p>4. Providers decide whom to involve in the different stages of monitoring and evaluation, clearly defining roles and responsibilities and communicating them to those involved.</p> <p>Providers identify key internal and external stakeholders, particularly students, allowing consideration of how they can be involved and contribute to the design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems, analysis of data and the communication of findings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles, responsibilities and authority of individuals and bodies in monitoring and review activities are clearly defined within the respective Terms of References for the primary committees of the Senate (ie, UCQS, UCLT and UCRI) which between them have monitoring and review responsibilities, such as developing, monitoring, implementing and reviewing outcomes from review activities, such as annual monitoring, periodic reviews, external reviews, key performance indicators and student surveys. Each committee is responsible for ensuring the involvement of key stakeholders in the design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems. In practice, some of these responsibilities are delegated to sub-committees such as the Student Learning and Experience Committee (SLEC) and the Research Degrees Committee (RDC). The work of the Research Degrees Committee is supported by the “Research Administrators Forum - PGR” group. • Key stakeholders in monitoring and review processes are determined at the design and approval stages, but these may be reviewed/revised as deemed appropriate and with a need to respond to change. • Roles and responsibilities for monitoring and review processes, such as External Examiners, AMR, Academic Review, Academic-Related Professional Services Review and Internal Audit are defined within Handbooks and guidance materials on the web. Timely briefing sessions, planning meetings and inductions, are delivered by Academic Quality and Schools. • The Planning Office is responsible for providing data to external agencies such as the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), as well as for internal purposes. • For taught programmes, a University-wide Academic Management Structure is in place at all campuses. The structure provides clarity around the roles and responsibilities of School Management structures, including School committees and key roles. Key roles include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Director of Learning and Teaching ○ Director of Academic Quality ○ Senior Programme Director of Studies/School Programme Director of Studies ○ Year Co-ordinator ○ Senior Course Leader/Course Leader • For research degree programmes, the University's Code of Practice sets out the responsibilities of research students, supervisors, as well as academic Schools and the wider University. Key bodies and personnel are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ University Committee for Research and Innovation ○ Research Degrees Committee ○ School Research Committee ○ School Research Student Committee ○ Director of Research ○ Director of Postgraduate Research Study ○ Primary Supervisor ○ Secondary Supervisor(s) • The above key roles have varying responsibilities, at the appropriate level, for ensuring staff engage in, and are guided on, monitoring and review activities. Discussion of findings, dissemination of good practice and requirements to implement new or revised policies/practices, will take place through these formal structures. • The School Committee structures and Student representation systems provide opportunities for students to be engaged in the consideration of monitoring and review outcomes. • For undertaking their responsibilities, these key staff will receive guidance from those in a more senior role, eg: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Senior Programme Director of Studies will be guided by the Director of Learning and Teaching ○ Director of PGR Studies will be guided by the Director of Research and the Chair of RDC ○ Directors of Learning and Teaching, Directors of Academic Quality and Directors of Research will be supported in their roles by the Deputy Principal (Learning and Teaching), the Deputy Principal (Research and Innovation) and the Academic Quality Team. Direction will also be provided through the Committees upon which they represent their Schools (ie, UCLT/SLEC, UCQS, UCRI/RDC). • Students are involved in monitoring and review activities at all levels (from course to University-level). Opportunities to engage in the monitoring and evaluation of their courses are provided through various mechanisms, such as surveys, student-staff committees and representative structures (Sabbatical Officers, School Officers and Class Representatives) and Academic Review. The Academic Management Structure and Student representation systems provide opportunities for students to be engaged in the consideration of monitoring and review outcomes. Sabbatical Officers represent the student body on the primary committees of the Senate where monitoring and review outcomes are considered. • The Postgraduate Research Code of Practice requires Schools to establish a Research Student Committee to discuss research degree provision and to ensure that Research Degree Candidates are represented on those policy committees, which are directly relevant to their research degree programmes. Review of representation structures in Schools by RDC in March 2019 indicated that Research Student Committees did not operate consistently across the University, but that Schools did have mechanisms for engaging with research students in other fora. This has identified development work required to review and evaluate the operation of these committees. • The legal power of Heriot-Watt University as a UK degree-awarding body means that the institution is responsible for the academic standards of all credit and awards granted in its name. This responsibility is never delegated. For Approved Learning Partners and Articulations, Heriot-Watt University is the awarding body and is solely responsible for the academic standards of its awards. In the case of Joint Collaborative Partnerships, the University makes the award in conjunction with another Institution(s) (<i>COP Principle 3.1: Academic Standards in Partnership Programmes</i>). • Where programmes are delivered through, or in collaboration, with partner institutions, monitoring and review responsibilities are outlined within the partnership contract. The Annual Monitoring and Review process incorporates Partner Annual Monitoring and Review, which requires the collaborative production of annual reports and action plans by HWU and the partner institution. Responsibility for this resides with Professional Service staff within the School who will be guided by the Director of Learning and Teaching and/or Director of Academic Quality.
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are various opportunities for key stakeholders to provide feedback on the implementation of monitoring and review processes such as, through the Academic Management Structure, directly to Academic Quality staff, directly to the Senate and its committees, through the student representation system. In addition, AMR and Academic Review (which includes external and student representatives) specifically invites participants to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the processes.
<p>5. Providers evaluate, analyse and use the information generated from monitoring to learn and improve.</p> <p>Providers ensure their processes periodically analyse and assess data they collect to generate evidence used in quality assurance and enhancement, internal decision-making, planning and learning processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The University makes extensive use of both quantitative and qualitative data to inform decision making and support its evaluative practices, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome Survey; Annual Survey; Course Feedback Surveys; National Student Survey; PTES; PRES Student/Staff Liaison Committee meetings Consideration of Key Performance Indicator data and PGR data Examination Board processes (including consideration of grades, progression, awards, unusual results etc) Outcomes from PSRB accreditations Advisory Boards and Industrial links (taught and research) Strategic Alliance Boards Centres for Doctoral Training Research Pools Supervisors located in industry Consideration of External Examiner reports University league tables External colleagues The Planning Office is responsible for the compilation and analysis of statistical data relating to learning and teaching and the student learning experience (including key performance indicators). The Planning Office provides Schools with the data they require to undertake relevant and timely analysis, for improving course design, learning and decision-making. Close liaison with Schools and Academic Registry takes place to ensure data collected, analysed and distributed is accurate, relevant, credible valid and reliable. On an annual basis, statistical data will be considered at all levels and outcomes will feed into programme development/design. Programme Teams will review statistics and look for patterns that might identify particular groups of students being disadvantaged. The University Committee for Learning and Teaching will review a suite of key performance indicators and other statistics provided by the Planning Office and the Equality and Diversity Officer, along with associated action plans from Schools. Monitoring and review processes are designed and operated in such a way that allow outcomes to be raised in a timeous manner, providing opportunities for early remedy or informing higher-level monitoring and decision-making, for example, development and implementation of the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy. The KPIs measure progress towards the strategic objectives, as well as towards national priority areas as specified in the Outcome Agreement. The indicators are benchmarked nationally and incorporate previous years' performance for comparison purposes. They are monitored by UCLT (which includes representatives from Schools, Professional Services and the student body) and considered by the Court, the University Executive (and its Boards). With the formation of the Research Degrees Committee (a sub-committee of UCRI) and revisions made to the Annual Monitoring and Review process to enhance consideration of the PGR student experience, a revised set of PGR data stats were considered by RDC for the first time in 2019. The RDC will continue to scrutinise and consider performance data annually³ - Recruitment: actuals; numbers of students going through progression; Thesis submission rates; Completion rates; PRES performance. The work of the Research Degrees Committee is supported by the "Research Administrators Forum - PGR" group. Annual Monitoring and Review (AMR), Academic Review and Academic-Related Reviews involve the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, such as feedback from students, staff, PSRBs, External Examiners, employers, etc. Where Visa and Immigration issues have had an impact on operations or the student learning experience, these will also be reported through these processes, for the purposes of identifying common issues and gaining an holistic view. The AMR process involves consideration of, and reporting progress on, actions identified through the previous year's process. For Academic Review, annual progress reports on actions being taken are submitted to University committees and Review Teams are given access to the previous review's report, action plan and progress report. AMR reports are provided to Academic Review Teams. Academic Review is the process used by the University to re-approve its programmes of study. The Student Survey Management Group (which reports to SLEC) manages and coordinates a University-wide Student Survey Framework and Process for all students across the institution. The Framework provides a managed and co-ordinated approach to institution-wide surveys. Surveys are undertaken in a timely manner and at an appropriate point in the academic session which allows actions to be taken as early as possible. Informal, classroom based surveys (such as Start/Stop/Continue) and Course Feedback Surveys, will allow some issues to be addressed quickly, whereas other survey results will be considered at a higher level by University committees. On behalf of the University Committee for Research and Innovation, the Research Degrees Committee will consider and make recommendations in relation to the findings of surveys for Postgraduate Research students. Through focused forums, students will at times be consulted on proposed key changes to courses and programmes, which may be proposed in response to monitoring and evaluation outcomes. Key principles for meeting CMA guidelines (eg student consultation on programme/course changes) have been incorporated into the revised Global Code of Practice for the Management, Assurance and Enhancement of Taught Programmes. Information provided as part of monitoring and review activities is systematically recorded and the outcomes are summarised within annual reports to University committees: process-specific summary reports; a 'summary of summaries' report. Action plans are formulated for approval by, and progressing developments through the committees of the Senate. The Student Survey Framework and Process provides a managed and co-ordinated approach to institution-wide surveys, and one of its key objectives is to ensure that actions taken as a result of surveys are communicated to students as part of the process of closing the loop on student feedback.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools adopt a range of measures in response to the Course Feedback Survey. Such measures include publishing responses to student feedback on the University's VLE (Vision), class discussions in seminars and tutorials around issues raised by students, elevation of common issues observed across the Course Feedback Survey to School Learning and Teaching Committees on which there is student representation, class discussions with students in the successive academic year on the responses and actions resulting from the previous year's Course Feedback Survey. During 2018/19 Closing the Feedback Loop for Course Feedback Surveys, was a funded research project as part of the QAA Enhancement theme which aimed to reflect the University's commitment to partnership-working by encouraging staff to communicate back to students actions being taken as a result of their feedback. The Project's report provides clear roles, timelines and dissemination for stakeholders involved in the process.
<p>6. Providers communicate outcomes from monitoring and evaluation to staff, students and external stakeholders.</p> <p>Providers put in place mechanisms to share, discuss and interpret findings, for example, periodic internal meetings and specific evaluation workshops. These systems may also facilitate conversations on actions required and draw out learning points for the provider and other stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sharing and discussion of Monitoring and Review outcomes take place at all levels, eg course, programme, discipline, School and University-level. Development topics and issues/challenges will be discussed at various forums such as programme/department team meetings, School committee meetings and local discussion events. Outcomes will be used internally and may also feed in to a University-wide consultation being led by a primary committee of Senate. The student body is represented on School committees and dependent upon the topic, students may also participate in workshops. A Good Practice in Learning and Teaching: Institutional Approaches document provides an agreed, documented approach to identifying and sharing good practice through Schools, relevant Professional Services, the Student Representative Bodies and University committees. Through the framework of approaches specified, it is intended that local examples of practice can be disseminated more widely and converted more easily into institutional projects. Routine and standard monitoring and review activities feed into higher-level formalised processes, for example, AMR and the monitoring of key performance indicators. Schools have in place processes for engaging staff and capturing outcomes that will feed into the School and University level processes. The primary Committees of the Senate will consider outcomes as reported through formal monitoring and review activities. Information provided as part of monitoring and review activities is systematically recorded and the outcomes are summarised within annual reports to University committees: process-specific summary reports; a 'summary of summaries' report. Action plans are formulated for approval by, and progressing developments through the committees of the Senate. As representatives on UCLT and UCQS, it is the responsibility of the DLTs and DAQs, to ensure that outcomes are widely disseminated and development initiatives implemented. (See <i>Guiding Principle 2</i>). As members of UCRI/RDC equivalent responsibility sits with the Director of Research and the Director of Postgraduate Research Study for the postgraduate research student experience. Academic staff are in close liaison with external stakeholders such as External Examiners (taught and research) PSRBs, Industrial Advisory Boards and employers. Findings from monitoring processes and resultant action will be discussed with/communicated to external stakeholders as relevant. The University also shares practice with, and learns from, its global network of academic partners. Teaching teams are in close liaison with partner institutions and will disseminate monitoring and review findings and actions. The Partner Annual Monitoring and Review process provides a regular, formal opportunity for discussing outcomes and enhancements. Enhancement workshops take place as part of the Academic Review process. Workshop topics relate to the Learning and Teaching Strategy and provide an opportunity for the School staff, to explore with their peers, students and external representatives, development topics or issues/challenges, some of which may have been raised through monitoring and review processes, such as student surveys and the review of the KPIs. Other opportunities to share, discuss and interpret monitoring and review findings are provided, for example: the AMR Dissemination event, the annual Learning and Teaching Symposium and Learning and Teaching Colloquium. Further opportunities are foreseen through the newly established Learning and Teaching Academy (September 2019). Examples of sound practice and innovation are also drawn upon externally, through wide-spread engagement with sector-wide initiatives such as the QAA Enhancement Themes and memberships on sector-wide groups. For example: Universities Scotland's Learning and Teaching Committee and International Committee; Scottish Higher Education Enhancement Committee; SFC's Learning Enhancement and Skills Committee; Teaching Quality Forum; Theme Leaders Group for Enhancement Themes. Relevant UKCGE resources and events are publicised to the research community by Research Futures Academy and some staff have attended events. The Research Futures Academy offers training for PhD students and early career researchers, as well as training for researchers at all levels in the University. All training courses produced for delivery to PhD students and research staff are mapped to the Vitae Researcher Development Framework. RFA staff attend development events as part of their personal development (including the annual conference) and use Vitae resources to support the research community. External summary reports are considered by the University Committee for Learning and Teaching, such as the Annual Report on Quality to Scottish Funding Council and the Annual Report from QAA Scotland on Institutional Quality Reports to SFC. PGR specific reports would be considered at the Research Degrees Committee. Engagement in sector-wide initiatives and consideration of sector-wide reports, provides a mechanism by which the University's strategic approach to learning and teaching can be monitored and modified as new opportunities arise to improve learning and teaching.

<p>7. Providers take account of ethics and data protection requirements when designing and operating monitoring and evaluation systems.</p> <p>Providers have informed consent from any participants, ensure anonymity in the communication of findings, and respect GDPR and all other data protection laws.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning Office is responsible for the compilation and analysis of statistical data relating to learning and teaching and the student learning experience (including key performance indicators). The Planning Office provides Schools with the data they require to undertake relevant and timely analysis, for improving course design, learning and decision-making. Close liaison with Schools and Academic Registry takes place to ensure data collected, analysed and distributed is accurate, relevant, credible valid and reliable. • External summary reports are considered by the University Committee for Learning and Teaching, such as the Annual Report on Quality to Scottish Funding Council and the Annual Report from QAA Scotland on Institutional Quality Reports to SFC. PGR specific reports would be considered at the Research Degrees Committee. • The Student Survey Management Group manages and coordinates student survey processes, to ensure consistency of approach. The Group reports to the UCLT via SLEC, which helps to provide visibility to the process. In support of the work of the SSMG, a University-wide Student Survey Framework and Process is in place, which outlines clear objectives and provides a managed and co-ordinated approach to institution-wide surveys. • The operation of the SSMG is designed to support consistency of approach and the membership including Information Services and Planning Office colleagues ensures that issues relating to different records systems and definitions of data are addressed. The remit of the group means that requests for one-off surveys not included in the stated list of key annual surveys, can be rejected, which focuses the output on what the University ‘needs’ to know. • The University has various Information Governance Policies including (but not exclusively) a Data Protection Policy, a Privacy Notice (current and prospective students) and ‘Privacy by Design and Data Protection Impact Assessment Toolkit’ • The University also continually enhances information provided through enrolment and during the year, to advise ‘what we do with your data’ to access relevant policies at any time. • Feedback to UCLT and relevant groups in relation to annual monitoring processes and performance indicators is analysed by a variety of categories, including gender, disability, ethnicity and widening access categories. Reporting is regularly reviewed in line with institutional strategic priorities, regulatory requirements and monitoring, with a view to enhancing evaluation systems. This can be seen for example in the on-going work coordinated by the University’s Equality and Diversity Advisory Group
--	--

