

A guide to the annual programme monitoring and enhancement of academic provision

Academic session 2016/17

This guide is intended to provide support to those involved with the annual programme monitoring and enhancement of academic provision process. It provides information relating to the ongoing development and evolution of Programme Enhancement Plans (PEPs).

For further guidance about monitoring processes, please contact:

Louise Salmon
Quality Officer (Monitoring & Review)
T: (0116) 257 7665
E: louise.salmon@dmu.ac.uk
W: dmu.ac.uk/monitoring

Contents

Introduction.....	2
The programme monitoring and enhancement process	2
What is a Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP)?	2
Benefits of the PEP	3
New for 2016 /17	4
Thematic element	4
2016/17 timetable.....	4
PEP Drop in sessions/clinics	4
Section 1: Preparation for the PEP	6
Implementation issues to be considered	6
A guide to key monitoring information.....	6
Areas of focus	8
Suggested timescales for considering key monitoring information	8
Section 2: Completing the PEP	9
PEP templates.....	9
How is an entry to the PEP made?	10
Colleagues should articulate SMART areas of focus:	12
Completing a PEP for a newly validated programme	12
Academic Standards	12
Section 3: Process for approving and monitoring the PEP	13
Section 4: Programme monitoring arrangements for collaborative provision.....	15
Appendix 1: Guidance notes for completing the PEP	16
Appendix 2: PEP template	18
Appendix 3: PEP PMB summary template	21
Appendix 4: PEP faculty summary template.....	23
Appendix 5: Good practice in higher education.....	25
Appendix 6: Guidance for dissemination and sharing of good practice arising from PEPs.....	27

Introduction

‘Monitoring’ refers to the regular and continuous reflective practice in which staff are expected to engage – individually and collectively – leading to a better understanding of how programme teams are doing and how they can improve what they are doing. Monitoring should provide faculties and the university with a ‘health check’ for academic provision. It may be an obvious point, but it is worth reminding ourselves that the quality of the programmes we offer at De Montfort University (DMU) makes a keystone contribution to our success as a university, so it is essential that we know how we are doing.

Monitoring is also about identifying areas for improvement and enhancement in a dynamic environment. The national HE context is constantly changing and we need to reflect on what is the best academic practice to support what are increasingly diverse student groups. In fact, even where the context is less dynamic, there is always room to improve what we do for students by reflecting on key monitoring information. Finally, monitoring is also about celebrating our successes, promoting best practice, and learning from each other.

This guide articulates the annual programme monitoring and enhancement process at DMU and provides information about the quality assurance and enhancement processes relating to the development and evolution of the Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP). It also provides information on annual monitoring by Programme Management Boards (PMBs), Faculty Academic Committees (FACs), the Department of Academic Quality (DAQ) and the Academic Quality Committee (AQC). Reference is made throughout the guide to students with protected characteristics. Protected characteristics are the grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful. The protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 are:

- Age
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership*
- Race
- Religion or belief (including lack of belief)
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

* Marriage and civil partnership do not apply to educational provision

The programme monitoring and enhancement process

The Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP) is an 'enhancement' plan for a programme or cluster of programmes. This process, which is based on the key principles of trust and accountability, has now embedded itself successfully across the university.

The PEP records the main areas of development and/or improvement for the coming academic year for each programme, or group of related programmes. It requires programme teams to submit an annual plan to the PMB and FAC to reflect the outcomes of the evaluation of defined and established key monitoring information, which the programme teams identify as 'areas of focus'.

What is a Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP)?

Undergraduate and taught postgraduate programme teams are required to produce an enhancement plan **each year**. The process of its development provides programme teams with the opportunity to determine what is important for their programme and allows them to focus on teaching and learning and the

enhancement of provision. It is expected that staff will want to rectify any issues that have arisen out of consideration of the key monitoring information and/or any other relevant source, which are identified as areas of focus. The PEP records the areas of focus for the coming academic session for each programme, or group of related programmes. It is recommended that programme teams will normally identify no more than six areas of focus – this is suggested as an optimum number for the team to focus on, but it remains flexible. Each of these areas of strategic focus may contain more sub points.

The PEP is then submitted to the PMB for **approval, monitoring and evaluation**. A summary of all PEPs submitted to a PMB is submitted to FAC and incorporated into a faculty summary compiled by the Faculty Head of Quality which is submitted to the Academic Quality Committee (AQC) following FAC approval. The PMB has responsibility for the overall academic management, development and quality assurance of the programme/subject area. The FAC is responsible for quality assurance processes at faculty level. Programme teams are required to consider **all** key monitoring information as it becomes available throughout the year, indicating in their PEP what information they have considered.

It should be noted that the PEP is intended to be a plan for quality improvement and enhancement and not just a quality assurance process.

UK and overseas collaborative provision

- The approach to annual programme monitoring differs for faculty based UK and overseas franchised programmes, in that they complete a separate annual report which feeds into the main PEP. If a programme does not run at DMU then the partner programme co-ordinator will need to complete a PEP. Further guidance for these types of provision can be found in section 4 of this guide.

Benefits of the PEP

- The PEP development/evolution process is based on trust and accountability. Programme teams are expected to have strategies for dealing with significant quality issues, such as poor student retention. Programme teams are trusted to debate and evaluate quality issues and record actions in their PMB minutes. Additional reporting is not required.
- The introduction of the PEP has reduced bureaucracy by removing the burden of reporting. Where an enhancement plan has been produced for Periodic Review or PSRB accreditation this may be submitted instead of completing the 'areas of focus' section of the PEP.
- PEP development/evolution encourages programme teams to debate topical issues and bring coherence to the analysis and evaluation of a variety of information sources; such as student, employer and external examiner views.
- The PEP is a **dynamic document** for programme teams as it allows them to address issues as they arise out of the consideration of the key monitoring information, which is an ongoing reflective activity.
- Preparing the PEP provides an opportunity for subject teams to reflect. This includes looking at the way in which the student learning and teaching experience meets the needs of all stakeholders, taking into account factors such as Enhanced Learning through Technology and our equality duties and objectives.
- It offers a better balance between a reporting and evaluative framework.
- The PEP allows for the PMB, and programme team objectives to be considered, and areas of focus identified which are in line with faculty and university strategic objectives.

New for 2016 /17

Thematic element

Each year a thematic element is included within PEPs. Key monitoring information relating to the thematic element should be considered with actions and good practice identified. **The theme for 2016/17 is transitions.** The broad theme of transitions was agreed at the Academic Quality Committee and allows programme teams to interpret that within their context.

2016/17 timetable

- PEPs for undergraduate programmes run at DMU to be approved by the relevant PMB by 23 September 2016
- For non-standard undergraduate, postgraduate taught and collaborative programmes, PEPs to be approved by the relevant PMB by October/November/December 2016
- Faculty Academic Committees to consider all relevant PEPs in December 2016/January 2017
- Academic Quality Committee to consider Faculty PEP overviews in April 2017

PEP Drop in sessions/clinics

PEP drop in sessions are scheduled as follows:

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| • Wednesday 31 August | 10am-12noon | John Whitehead, 00.06f |
| • Thursday 8 September | 9am-11am | John Whitehead, 00.06g |
| • Monday 12 September | 12noon – 2pm | John Whitehead, 00.06g |
| • Wednesday 14 September | 11am-1pm | John Whitehead, 00.06f |

These 'drop in sessions' are designed to support colleagues regarding the PEP process and the following can be covered alongside specific queries:

- What is a PEP and why are PEPs in place?
- Templates
- Key monitoring information
- Steps to completing the PEP
- Good practice
- Areas of Focus
- Support and contacts

Colleagues can 'drop in' to these sessions at any point.

Please contact Louise Salmon, Quality Officer (Monitoring & Review) - louise.salmon@dmu.ac.uk, for further information.

An overview of Annual Programme Monitoring (APM) Quick start guide

Annual programme monitoring

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Code outlines in expectation B8 that HE providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes. A process of annual monitoring is in place at DMU and our successful Higher Education Review in April 2015 confirmed that Expectation B8 was being met.

What is it?

Monitoring refers to the regular and continuous reflective and evaluative practice in which staff are expected to engage collectively and individually to provide a 'health check' of academic provision.

DMU's monitoring processes provide

- opportunities for identifying:
- areas for improvement and enhancement
- identifying and promoting good practice.

Annual monitoring of modules and programmes is conducted through Module Enhancement Plans (MEPs) and Programme Enhancement Plans (PEPs). The process of producing MEPs and PEPs provides the opportunity to determine what is important for modules and programmes to develop the provision.

Module Enhancement

The process should ensure that:

- The module syllabus is relevant and up-to-date and the module template continues to accurately represent the module;
- The teaching, learning and assessment approach for the module continues to be effective;
- There is formal opportunity for reflection and evaluation which might lead to further developments; and
- Feedback from the teaching team (if appropriate), external examiners and students is promptly responded to.

Module Enhancement Plan (MEP)

- Should include information from the evaluation of interim and final module level feedback;
- Evaluations should take into consideration key monitoring information eg, student views, external examiner comments, student performance data as well as the views of the teaching team;
- The MEP template requires reflection on how last year's MEP action plan has been taken forward and include an action plan with areas for improvement for the following academic session;
- Is a 'live' document with different sources of evidence being evaluated at different times and added to the MEP as they occur.

Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP)

Developing the PEP is a crucial part of the annual programme monitoring process which requires Programme Leaders, Programme Management Board Chairs and the faculty Heads of Quality to confirm explicitly whether or not academic standards are being maintained in line with the QAA Quality Code.

Issues that arise from evaluating key monitoring information form 'areas of focus' which record the main areas of development for the coming year.

The process of PEP development encourages teams to identify areas of good practice where deliberate steps are being taken to improve provision. The process also requires active consideration of the results of both internal and external student surveys and information on the main outcomes and issues should be detailed on the PEP including how these will be taken forward.

Each year the PEP will have a thematic element and key monitoring information relating to the thematic element should be considered to identify areas of focus and good practice.

The PEP is a dynamic document which allows programme teams to address issues as soon as key monitoring information becomes available.

Collaborative provision

In order to maintain a parity of standards, the same processes used for monitoring standard DMU provision are applied to collaborative provision.

Depending on the type of provision, an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) and/or a PEP should be completed.

Where relevant, the AMR and the PEP should be completed jointly by the partner and the Programme Leader or Link Tutor and/or Academic Partnerships Unit (APU) Account Manager. The final agreed version of the reports should be submitted to DAQ by the stated deadline, normally around September/October, who will then forward on the reports as appropriate to the Faculty Head of Quality, Faculty Collaborative Coordinator, and for the attention of the PMB or Validation Services Board Chairs.

Monitoring

Academic Board oversees the monitoring processes via a reporting line from the Academic Quality Committee (AQC).

MEPs are completed by the module leader and monitored through the relevant Programme Management Board (PMB).

PEPs are completed by programme leaders for consideration at PMBs.

Faculty heads of quality consider PEPs from all programmes scrutinising them for common themes and producing a summary of these themes and areas of good practice for consideration at a specially convened meeting of the Faculty Academic Committee (FAC).

The Department of Academic Quality (DAQ) receives summaries from each faculty and collaborative partners (including Validation Services) and an annual programme monitoring report is produced for submission to AQC.

The annual programme monitoring process in brief

1. Interim & final MLF informs the MEP produced by Module Leader

2. MEP informs the PEP produced by Programme Leader (PL)

3. PL's PEP informs the PMB PEP summary produced by PMB Chair

4. PMB summaries form the faculty PEP summary produced by faculty Head of Quality

5. Overview summaries produced by DAQ for collaborative and Validation Service provision

6. All PEP overview summaries inform DAQ's university wide annual programme monitoring report (APMR)

Useful DMU resources

Guidance and forms	http://www.dmu.ac.uk/guidanceandforms
Quality Officer (Monitoring & Review), DAQ	0116 257 7665 louise.salmon@dmu.ac.uk
Partnerships Officer (Quality), DAQ	0116 207 8316 uzma.ali@dmu.ac.uk

Section 1: Preparation for the PEP

Implementation issues to be considered

- The PMB is responsible for identifying whether the PEP should capture the activity of a single programme or a cluster of related programmes, and subsequently which programme leaders need to complete a PEP each year.
- The impact of Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements, developments and improvement plans.
- Timing of reporting for programmes which operate a non-standard session calendar.
- Input from collaborative partners annual monitoring reports, UK and overseas.
- For joint programmes, it may be necessary to identify which PMB a PEP should report to (if the programme is currently overseen by more than one board).
- For programmes with service modules from other subject areas it may be necessary for additional evaluative information (such as external examiner's reports) to be made available for consideration by more than one board. Issues relating to formal communication between boards will need to be addressed if effective lines of communication are not currently operating.
- The level of scrutiny to which an individual PEP is subjected is heavily dependent on the number of PEPs being presented at a meeting. The minute record of any relevant sub-committee meetings will need to be appended to the PMB minutes. This is already good practice that some committees across the university have established.
- As the PMB minute book is where the process of programme evaluation is documented, there is a lot of emphasis on the quality of minutes being evaluative and providing a full and evidential record of programme monitoring discussions.
- Recording when areas of focus are complete, in order to close the quality assurance loop.
- Reporting of good practice.
- Timely consideration of key monitoring information.

A guide to key monitoring information

The university has a number of effective and well established quality assurance and enhancement mechanisms in place, which provide information for monitoring programmes. There are also well established processes for considering and responding to available information and ensuring that any issues raised are addressed in a timely manner. It is expected that programme teams routinely consider key monitoring information, as part of their quality assurance and enhancement processes.

The different types of key monitoring information available in the university are:

- **External examiners**

The views of external examiners and issues raised in their written reports should be responded to and addressed, in line with the university's operational statement which sets out clear timescales.

- **Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB)**

Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) scrutiny provides further opportunities for concerns about standards of student achievement and shortfalls in resources to be identified. PSRB reports are considered by Faculty Academic Committees (FACs) and the Academic Quality Committee (AQC).

- **Periodic review**

Programme/subject teams are responsible for working towards periodic review and responding to the improvement/enhancement plans that arise as a result. This is monitored via the PMB, FAC, and AQC.

- **Performance data**

Programme teams have a responsibility to monitor retention, progression and achievement rates of their students. They are also expected to analyse entry profiles of new students to ensure that the curriculum remains relevant to their needs. This is undertaken through the PMB under the direction of the FAC.

- **Module evaluations**

Every module is evaluated by the teaching team at the end of each session. This evaluation should take into consideration key monitoring information such as student views, external examiner comments and achievement rates etc, as well as the views of the teaching team. The process of reflection should then lead to actions for enhancement. A Module Enhancement Plan (MEP) for every module must be submitted to the relevant programme leader to facilitate production of the PEP.

- **Student feedback**

National Student Survey (NSS)

The university has developed mechanisms for managing and responding to the results of the National Student Survey (NSS), including the use of action plans for areas scoring below agreed benchmarks. These action plans are monitored by each faculty and the university keeps a close overview of this work.

Module level feedback

Module teams must gather feedback from students and use this to contribute to the MEP. Module teams are expected to advise students on any actions taken in response to their feedback on the module.

- **Information regarding collaborative provision (annual programme monitoring reports)**

For franchised UK and overseas collaborative provision a separate annual report is completed which feeds into the main PEP. If a programme does not run at DMU then the partner programme co-ordinator will need to complete a PEP in consultation with the DMU Programme Leader/Link Tutor. Other information that could be available to programme teams includes minutes of the HE forums (for FE colleges) as well as collaborative review reports.

- **Other relevant sources**

The above is not a comprehensive list of information sources available to programme teams. Many information sources are subject and programme specific, eg national and international subject developments and initiatives, legislation updates, as well as influences from external agencies and any other relevant source.

Additional information regarding procedures associated with the collection and consideration of key monitoring information can be found in the following guides:

- Guide to external examining at DMU
- Guide to periodic review
- Guide to module enhancement

Programme teams are required to indicate which key monitoring information has been analysed during PEP development.

Areas of focus

How are areas of focus identified for the PEP?

The faculty Head of Quality and the faculty executive ensure that PMBs consider and evaluate key monitoring information in a timely and consistent manner, and advise the FAC on aspects of programmes/modules that fall short of any relevant benchmarks.

When identifying areas of focus, recurring themes should be looked for as well as items of concern and good practice which are highlighted in the key monitoring information. It is important to note that the choice of areas of focus should not be governed only by issues which need addressing but should also encompass areas for development.

Programme leaders and teams are encouraged to explore ways by which areas of focus are identified and their related impact on the learning and teaching experience, to ensure they are meeting the needs of all students, including those with protected characteristics.

Thematic element

Each year a thematic element will be included in PEPs. Key monitoring information relating to the thematic element should be considered with actions and good practice identified. The theme for 2016/17 is transitions. The broad theme of transitions was agreed at the Academic Quality Committee and allows programme teams to interpret that within their context.

Suggested timescales for considering key monitoring information

Please note timings may vary for postgraduate and/or programmes that sit outside of the standard full-time undergraduate framework, such as nursing.

June - September	Performance data
July - September	External examiner reports
August	National Student Survey (NSS)
September	Module Enhancement Plans (MEPs)
September onwards	Annual programme monitoring reports for collaborative provision

A FAC may task a PMB and/or other committee with addressing an issue which falls below a relevant benchmark e.g. student progression or NSS scores, then an area of focus may also be identified for the PEP, which can therefore be at any time in the year. Once programme teams have considered their key monitoring information, the PEP provides an opportunity to formulate a clear plan for the direction of the programme detailed in the identified areas of focus.

Section 2: Completing the PEP

PEP templates

Guidance notes for Programme Leaders on making entries in the PEP template can be found at **Appendix 1**. The PEP template can be found at **Appendix 2**. A PEP PMB Summary, see **Appendix 3**, is produced followed by a PEP Faculty Summary, **Appendix 4**, which is presented to the FAC for consideration and monitoring.

1 Update on previous year's PEP

For those areas of focus not carried forward to the following year, consideration should be given to the outcome of last year's areas of focus: how and where were these areas of focus discussed/considered/approved; how were they monitored; the impact of the changes (positive/negative). If no actions were taken, this decision should be explained.

2 How to identify areas of good practice

Whilst there is much good practice in teaching and learning occurring across the university, this is not always systematically identified and disseminated. The PEP offers an opportunity to identify and disseminate good practice, not only for the benefit of the individual programme team, but more widely for the faculty and university as a whole. Describing good practice clearly in the PEP may lead to colleagues being able to address their own issues based on the strengths of others, and is therefore important in helping to enhance the quality of provision across the university.

Good practice might include:

- Established ways of working that have been modified and improved.
- Innovations that have successfully addressed specific issues.
- Identified ways of working that have demonstrable positive outcomes and could be transferred across other programmes/department/faculties.

Methods for disseminating good practice may require the most time for reflection. Once an example of good practice has been recognised, it is important to consider what elements actually make it 'good'. It is these which should be identified for dissemination. As a general rule, it will be those elements that others will find useful and/or relevant – highly subject-specific elements may be less applicable, and careful consideration should be given to as to how these should be disseminated.

The action taken to disseminate the good practice will depend largely on the methods used within each faculty. There are likely to be a number of avenues available and programme teams need to consider which is the most appropriate.

Appendix 5 'Good Practice in Higher Education' explores definitions of good practice and dissemination further. **Appendix 6** provides further guidance for dissemination and sharing of good practice arising from PEPs. Further assistance on defining, disseminating and embedding good practice can be sought from your Faculty Head of Quality.

3 Response to student survey outcomes

Actively consider the results of both internal and external surveys and focussing on enhancement, think about the main outcomes and issues and how these will be taken forward and ensure students are made aware of action taken in response to their feedback.

4 Consideration of key monitoring information

Below is an example of how to identify an area of focus to make a PEP entry:

After consideration of the key monitoring information by the PMB, ie external examiner report and National Student Survey (NSS), the following issues were identified:

- Quality of student feedback is inconsistent across modules eg grammar, referencing, feedback sheets. It is recommended that programme teams should have similar feedback methods and module leader's feedback should be consistent within a team.
- Not enough critical and constructive advice is given in order to facilitate improvement.
- Feedback to students is to be improved by increasing the speed at which marked work is returned, by meeting the required 20 working days (when the university is open) turnaround (Assessment and Feedback Policy).

NB this may be one issue or a group of issues needing to be addressed, in this example there are a number relating to 'student assessment feedback'.

Therefore a summary of the above issues is:

- Inconsistent feedback
- Critical detail required
- Timely feedback

How is an entry to the PEP made?

Using the identified area of focus above, an entry to the PEP can be made using a more or less detailed approach. Both methods are acceptable and an example of each is given below using the PEP template:

Area of focus 1 – Assessment feedback

- Use standard feedback proformas for all assessments giving a breakdown of marks against the marking criteria and some space for free comment.
- Programme team to monitor feedback forms to ensure constructive comment.
- Reinforce the commitment to 20 working day turnaround (as per the university's Assessment and Feedback Policy and monitor this. Publish feedback dates in handbooks.

Please indicate if this area of focus has arisen from consideration of the key monitoring information and if it is an item being carried forward from the previous session.

NSS and external examiner reports

It is important to note that the level of detail included in areas of focus does vary across the board. However without being prescriptive, programme teams should include enough information in each entry so that clear targets/objectives can be defined, understood, and signed up to by the programme team, and approved by the PMB.

The table below demonstrates the degree of variation that can be adopted by programme teams to articulate the feasibility of their areas of focus. This example of good practice was introduced in the Faculty of Art, Design and Humanities to demonstrate to programme teams what level of detail is required by the PMB/FAC in order to maintain adequate records in the minute book for approving the feasibility of targets:

Feasibility of areas of focus – examples of varied practice

Inappropriate practice 'Improve resources' 'Improve security' 'Library facilities at partner college'	Poor practice 'Develop marketing activities' 'Coherence of marking and records' 'Ensuring stronger course identity and promotion of its unique selling point' 'Blackboard' 'Attendance monitoring system' 'Curriculum development'
Acceptable practice 'Investigate a range of methods to get students to engage with critical thinking and debate' 'Encourage independent study, self-motivation and studio working' 'Develop portfolio presentation and drawing skills across all years' 'Continued review of curriculum and timetabling to accommodate increased student numbers' 'Use of Blackboard as a supportive information and teaching resource' 'Review levels of feedback given to students across all modules including the mapping of learning outcomes to assessment criteria'	Good practice 'Put in place a monitoring programme for first cohort of foundation degree students joining level 3' 'The relationship between formative and summative assessment remains unclear to students, particularly those in year one. A clearer policy statement from the course team will be posted on Blackboard and form part of sessions where we periodically 'remind' students of how the feedback and assessment process works' 'Develop the use of Blackboard and social networking sites to create programme communications for tutorial support and peer group exchange' 'Integration of staff team to develop stronger communication with ... to improve management and organisation' 'Develop external competitions and live briefs in relation to student projects' 'Assessment and feedback timescales to be reviewed, communicated to students, and adhered to' 'Address low recruitment through rebranding and integrating interactive design into the graphic design subject area'

Colleagues should articulate SMART areas of focus:

Specific – stating exactly what needs to be achieved;

Measurable – including a qualitative or quantitative measure;

Achievable;

Realistic – can be challenging but must be achievable; and

Time bound – with a clear end date or timescale.

Completing a PEP for a newly validated programme

The opening sections which provide an update on the previous year and good practice do not need to be completed for your first PEP. In its first year of delivery, the number of areas of focus identified for a programme is often small and will probably reflect any conditions and/or recommendations included in the programme's validation report. However, a new programme team will constantly review and evaluate the delivery of the programme, particularly to the first cohort of students. The PEP may include the outcomes of this process.

Academic Standards

The PMB and faculty summary templates include a dedicated section to record any potential risks to academic standards. Details are required of the programme it relates to, the risk and the action being taken to address the risk. Any issues should be sent to the Department of Academic Quality immediately for referral to the Academic Quality Committee. By signing the summary, Faculty Heads of Quality are confirming that academic standards are being maintained.

Section 3: Process for approving and monitoring the PEP

Approval and monitoring by the Programme Management Board (PMB)

Programme Enhancement Plans (PEPs) form part of the PMB's strategic planning activity whilst fitting into a wider quality management and enhancement process. The programme leader along with the programme team has responsibility for ensuring that the PEP is reviewed and regularly updated as areas of focus are identified, progressed and closed.

PMBs receive PEPs at an agreed time each year, to consider, approve, and monitor the areas of focus within them. It is recommended that postgraduate PEPs should be considered to fit into the recommended timeframe for the presentation of PMB and Faculty summaries to FACs in December/January. It is also **recommended** that consideration be given to scheduling a special meeting of these committees, specifically to consider and approve the PEPs, although it is recognised that this is not always feasible.

PMBs are responsible for ensuring that the PEPs are taken forward as appropriate and requesting progress updates at each meeting on the areas of focus identified, particularly when a new PEP is produced. This provides a formal mechanism for 'closing the loop' and recording where action is still to be taken. Detailed discussions of programme monitoring and evaluation should be recorded in the PMB minutes. The PMB should also take a view about the feasibility of targets set within each area of focus. These need to be realistic and achievable within the timeframe set.

Sample PMB meeting agenda/headings for minutes

- 1 Presentation by the programme leader(s) to introduce the PEP and details of the identified areas of focus for discussion and approval. Programme leaders will also need to formally record which areas of focus from the previous session are now closed and which have been carried forward.
- 2 Debate and discussion to clarify details and contextualise new areas of focus.
- 3 In relation to the approval of the PEP(s), the PMB may wish to consider the following:
 - Subject/programme development plans (short and long term)
 - Key monitoring information
 - Faculty strategic plans
 - Resource implications
 - Time frames for implementation
 - Guidance and support required
 - Suggestions for any other areas of focus
 - Inclusion of annual programme monitoring reports from standard UK and overseas collaborative provision
 - Inclusion of good practice
 - Any issues identified as falling below any relevant benchmark(s)
- 4 Confirmation of approval to be recorded and any special criteria noted, such as deadlines for implementation.
- 5 Identify any additional updates required by programme leaders.

Approval and monitoring by the Faculty Academic Committee (FAC)

Typically a special meeting of the FAC (or equivalent) will take place in November/December/January to consider the PMB summaries of the PEPs. The faculty Head of Quality will prepare a faculty overview of the PEPs commenting on common issues and themes arising, as well as the implementation process. PMB chairs will be asked to present a written summary of their PEPs for consideration at this FAC meeting. It is **recommended** that the FAC should add value to PEPs as well as implementing a quick check that all issues in a specific subject area are being addressed. This gives ownership of the process to the faculty and ensures that the FAC is aware of common themes arising across the faculty and can therefore take action on issues as appropriate. It is acknowledged that some provision may fall outside of the standard timescale and as such, FACs will need to ensure that any PEPs not presented at the special meeting are considered at

a future meeting. FACs may also choose to monitor issues which they have identified as below any relevant benchmark which then arise as areas of focus.

Sample FAC meeting agenda/headings for minutes

- 1 Faculty overview of the PEPs to be presented by the Head of Quality (to include a summary of common issues and themes arising, as well as a brief commentary on implementation issues).
- 2 Each PMB chair will present a written summary of its PEPs for discussion and debate against an agreed set of criteria.
- 3 Confirmation of approval to be recorded and any special criteria noted, such as deadlines for implementation. A record should also be made if FACs refer and commission work by other committees as a result of issues highlighted in the PEPs.
- 4 PMB chairs are required to give regular updates on PEPs at subsequent meetings.

On behalf of the FAC, the Head of Quality will monitor implementation of the PEP process (after approval by PMBs).

The monitoring process will look at:

- All PEPs submitted for the current session, including references to key monitoring information
- Programme board minute trail, to evaluate the quality of records of discussions and comment on any areas for improvement

It is **recommended** that faculty Heads of Quality ensure that the faculty PEP overview reports are well publicised and disseminated within the faculties, possibly through publication on a Blackboard shell.

Monitoring by the Academic Quality Committee (AQC)

AQC monitors common issues and themes identified in PEPs across the university's provision. It is also responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of programme monitoring and enhancement arrangements in the university.

Monitoring by the Department of Academic Quality (DAQ)

Support to programme leaders is provided by the Quality Officer (Monitoring and Review). DAQ receives copies of PEP PMB and Faculty summaries via representation at the FACs as well as the annual review of PEPs by each faculty Head of Quality. From this, a report identifying common issues and themes across the university is prepared for consideration by the AQC each session. This should provide enough time for the dissemination of approved recommendations and applicable feedback to programme teams and other relevant parties before the start of the next session.

Section 4: Programme monitoring arrangements for collaborative provision

The day-to-day management of collaborative programmes and monitoring of standards is devolved to faculties, as per standard in-house provision. In order to maintain a parity of standards the same processes used for monitoring standard DMU provision are applied to collaborative provision, however greater central oversight is maintained due to the higher risks presented by the provision. In the case of the Validation Service, the Validation Service Board retains oversight and operates in the same way as a DMU Faculty Academic Committee.

APU and DAQ will have a role in alerting faculties when annual monitoring activities need to be undertaken and seeking confirmation that they have been completed. Activities across the faculty will also be monitored at Faculty Collaborative Provision Committees (FCPCs). The different types of key quality monitoring information used annually by DMU in maintaining oversight of the academic standards of collaborative provision are:

- External examiners reports
- Annual programme monitoring reports
- Student feedback
- Review of programme compositions, teaching staff CVs and Service Level Agreements
- Student Handbooks for the following academic session
- Public information checks

For full details of all annual monitoring activities for collaborative provision see the *DAQ Guide to Managing Collaborative Provision* or contact DAQ.

Appendix 1: Guidance notes for completing the PEP

What is a PEP?

Developing the PEP is a crucial part of the annual programme monitoring process which requires Programme Leaders, Programme Management Board Chairs and Deans of faculties to confirm explicitly whether or not academic standards are being maintained in line with the QAA Quality Code. The PEP is an annual quality improvement and enhancement plan which reflects the evaluation of defined and established key monitoring information. Issues that arise from this evaluation form 'areas of focus' which record the main areas of development for the coming academic year to enhance a programme or group of related programmes. The process of PEP development also encourages teams to identify areas of good practice where deliberate steps are being taken to improve provision. Each year the PEP will have a thematic element. This year's thematic element is transitions* and areas of good practice and areas of focus relating to this thematic element should be recorded on the PEP. The PEP is submitted to the PMB and FAC for approval, monitoring and evaluation to ensure the areas of focus identified are in line with faculty and university strategic objectives.

** The thematic element of transitions was agreed at the Academic Quality Committee and allows programme teams to interpret that within their context.*

Steps to completing the PEP

1. **Update on previous year's PEP** – for those areas of focus not carried forward to the following year, think about the outcome of last year's areas of focus; how and where were the areas of focus discussed/considered/approved; how were they monitored; the impact of the changes (positive/negative); and if no actions were taken please explain this decision. You can then provide a short commentary in **box 1** of the template.
2. **Identify areas of good practice in relation to the thematic element and other good practices** – referring to Appendices 5 and 6 of the Guide to the Annual Programme Monitoring and Enhancement of Academic Provision, think about the new initiatives you have tried that have worked particularly well; any established ways of working that have been modified and improved; innovations that have successfully addressed specific issues; and identified ways of working that have demonstrable positive outcome and could be transferred across other programmes/departments/faculties. You can then quote any specific examples in **boxes 2a and 2b** of the template including how successful initiatives might be shared.
3. **Response to student survey outcomes** – following active consideration of the results of both internal and external surveys and focussing on enhancements, think about the main outcomes and issues and how these will be taken forward. You can then provide a concise commentary in **box 3**.
4. **Key Areas of Focus** - you should consider the key monitoring information available on the thematic area and identify actions as appropriate. Once you have considered all aspects of this, you can then provide a short commentary in **box 4a** outlining your considerations.

Identify areas of focus for the coming academic year – having examined the key monitoring information, this section provides an opportunity to formulate a clear plan for the direction of the programme. Identify actions in relation to the thematic elements and provide a short commentary in **box 4a** outlining your considerations. There are 5 additional boxes for areas of focus on the template however there is no minimum or maximum number to be identified – please feel free to add more boxes for additional areas of focus if required. You should indicate how each has arisen, why it is an area of focus and how it will be taken forward. Any Area of Focus identified should be SMART - **S**pecific – stating exactly what needs to be achieved; **M**easurable – including a qualitative or quantitative measure; **A**chievable; **R**ealistic – can be challenging but must be achievable; and

Time bound – with a clear end date or timescale. From your evaluation of all relevant data you will need to think about any related impact on the learning and teaching experience to ensure the needs of all students are being met (including those with protected characteristics) in any areas of focus. You can then provide a short commentary in **boxes 4b to 4f** of the template using a separate box for each area of focus.

5. **Evaluate key monitoring information to establish recurring themes and items of concern** – consider as a minimum external examiner reports; Professional and Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) reports; periodic review reports and enhancement plans; performance data; module evaluations; student feedback (including NSS results, module feedback, Module Enhancement Plans (MEPs), DLHE, PTES, PRES, UKES and other relevant sources of student feedback) and annual programme monitoring reports for collaborative provision. This is not a comprehensive list as some information sources may be programme or subject specific. You will need to provide confirmation in **box 5** of the template which key monitoring information has been analysed in the preparation of the PEP. Your faculty Head of Quality can advise you further regarding selection, use and evaluation of key monitoring information including student feedback.
6. **Signatures** – the form should be signed in **box 6** by the Programme Leader to confirm the PEP has been prepared by them; and the Programme Management Board Chair and Faculty Head of Quality to confirm they are in agreement with the content of the PEP.

Once the PEP is completed

The completed PEP should be submitted to the Programme Management Board at the agreed time. The PEP is then monitored at subsequent PMBs, with revisions to the PEP being made whenever necessary. Any new versions of the PEP need to be lodged with the relevant faculty administrator to assure effective version control.

Further guidance

Your faculty Head of Quality can provide valuable advice and support throughout the annual programme monitoring and enhancement process. Further guidance can also be found on the Department of Academic Quality (DAQ) website at <http://www.dmu.ac.uk/peps> and in the Guide to the Annual Programme Monitoring and Enhancement of Academic Provision at <http://www.dmu.ac.uk/monitoring> For further guidance on accessing and evaluating key monitoring information using Tableau, please contact Suzanne Nelson, Senior Quality Officer (Management Information) snelson@dmu.ac.uk or extension 8310.

There is also a programme of briefing sessions for those preparing PEPs which are delivered by DAQ staff and faculty Heads of Quality. Further information on these can be obtained from Louise Salmon, Quality Officer (Monitoring and Review) louise.salmon@dmu.ac.uk or extension 7665.

Appendix 2: PEP template

Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP) for Academic Session 2016/17

Please refer to the Guidance Notes for further information

Programme Title(s)																	
Programme Management Board	Faculty																
Programme Leader																	
1.	Update on previous year's PEP																
<p>Please provide a short commentary on and/or minute references relating to the outcomes of last year's areas of focus which are not to be carried forward in the section below. For each area of focus, include discussion of: What actions were planned to address it and where these were discussed / considered / approved. How actions were monitored and what positive/negative impact the actions had. If no actions were taken with respect to an area of focus then explain why this was the case.</p>																	
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area of Focus</th> <th>Outcome</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Area of Focus	Outcome														
Area of Focus	Outcome																
2.	Identification of Good Practice																
<p>(For definition of, and commentary relating to Good Practice, please refer to the Guidance Notes accompanying this form and to the Guide to Annual Programme Monitoring and Enhancement of Academic Provision). Quote specific examples of good practice providing evidence to support this judgement. Consider and give examples of how successful good practice initiatives might be taken forward and/or shared.</p>																	
2a	Good Practice – Thematic element – Transitions																
<p>Please consider the key monitoring information available on the thematic area and identify good practices as appropriate:</p>																	
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Good Practice identified</th> <th>How this could be taken forward/shared</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Good Practice identified	How this could be taken forward/shared														
Good Practice identified	How this could be taken forward/shared																
2b	Other Good Practices																
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Good Practice identified</th> <th>How this could be taken forward/shared</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Good Practice identified	How this could be taken forward/shared														
Good Practice identified	How this could be taken forward/shared																

3.	Response to student survey outcomes																			
<p><i>Following active consideration of the results of internal and external student surveys and focussing on enhancements, state the main outcomes and how these will be taken forward. The guidance notes accompanying this form provide more information/details on completing this section.</i></p>																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <th>How this will be taken forward</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>			Outcome	How this will be taken forward																
Outcome	How this will be taken forward																			
4.	Key Areas of Focus for 2016/17																			
<p><i>Programme Teams are asked to indicate the key areas that they wish to focus on during the session. Teams are asked to limit these to no more than 6 where possible however, there is no minimum or maximum number of areas of focus. It is understood that teams are routinely considering key monitoring information (KMI). Confirmation that the KMI has been considered, and responded to where necessary, is required below. Where an enhancement plan has been produced for Periodic Review this may be submitted instead of this section of the PEP. Similarly, if teams are required to produce enhancement plans for their PSRBs, these may be submitted in lieu of this section of the PEP.</i></p>																				
4a.	Area(s) of Focus for the Thematic Element – Transitions																			
<p><i>The thematic element of transitions allows programme teams to interpret that within their context.</i></p>																				
<p><i>Please consider the key monitoring information available on the thematic area and identify actions as appropriate:</i></p>																				
Area(s) of Focus for the Thematic Element																				
4b.	Area of Focus 1																			
<p><i>Please indicate from where this area of focus has arisen (student feedback/external examiner comment etc.), consideration of the Key Monitoring Information and if the item is being carried forward from the previous session.</i></p>																				
4c.	Area of Focus 2																			
<p><i>Please indicate from where this area of focus has arisen (student feedback/external examiner comment etc.), consideration of the Key Monitoring Information and if the item is being carried forward from the previous session.</i></p>																				
4d.	Area of Focus 3																			
<p><i>Please indicate from where this area of focus has arisen (student feedback/external examiner comment etc.), consideration of the Key Monitoring Information and if the item is being carried forward from the previous session.</i></p>																				
4e.	Area of Focus 4																			
<p><i>Please indicate from where this area of focus has arisen (student feedback/external examiner comment etc.), consideration of the Key Monitoring Information and if the item is being carried forward from the previous session.</i></p>																				

4f.	Area of Focus 5	
Please indicate from where this area of focus has arisen (student feedback/external examiner comment etc.), consideration of the Key Monitoring Information and if the item is being carried forward from the previous session.		
5.	I confirm that the following key monitoring information has been considered and the evaluation of such has informed the production of this PEP:	
External Examiners	<input type="checkbox"/>	Student Feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Please specify the sources of student feedback considered eg, NSS, module evaluations, DLHE, PTES, PRES:
PSRB activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	Module Enhancement Plans (MEPs) <input type="checkbox"/>
Periodic Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	Collaborative Provision Reports <input type="checkbox"/>
Performance Data ¹	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please state):
6.	Signatures	
This PEP has been prepared by the Programme Leader(s): Signed: _____ Date: _____ (Programme Leader(s))		
This PEP has been agreed by the Programme Management Board Chair: Signed: _____ Date: _____ (Programme Management Board Chair)		
This PEP has been agreed by the Faculty Head of Quality: Signed: _____ Date: _____ (Faculty Head of Quality)		

¹ Available from Tableau module achievement report via <http://tableau.dmu.ac.uk>, choose the 'Information about students' site (if multiple options are presented). Select the 'Reporting Portal', then the 'DAQ Portal' and then the 'Academic Quality Portal'. Within the 'Programme-level retention, progression and award reporting' section select the 'Individual programme performance' workbook. Any module or programme performance data generated by Tableau, whether in electronic or hard copy, does not need to be appended to the PEP. However as the data refreshes and is therefore not static, copies of the data snapshots you have analysed should be exported and saved locally. Local copies should also be made for all key monitoring information being considered. Contact daqtableau@dmu.ac.uk to request access to Tableau.

Appendix 3: PEP PMB summary template

Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP) Programme Management Board (PMB) Summary for Academic Session 2016/17

This summary is an evaluative overview of the individual Programme Enhancement Plans completed by programme leaders for the programmes owned by your PMB.

For single programme PMBs, this summary is not required to be fully completed however PMB Chairs **MUST** complete Section 1* and sign the form.

PMB		Faculty	
Programmes included in summary			
Chair of the PMB			
1.	Academic Standards*		
Having assessed all the PEPs owned by your PMB, please provide details of any programmes for which there are risks to academic standards and the action being taken to address this:			
	Programme	Risk	Action to be taken
2.	Review of the key themes/issues from the previous PEP summary		
Please provide an overview of the outcome of key themes/issues noted in the previous PEP summary and whether any are ongoing:			
	Key theme/issue	Outcome	Status – closed/ongoing
3.	Good practice – Thematic Element – Transitions		
The thematic element of transitions allows programme teams to interpret that within their context.			
Please provide an overview of areas of good practice in relation to the Thematic Element including their source of origin and how successful initiatives might be taken forward and shared:			
	Area of good practice identified	Source of origin	How this will be taken forward/shared
4.	Other Good practice		

Please provide an **overview** of areas of good practice including their source of origin and how successful initiatives might be taken forward and shared:

Area of good practice identified	Source of origin	How this will be taken forward/shared

5. Response to student survey outcomes

With a focus on enhancement, please list the main outcomes and how these will be taken forward. Also indicate any actions that will be taken at PMB level.

Outcome	How this will be taken forward

6. Areas of focus

Please list the key themes from the areas of focus from the current session, including their source of origin. Also indicate the actions that can be taken at PMB level.

Thematic Element –Transitions	Source of origin	Action at PMB level
Area(s) of focus		
Key theme	Source of origin	Action at PMB level

7. Any additional comments/feedback

Please provide any general comments/feedback arising from reviewing the PEPs that is not covered elsewhere – e.g., any staff development requirements regarding PEP completion or additional guidance needed, any recommended changes to the PEP proforma, etc.

This summary has been prepared by the Programme Management Board Chair and by signing below I confirm that academic standards are being maintained:

Signed: _____ Date: _____
(Programme Management Board Chair)

Appendix 4: PEP faculty summary template

Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP) Faculty Summary for Academic Session 2016/17

Faculty		
Report prepared by [insert name and faculty] Head of Quality		Date
1.	Academic Standards	
Please provide details of any risks to academic standards and the action being taken to address this – any issues should be sent to the Department of Academic Quality immediately for referral to the Academic Quality Committee		
2.	Review of the key themes/issues from the previous PEP summary	
Please provide an overview of the outcome of key themes/issues noted in the previous summary and whether any are ongoing.		
	Key theme/issue	Outcome
		Status – closed/ongoing
3.	Good practice – Thematic Element - Transitions	
Please identify areas of good practice in relation to the Thematic Element including their source of origin and how successful initiative might be taken forward and shared		
	Area of good practice identified	Source of origin
		How this will be taken forward/shared
4.	Other good practice	
Please identify areas of good practice including their source of origin and how successful initiative might be taken forward and shared		
	Area of good practice identified	Source of origin
		How this will be taken forward/shared

5.	Response to student survey outcomes
<i>Please list the main outcomes and how these will be taken forward</i>	
Outcome	How this will be taken forward
5.	Key themes/issues from the areas of focus for the current session
<i>Please list the key themes from the thematic element and other areas of focus and how these will be taken forward at faculty level</i>	
Thematic Element –Transitions	How this will be taken forward
Area(s) of focus	
Key theme	How this will be taken forward
6.	Additional Comments
<p>This summary has been prepared by the Faculty Head of Quality and by signing below I confirm that academic standards are being maintained:</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 40%;"> <p>Signed:</p> <p>(Faculty Head of Quality)</p> </div> <div style="width: 40%;"> <p>Date:</p> </div> </div>	

Appendix 5: Good practice in higher education

What is good practice?

The definition of good practice is a much deliberated topic; however a working definition is necessary to inform understanding and identification.

Within the context of higher education, good practice is generally defined as practice that is regarded as making a positive contribution, adding value to the provision and student learning experience and which is worthy of wider dissemination. The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA)¹ is the independent body entrusted with monitoring and advising on standards and quality in UK higher education. The QAA articulate that a feature of good practice is a process or way of working that makes a particularly positive contribution to the following judgement areas:

- the provider's assurance of its academic standards;
- the quality and/or enhancement of the learning opportunities it provides for students; and
- the quality of the information it produces about its higher education provision².

Good practice may include:

- established ways of working that have been modified and improved;
- innovations that have successfully addressed specific issues;
- identified ways of working that have demonstrable positive outcomes and could be transferred across other programmes/departments/faculties.

How to define good practice: identification, verification, dissemination and embedding

The first stage in the process has to be **identification**. All too often colleagues are reticent to put forward examples of their practice as being “good”. There is perhaps a view that everyone is doing that already or that upon investigation it will prove to be usual or expected standard practice. Whilst this is perfectly understandable, it is worth remembering that the university is not just looking for *exceptional* practice but anything that goes above and beyond ordinary, standard practice. Colleagues are therefore encouraged to use the mechanisms available to them such as periodic review, validation, Module Enhancement Plans (MEPs) and Programme Enhancement Plans (PEPs) to identify examples of good practice and potential areas of good practice worthy of investigation.

The second stage in this process is **verification**. It is important that others within a programme team, subject area or faculty accept that examples put forward as good practice are better than the norm. However this does not mean examples should only be promoted if identified or supported by an outside agency eg, an external examiner. Indeed experience suggests that practice identified by external examiners is just as likely to be what might be expected or standard as anything else. Verification of good practice also needs to operate at team level if the examples are to be successfully disseminated and embedded. Teams should be encouraged to discuss ideas/practice put forward in an honest and robust fashion including testing with those outside their areas. This discussion is at the heart of verification. If as a result of this it is agreed that practice is solid working practice rather than good or exceptional practice, this is still a good outcome and worthy of recognition as it is endorsement of appropriate practice.

The third stage is to agree on the most appropriate method(s) of **dissemination**. These will vary according to circumstance; nevertheless, whatever methods are agreed upon need to be *proactive and systematic*. Colleagues will not find out about examples of agreed good practice unless they

¹ <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/home>

² <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/HER-handbook-14.pdf>

are communicated effectively and widely thereby increasing opportunities for enhancement. Simply placing examples on a website or in a file for colleagues to look through when they find the time will not work effectively.

It may be useful to refer to the following:

The term “dissemination” has become a familiar part of our vocabulary within higher education and it is easy, therefore, to talk about doing it without having a real grasp of what it means, “to disseminate” or what it is you are trying to achieve by doing it. It is helpful to think about dissemination in three different ways:

- *Dissemination for Awareness*
- *Dissemination for Understanding*
- *Dissemination for Action*

Perhaps the term dissemination can be best described as the “delivering and receiving of a message”, “the engagement of an individual in a process” and “the transfer of a process or product”.

Extract from ‘Creating an Effective Dissemination Strategy’ TQEF National Co-ordination Team, 2000 see <http://www.innovations.ac.uk/btg/resources/publications/dissemination.pdf>

The final stage is **embedding**. Identifying, verifying and disseminating examples of good practice is good but if it makes little or no difference to the practice of others, the process is questionable. Those completing the PEPs should record potential good practice on the PEP proforma and indicate how it has been or could be subjected to the identification, verification, dissemination and embedding stages. In the first instance PEPs will be presented to Programme Management Boards (PMBs) for consideration, approval and monitoring. PMBs are responsible for ensuring that PEPs are taken forward and request a progress update at each meeting. Monitoring is also undertaken by Faculty Academic Committees (FACs) and the Faculty Head of Quality will prepare a faculty overview of the PEPs commenting on areas of good practice, common themes and implementation. The minutes of each FAC are presented to the Academic Quality Committee (AQC) for scrutiny and monitoring at a strategic level. DAQ also produce an annual programme monitoring report which is presented to AQC identifying good practice, common issues and themes across the university. This process provides a mechanism for wider discussion and reflection on areas of good practice to see how they have been or could be taken forward, disseminated and embedded within programmes, departments and faculties.

Notes:

This paper also draws upon discussions and work in this area (regarding good practice) undertaken by DMU colleagues including the Department of Academic Quality and Academic Professional Development team. Feedback is encouraged and will inform our definition and dissemination of good practice. Please send comments and feedback to the Quality Officer (Monitoring and Review) – louise.salmon@dmu.ac.uk.

Appendix 6: Guidance for dissemination and sharing of good practice arising from PEPs

Many programmes identify good practice when completing the annual PEP. This is only a fruitful exercise if that good practice is shared widely to maximise dissemination and offer opportunities for other programmes to be enhanced. It is recognised that good practice for one programme does not necessarily translate into another. Notwithstanding this the guidance outlines below a range of strategies that faculties may adopt to facilitate sharing and wider implementation of good practice.

1. Faculty Head of Quality PEP summary is compiled following PMB and/or FAC PEP special meeting (or equivalent) to be an agenda item on next available FAC.
2. Faculty Head of Quality requests PMB chairs to include FAC PEP summary on next PMB agenda for consideration of good practice by programme teams.
3. Agenda item on FAC agenda at final meeting of the session to receive feedback from PMBs on shared good practice that has been adopted by relevant programmes.
4. Agenda item on FAC specifically to consider good practice highlighted in DAQ PEP summary and how this may be incorporated into programmes. This will facilitate dissemination of good practice from the wider university.
5. A summary of the good practice extracted from PEPs to be considered at Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee (FLTC).³
6. Faculties may also consider short programmes of seminars or workshops offered to staff in order to explore examples of good practice. These can be delivered in partnership with other faculties as well as the academic professional development team in the Directorate of People and Organisational Development (POD).

³ Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee terms of reference include 'To monitor good practice highlighted through academic quality processes and identify channels of dissemination'.