



Policy and Procedure on Quality Monitoring and Evaluation

VERSION CONTROL STATEMENT

Version No:	2.1
Author:	Academic Registrar
Approved by:	Academic Quality and Governance
Approval date:	29 October 2025

Contents

Policy and Procedure on Quality Monitoring and Evaluation	1
Purpose	3
Module Review	4
Annual Programme Monitoring	5
Institution-led Review	6
Periodic Subject Quality Review	6
Student-Facing Professional Services Review	8
Appendix 1 – Module Review and Annual Programme Monitoring Timeline	9

Purpose

1. The University of Stirling is committed to maintaining academic standards and delivering consistently high standards of quality in its programmes, thereby ensuring that they provide curriculum currency, an excellent academic experience and enable student achievement to be reliably assessed.
2. Within the obligations set out by both the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, and the Scottish Funding Council, in line with the national Tertiary Quality Enhancement Framework, higher education institutions in Scotland are required to have in place explicit, effective, strategic approaches to quality assurance and enhancement.
3. The University of Stirling Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework sets out the University's arrangements for academic quality and our approach to managing quality and enhancing provision.
4. The [Curriculum Development and Management Policy and Procedure](#) provides the University's approach to the development, approval and continuing management of modules and programmes, and facilitates both being consistently well designed and offering a high-quality learning experience. The policy and procedure represent elements of ongoing, underpinning activity which form part of the University's Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework.
5. A further key element of the Academic Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework is Institution-led Review. Higher Education Institutions in Scotland are expected to undertake Institution-led Review, including both annual and periodic review of education provision in order to be able to determine and demonstrate that required academic standards are being consistently met. In addition, institutions are expected to reflect, at the institutional level, on strategic issues arising from regular quality processes (including annual and periodic reviews), and to make use of this information as part of the overall strategic approach to quality enhancement. This strategic approach and its effectiveness are explicitly considered during Tertiary Quality Enhancement Review (TQER).
6. As part of our overall approach to Institution-led Review, modules and programmes are monitored in terms of standards, student achievement and opportunities for enhancement on an ongoing basis. This takes place through the Module Review and Annual Programme Monitoring procedures.
7. A further element of Institution-led Review is Periodic Subject Quality Review which takes place at the subject-level and facilitates periodic review of provision.
8. The purpose of this policy and procedure is to set out the University's arrangements for quality monitoring and evaluation across Module Review, Annual Programme Monitoring and Periodic Subject Quality Review. The preparation of the policy and procedure has taken account of the

[UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#) and the associated [Advice and Guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation](#).

9. The policy and procedure should be read and understood in conjunction with the External Examining Policy and the guidance resources that exist in relation to External Examining and Periodic Subject Quality Review. Links to associated documents are provided throughout the policy.
10. Academic Registry has responsibility for managing and developing the University's academic quality assurance and enhancement arrangements. The Academic Quality and Governance area of the Academic Registry team (AQG) operates the arrangements and can be contacted in respect of quality matters via quality@stir.ac.uk.

Module Review

11. After every delivery of a module, Module Review should take place in line with the following steps.
12. The Module Coordinator should: collate and review data on student attainment outcomes on the module; consider the feedback provided by students through Module Evaluation; consider the comments of External Examiners provided via the Module Board; consider relevant feedback from the Staff Student Voice Committee (SSVC). You should reflect on this information and consider any enhancements or amendments to the module that require to be progressed in order to ensure continuing appropriateness and quality of student learning experience.
13. The Module Review Report form should be completed to record: the data gathered on student attainment; key reflections on the feedback from Module Evaluation, External Examiners and SSVC; an overall reflection on the performance of the module; enhancements or amendments planned along with corresponding timescales for implementation.
14. Completed Module Review Reports require to be signed off by the Head of Division (or equivalent) and then uploaded to the institutional [Quality Monitoring Repository SharePoint site](#).
15. Each semester the outcomes of Module Review should be considered and discussed by the relevant Divisional Committee (or equivalent). Key outcomes, including any plans for enhancement, should be reported to the Staff Student Voice Committee.
16. The Dean of Faculty has overall responsibility for ensuring that appropriate follow-up activity is taken and can choose to assign accountability as appropriate within the Faculty to ensure this is progressed.
17. [Appendix 1](#) summarises the overall timeline for Module Review and Annual Programme Monitoring to take place.

Annual Programme Monitoring

18. Annual Programme Monitoring takes place at the end of each academic year and is required for all approved programmes, including combined honours programmes and suspended programmes.
19. The purpose of Annual Programme Monitoring is to consider objectively: whether the programme continues to be well designed and is of high quality and consistent with national qualification frameworks; whether assessment arrangements are reliable; student attainment, whether students are achieving threshold standards and the intended learning outcomes; support available to students; student feedback.
20. Programme Directors have responsibility for monitoring all the programmes for which they are Programme Director, and seeking input from other Programme Directors / colleagues as appropriate for the monitoring of any combined degree programmes for which they are responsible. For approved programmes that are currently suspended, consideration should be given to these programmes through the Annual Programme Monitoring process as to whether or not the programme is to be reinstated. As specified in the [Curriculum Development and Management Procedure](#), a programme can only be suspended for a maximum period of one year, after which the suspension must be considered again and if the Faculty does not wish to resume offering the programme, it should be formally withdrawn, in line with the procedure.
21. The Programme Director should collate and review data on student attainment outcomes on the programme; consider the outcomes of Module Review; consider the comments of External Examiners provided via the Awards Board; and consider relevant student feedback from the National Student Survey (NSS) / Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES).
22. In addition, the Programme Director should consider the attainment data, the feedback from students and External Examiners, and taking account of this consideration, undertake an overall reflection of the performance of the programme and any enhancements or amendments to the programme that require to be progressed in order to ensure continuing appropriateness and quality of student learning experience. This reflection should include matters such as: programme content; assessment approaches; student achievement of learning outcomes; any professional accreditation requirements.
23. The Annual Programme Monitoring Report form should be completed to record: data on student attainment; key reflections on the feedback from students and External Examiners; key reflections on the programme; enhancements or amendments planned along with corresponding timescales for implementation.
24. In the year following a Periodic Subject Quality Review, updates on progress relevant to the recommendations that resulted from the review should be included as appropriate within the Annual Programme Monitoring Report form.

25. The Programme Director should have the completed Annual Programme Monitoring Report signed off by the Associate Dean for Learning and Teaching (ADLT) and then submit it to the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee at the end of October for undergraduate programmes and the end of February for postgraduate programmes. Annual Programme Review reports are considered at the Faculty's Education and Student Experience Committee (or equivalent). Key outcomes, including any plans for enhancement, should be reported to the Staff Student Voice Committee.
26. All completed Annual Programme Monitoring Report forms are required to be uploaded to the institutional [Quality Monitoring Repository SharePoint site](#).
27. Faculties (normally the ADLT) are then required to prepare an Annual Programme Monitoring Summary Report, in line with the report template, and submit to quality@stir.ac.uk at the end of November for undergraduate programmes and the end of March for postgraduate programmes.
28. Academic Quality and Governance collates Annual Programme Summary Reports and undertakes an institutional level review of the outcomes. Subsequently, Annual Programme Summary Reports are submitted to the Education Committee (EC), along with any reflections or outcomes from the institutional level review. EC has a remit to receive and reflect on the outcomes of Module Review and Annual Programme Monitoring.
29. The Dean of Faculty, either directly or via a formally nominated individual or committee, is responsible for ensuring that appropriate follow-up action is taken.
30. [Appendix 1](#) summarises the overall timeline for Module Review and Annual Programme Monitoring to take place.

Institution-led Review

Periodic Subject Quality Review

31. As part of the overall approach to Institution-led Review, the University carries out Periodic Subject Quality Reviews of specified subject-areas on a five-yearly cycle.
32. A Periodic Subject Quality review includes scrutiny of:
 - The strategic approach to quality and enhancing learning, teaching and the student learning experience;
 - All credit-bearing provision at undergraduate and postgraduate level for all modes of study, including any collaborative provision in those areas, CPD, continuing education provision, and the supervision of postgraduate research students;
 - Enhancement that has taken place and is planned in respect of learning, teaching and the student learning experience;
 - Approaches to identifying and sharing good practice.

33. The **aims** of each Subject Quality Review are to:
1. Undertake an objective review of the subject-area's provision, and a critical reflection on existing practice, impact and student outcomes;
 2. Consider approaches and plans in place for enhancing quality and the student learning experience, and progress and impact achieved since the previous review;
 3. Produce reliable confirmation that the academic standards and quality are secure and that provision is of high quality and being enhanced.

The **objectives** of each Subject Quality Review are to:

1. Consider the subject-area's curriculum provision, its quality and enhancement.
 2. Consider the subject-area's engagement with and adherence to the institutional academic quality and governance arrangements, including annual monitoring, external examining, oversight and governance through committees and other forums.
 3. Consider areas of strength or weakness in relation to key performance indicators including: honours degrees awarded; employability and graduate outcomes; student cohorts; equality and diversity;
 4. Consider the ways in which student engagement takes place and how student feedback is considered and acted upon;
 5. Consider themes arising from external examiner reports and responses to these themes;
 6. Consider the effectiveness of the academic support and learning resources provided/available for students;
 7. Give a central role to quality enhancement through dialogue on the approach to enhancement, enhancement that has been or is being progressed, and areas in which quality could be improved;
 8. Consider the subject-area's use of relevant external and internal benchmarks in the design and delivery of its programmes including the University's strategic objectives in respect of education and enhancement of the student learning experience, the UK Quality Code for HE, Subject Benchmark Statements, and the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF);
 9. Recognise and commend areas of positive practice and make recommendations for future development.
34. Each review takes place through a process of: preparation of an Advance Information Set (AIS) including a Self-Evaluation Document prepared by the subject-area; consideration of the AIS by a Review Panel chaired by a Deputy Principal and including internal, external and student members; a Review Meeting in which the Review Panel meets with groups of staff and students from the subject-area; preparation of a Review Report which includes areas of commendation and a set of recommendations.
35. The 'Periodic Subject Quality Review: Requirements and procedure for undertaking a review' provides comprehensive detail on reviews and is provided to subject-areas at the outset of preparation for each review.

Student-Facing Professional Services Review

36. Student-Facing Professional Services Reviews are undertaken on a periodic basis, on a four to five year rolling programme. Each review addresses either an area of professional service practice or a particular theme such as, for example, careers and employability, mental health support, library and information, learning support. Priorities for review are identified through the integrated strategic planning process.
37. The key aims of Student-Facing Services Reviews are to:
 - a. provide assurance about the quality of service provision
 - b. consider the effectiveness of services in creating or contributing to a quality culture and student experience
 - c. consider the effectiveness of arrangements to engage students in review and development of services
 - d. identify and disseminate good practice.
38. The review process includes an initial self-evaluation of the practice or theme, and engagement with both staff and students. In addition, direct external input informs each review via an external adviser who is normally a relevant senior member of staff from another institution or expert in the relevant service or theme. This external adviser is appointed to act as a member of the Review Panel alongside internal staff members and a student member who will be nominated by the Students' Union.
39. A Review Report is prepared on each review which includes areas of commendation and recommendation.
40. In undertaking Student-Facing Services Reviews, the panel makes effective use of external and internal frameworks and data, for example, the strategic snapshot, student feedback and relevant professional body requirements.

Appendix 1 – Module Review and Annual Programme Monitoring Timeline

