

QUALITY FRAMEWORK QUALITY

MANUAL SECTION 4

ANNUAL REVIEW

Contents

1	Introduction
2	Aims and Purpose of Annual Review
3	Overview of Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Course and Module Level• Annual Review of Collaborative Partnerships and Provision• Department and Faculty Level• Institutional Level - Officer Overview Reports• Institutional Level - Scrutiny of the Outcomes of Annual Review
4	Timing of Annual Review
5	Module Review
6	Course Improvement Plans (CIPs)
7	Department Overview Reports and Action Plans
8	Governance of the Annual Review Process
9	Annual Review and Periodic Review

QUALITY FRAMEWORK

ANNUAL REVIEW

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Annual Review is undertaken by academic staff with responsibility for the design, delivery and enhancement of courses and modules and also operates at faculty and institutional level. Review, evaluation and the continuous enhancement of all the University's award-bearing provision is an essential activity to assure the quality of the student experience and to maintain standards. Annual Review allows course leaders to review the performance of their course against key performance indicators and enables heads of departments to compare the effectiveness of courses within their area. The annual review exercise should demonstrate (and provide evidence) that standards are being maintained and quality is being enhanced. Annual Review operates at the following levels through a hierarchical reporting structure:

- Module
- Course
- Department
- Faculty
- Institutional Level

A diagram showing the governance of the Annual and Periodic Review process is available [here](#). Annual Review provides opportunities for enhancement and for action and intervention at the relevant level of activity. Oversight of the outcomes of regular monitoring and review activity, through the higher level reports considered at both faculty and University level, is also key to the effectiveness of the process. Annual Review applies to all courses where current students are still enrolled on a course, whether the course is actively recruiting or is subject to phasing out arrangements. Annual Review also applies to all the University's award-bearing courses that are delivered in collaboration with an approved partner organisation.

2 AIMS AND PURPOSE OF ANNUAL REVIEW

2.1 Specifically, the aims and purpose of Annual Review are:

- To monitor, review and evaluate the ongoing quality, academic standards and effectiveness of courses, including their assessment and delivery, in relation to the achievement of the stated aims and learning outcomes
- Facilitate critical reflection and evaluation on all aspects of the delivery of the curriculum (including assessment issues)
- Monitor and review current methods of support for student learning, leading to continual systematic enhancement in the overall quality of provision and the student experience
- Through a review of statistical data and other quality metrics, to monitor, review and evaluate the extent to which course learning outcomes are being attained by students
- To identify appropriate actions for enhancement and development and

where issues of concern are raised or where a course is failing or where a collaborative partnership is experiencing difficulties

- Enable course leaders to take responsibility for actions or enhancements highlighted by student feedback or management information through the development of action plans which are implemented and monitored throughout the academic year
- Identify areas for improvement and highlight examples of good practice
- Enable engagement at departmental and faculty level with ongoing review and enhancement activity and to provide oversight of the management of quality and standards within departments
- Enable departments and faculties to ensure that recommendations and actions for improvements and appropriate enhancements are followed up
- Provide an opportunity to gather information systematically, through Annual Review, about specific enhancement themes that are strategically important for the University
- Provide an overview, at institutional level, of ongoing quality management and enhancement activity and to ensure alignment with strategic priorities and relevant enhancement and developmental themes

2.2 Faculties are required to undertake annual review and evaluation activity in line with the standard University processes, as set out in this section of the Quality Framework.

2.3 By its nature, the Annual Review process is informed by a continual cycle of review and enhancement, culminating in an Annual Review report and action plan for each course and each module. All action plans resulting from annual review processes should be regarded as 'live' documents and departments and faculties are responsible for ensuring they are monitored and updated on a regular basis throughout the year. The annual cycle of review also underpins the longer term six-yearly cycle of departmental Periodic Review. Information and action plans generated by previous years' annual review activity are a key source of evidence to demonstrate how academic departments manage the quality and standards of their provision. Annual review reports and actions plans at course level and departmental Overview Reports and Action Plans will be scrutinised as part of the evidence base that informs the departmental Periodic Review process.

3 OVERVIEW OF PROCESS

3.1 Course and Module Level - Review, Reports and Action Plans

The purpose of Annual Review is to provide the opportunity for course and module leaders to reflect on delivery, students' achievements and the quality of their learning experience over the past year (or most recent delivery, in the case of individual modules). To support the evaluation and review process, an annual Course Improvement Plan (CIP) or Module Review is produced to capture and highlight issues and enhancement opportunities and to identify relevant actions. The Annual Review reports are also used to inform faculty and University priorities, to align with University strategy and key performance indicators and to provide oversight at department, faculty and institutional level.

3.2 Annual Review should focus on the evaluation and enhancement of course

and/or module performance based on the review and analysis of a defined qualitative and quantitative data set and other relevant information including external examiner reporting and student feedback. The Annual Review process is used to inform course leaders, academic teams and senior managers about the academic 'health' of all courses, including those delivered in collaboration with partners. Through the review process, actions for improvement and enhancement are identified and completed with the aim of improving student satisfaction and success.

3.3 A standard Course Improvement Plan (CIP) or Module Review report is created annually for all credit-bearing provision. Course and Module Annual Reviews are produced and submitted using a standard template and are stored and accessed via the Quality Framework Sharepoint site. Reviews from previous years are available for reference. Action plans are included in both Course and Module Annual Reviews.

3.4 Information and evidence used to prepare Departmental, Course and Module Annual Review reports is drawn from a range of sources and is produced and made available at different times throughout the year. The full range of statistical information to inform the Review process, based on the previous year's course and module performance, is normally available in November each year. Strategic Planning and Intelligence produce a series of corporate reports that support the Annual Review process at Course, Module and Department level. The reports (Student Lifecycle Reports and Module Reports) are currently from the corporate reporting portal, [The Source](#).

3.5 Other information to support annual review includes External Examiners annual reports (normally available by the end of June each year) and the outcomes of module evaluation and other forms of student feedback. Although annual review relies primarily on a retrospective review of performance, and annual reports are completed at fixed points during the year, course and module teams remain responsible for proactively monitoring and enhancing the curriculum and the student experience during each delivery period and throughout the year, to facilitate ongoing, continuous improvement.

3.6 Annual Review of Collaborative Partnerships and Provision

The University is responsible for ensuring consistent quality and standards for all its awards, whether delivered wholly by, and at, the University or in collaboration with approved partners at other delivery locations in the UK or overseas. Collaborative partners, in liaison with designated University Collaborative Course Leaders, are responsible for conducting an annual review of collaborative provision in line with the same principles that apply to onsite provision. The requirement for all collaborative partners (including FE College partners, NHS and School-based partners) to produce and submit an annual report to the University is articulated in the formal agreement between the University and each partner organisation. To avoid unnecessary duplication, the University may agree to accept annual reports and/or action plans that arise from the partners own internal review system, as a replacement for the University's standard course review. However, such arrangements would be subject to prior agreement with the Head of Academic Quality and Standards.

3.7 In engaging with the University's annual review process, it is expected that collaborative partners will:

- review and reflect on the overall academic health of the partnership and consider opportunities for development and enhancement
- review, develop and enhance provision at course level with the ongoing support of the University using the same (or similar¹) range of indicators and evidence as those used for onsite provision
- submit an annual report for each course, known as a Collaborative Course Improvement Plan (CCIP), to the University in accordance with agreed timescales for Collaborative Annual Review

3.8 At departmental level, it is expected that Collaborative Course Leaders will liaise with heads of department and quality leads to ensure that any overarching issues concerning the department's collaborative partnerships and provision, as identified through the annual review process and captured in CCIPs, are adequately addressed and reflected in the Departmental Overview Report.

3.9 At institutional level, a separate, overarching annual report on the University's collaborative partners and associated provision is produced by Academic Quality and Standards to feed into the University's Annual Quality Review. A collaborative Overview Report is submitted at an Annual Review meeting each year, for consideration as part of the University Teaching Quality Committee's oversight of the overall annual review process.

3.10 Department and Faculty Level - Review, Reports and Action Plans

Annual review reports and action plans for courses, modules and collaborative partners/provision are produced and submitted annually. The reports are used, in conjunction with other statistical information contained in University performance reports (published by Strategic Planning and Intelligence), to inform the production of an annual Departmental Overview Report and Action Plan. The Departmental Overview Report is based on a review and analysis of the evidence produced from the earlier stages of the annual review process. The Overview Reports are authored by the Head of Department in liaison with the relevant departmental quality lead.

3.11 Each department will have the opportunity to discuss progress on preparations for Annual Review at an autumn meeting of the Departmental Board (usually held during October or November). Taking a 'continuous improvement' approach, departments may wish to link the quality-related Annual Review process more closely with the University's annual planning cycle and the annual 'refresh' of Faculty Plans (including the updating of portfolio development plans).

3.12 Departmental Overview Reports and Action Plans are completed according to a standard University report template and are submitted to Academic Quality and Standards in December each year. The department's collaborative partnerships and provision should also be considered as part of the departmental level annual review process.

3.13 Institutional Level - Officer Overview Reports

In addition to the annual review reports produced at faculty level (module, course

and departmental), a range of overarching annual 'Overview Reports' are produced by officers from specific central directorates to address cross-University quality and standards issues. An annual 'Student Voice' report is also produced by the Students' Union. The annual Overview Reports are based on delivery and oversight of University-wide processes, including validation and external examining, and the subsequent analysis of information, reports and other data generated from each specific area of activity. The range of Officer Overview Reports that produced annually on a range of quality-related areas includes:

- Validation and Periodic Review Outcomes
- Overview of Collaborative Partnerships and Provision
- External Examining
- Annual Report on Research Degrees Activity
- Overview of PSRB Activity
- LTA Enhancement Activity Report
- Students' Union Annual Student Voice Report

3.14 Institutional Level - Scrutiny of the Outcomes of Annual Review

All departments' Action Plans arising from the annual review process are considered by the University Teaching Quality Committee (UTQC), usually at its meeting held in April, each year. The range of annual Overview Reports produced by officers from central directorates (see above) also provides UTQC with further information and analysis on specific areas of cross-University activity including collaborative partnerships and research degrees provision.

- 3.15 As a result of its scrutiny of the overall outcomes of Annual Review, UTQC will agree and allocate appropriate actions, as required, to address any institutional level issues that have been identified through the review process. The submission and scrutiny of annual reports enables the Committee to exercise an appropriate level of oversight on behalf of the Board of Governors. A full report of the outcomes of Annual Quality Review activity and an accompanying Annual Action Plan is produced and submitted to the Academic Assurance Committee prior to submission to the Board of Governors at the end of the year. The Annual Quality Review and Action is received by the Board of Governors to satisfy the requirements of the HEFCE Annual Provider Review (APR) process and enables the Board to sign-off annual assurance statements to HEFCE, as part of the APR.

4 TIMING OF ANNUAL REVIEW

- 4.1 Annual monitoring and review activity is a continual process. Monitoring and review of individual courses and modules is ongoing throughout the year, dependent on specific delivery patterns. However, formal reporting is scheduled for specific times of the academic year to allow reports and actions plans to be produced and published and to enable institutional oversight of the process. The timing of annual review activity, particularly at course and departmental level, should allow sufficient time for consideration of the outcomes of review at the subsequent, aggregated stages of the process. This is constrained by the set timetable for the University's governance structures, including meetings of the Board of Governors.

- 4.2 For most courses delivered according to the standard academic calendar, an Annual Review, based on the previous year's delivery, should be completed by the end of October each year (with a 'census' point of mid-September for production of an initial draft of the Course Improvement Plan). Module Reviews should be produced once a year by the relevant Module Leader, usually after the main delivery of the module each year. Reviews should take into account quality measures and indicators of performance in relation to each delivery of the module that occurs during the year under review. An Annual Departmental Overview Report is produced by each academic department in December each year.
- 4.3 Where the same course is delivered in multiple locations, both onsite at the University and at collaborative partner locations, Annual Review must take account of the associated provision being delivered elsewhere. All collaborative provision is subject to a separate Annual Review exercise, undertaken at course level in liaison with the relevant partner and the University Collaborative Course Leader. Depending on the schedule for the collaborative delivery of the course, the precise timing of the annual review process may vary slightly from standard University deadlines for 'host' or 'home' courses. Regardless of timing issues, the annual Review exercise and associated collaborative Annual Review exercise should ensure appropriate cross-referencing between the 'host' provision at the University and the collaborative delivery of the same course, as appropriate. This is particularly important where modifications or other enhancements are proposed to a University-based 'host' course as there may be implications for the collaborative delivery of the same course.
- 4.4 Standard timings and responsibilities for Annual Review are as set out below:

Timing	Action	Responsible
Throughout year	Annual Module Reviews produced following main delivery of the module (annual review may be completed immediately following delivery of the module, depending on whether delivery is completed at the end of semester 1 or 2 or where delivery is year long)	Module Leader
June to end of Oct	Production of annual Course Improvement Plans (CIPs) based on review of previous year's performance (NB: annual review of a course may begin once course delivery is complete but some statistical information / other evidence of key performance indicators will not be available until after Assessment Boards and resit Boards are completed) Production of Collaborative Course Improvement Plans (CCIPs) (timings may vary according to delivery schedules at partner locations) - see Quality Manual, section on Collaborative Provision for further details.	Course Leader in liaison with Course Teams Collaborative partner staff in liaison with Collaborative

Timing	Action	Responsible
Sept - Nov	Departments consider progress on annual review at course and module level; agree approach to production of departmental Overview Report arising from discussion at departmental board meetings	Head of Department, Dept QLS and Department Board
Oct to Dec	Production of Departmental Overview Reports and Action Plans	Head of Department in liaison with dept quality leads
Jan to March	Departmental Overview Reports and Action Plans considered at Departmental Board meetings Central Overview Reports produced by specific central directorates/service areas including AQS, Registry Services, etc	Heads of Department and Dept Boards Officers from relevant directorates
April / May	Annual Review Meeting held (University Teaching Quality Committee chaired by PVC SE)	UTQC
Ongoing throughout the year	Range of evidence and feedback to inform annual review at Dept, Course, Module level generated via the relevant processes (including student feedback, statistical reports and EE reports)	Course and Module Leaders and HoDs in liaison with relevant dept quality leads

4.5 Faculties and departments should ensure that their own timescales for the production, approval and analysis of Course Improvement Plans and Module Reviews align with University deadlines detailed above. The timescales agreed locally should allow for any informal meetings between Course and Module Teams, and for discussions with external examiners, to take place to ensure a thorough and detailed annual review process. The timelines indicated above may need to be adjusted in instances where a course (or module) does not conform to the standard academic calendar, for example in relation to some collaborative courses or where there may be additional intakes for onsite provision.

5 MODULE REVIEW - COMPLETING REPORTS AND ACTION PLANS

5.1 Module Review should take place in the context of the course or course grouping to which an individual module contributes. Although module review provides an opportunity to critically reflect on performance at an individual module level they also provide a key evidence source to inform the next level of the process, course level review (resulting in Course Improvement Plans). The Module Leader is responsible for ensuring that all members of the module teaching team have an opportunity to feed into the annual review process either through informal meetings and discussions or by directly contributing to the writing of the Module Review. Key sources of information that can be used to

inform module review are:

- Statistical reports on student progression and achievement available from The Source (corporate reporting portal) and include module first time pass rates and module marks range
- Students' feedback via the module evaluation process and other sources of student feedback
- Feedback and comments from external examiners and teaching staff

5.2 The Module Review report is intended to be short and concise and primarily focused on:

- student performance
- outcomes of assessment and moderation processes
- areas of good practice
- identification of any modifications or other actions that are recommended prior to the next delivery (where recommended actions would have an impact at course level, discussion with the relevant course leader is required - any actions affecting course level should be taken forward via the relevant Course Improvement Plan)

6 COURSE IMPROVEMENT PLANS (CIPs)

6.1 Course Improvement Plans (CIPs) are produced by the Course Leader in liaison with the Course Team. CIPs are produced in September/October each year after the Team has had an opportunity to meet and discuss the previous year's delivery and performance. Local arrangements may vary as to how course teams and other academic staff engage with the review process, but discussions should focus on the current performance of courses in the context of the following:

- University strategy and key performance indicators for UG/PG courses
- Learning, teaching and assessment matters
- Trend data from statistical data and management information reports, including student progression and achievement data and DLHE results
- Student feedback, including NSS/PTES results, staff/student meetings and module evaluation
- External feedback, including external examiner reports and comments
- Quality of the student experience
- Resources and sustainability issues
- External drivers including any national developments in a specific subject area or discipline and market research
- University and faculty priorities, including consideration of strategic enhancement themes

6.2 Course Improvement Plans are also stored on the Quality Framework Sharepoint Site for reference and to assist with checking progress on actions from the previous year's Review. A range of course-related data and other qualitative information to inform the annual review process is made available at a number of

points throughout the year. Specific data and information that Course Leaders and Teams are expected to review and consider throughout the year include:

- Statistical information and reports, including student progression and achievement data, NSS/PTES and DLHE Survey results etc. Corporate reports are published via the University's corporate reporting portal, The Source. A complete course data set, based on the previous year's course performance, is available from [The Source](#) in November each year
- External Examiner Reports
- Module Reviews
- Module Evaluations
- Student Feedback other than NSS/PTES
- Reports and Feedback from relevant professional/statutory and/or regulatory bodies (as applicable to accredited courses)

- 6.3 Following the Course Team's discussions and review of evidence, the Course Improvement Plan provides the opportunity to capture progress against a range of institutionally-defined performance indicators, reflect on external feedback and identify appropriate actions to address issues and/or to further enhance the curriculum. The annual CIPs can alert senior managers within the department and faculty of any cases where there is a need to intervene and take action, as appropriate, if a course is under-performing or failing. Course Improvement Plans, collectively, provide a key source of information to feed into the annual Departmental Overview Report.
- 6.4 Course Improvement Plans are produced and on the basis of an individual course. However, in some cases it may be more appropriate for the annual review to be conducted on the basis of a specific grouping of courses. Where course groupings are proposed for the purposes of annual review, local agreement should be sought from the relevant faculty Assistant Dean (Academic Development). Agreement should also be reached as to how the review process will be co-ordinated across the group of courses and who will take responsibility for collating the findings into a single Course Improvement Plan.
- 6.5 Proposals for modifications to courses may be identified as part of the annual review process and should be recorded in the CIP. Actions identified through annual review will be monitored within the Department. Any identified actions associated with feedback from the annual NSS or PTES surveys are also monitored and reported on at institutional level. CIPs should be monitored and updated regularly by the Course Leader throughout the year.
- 6.6 Where a course is offered in multiple locations both at the University and in collaboration with a University partner, annual review activity should take into account any associated provision delivered elsewhere in the UK or overseas. This is necessary to ensure that the review of the 'host' or 'home' course, and any actions identified in relation to a course delivered at the University, are complementary to the associated provision delivered under collaborative arrangements (e.g. franchised courses). Course performance should be compared across multiple delivery locations. Where modifications or other enhancements are proposed to the 'host' course delivered at the University, it is

necessary to consider the implications for the associated collaborative delivery to ensure that any changes that affect the collaborative delivery can be phased in as appropriate. Partners are responsible for ensuring that Collaborative Course Improvement Plans are monitored and updated in liaison with the relevant University Collaborative Course Leader regularly throughout the year.

6.7 All collaborative courses are subject to a separate collaborative annual review exercise undertaken in liaison between the partner academic staff (course leader and course team) and the relevant University Collaborative Course Leader. A Collaborative Course Improvement Plan (CCIP) is required for all collaborative courses, to be submitted to the University on an annual basis. As with course reviews for onsite provision where there is associated collaborative delivery, the collaborative annual review exercise should also take into account the implications of any actions or modifications proposed for the 'host' course delivered at the University. Any issues should be addressed through liaison between the partner organisation's staff and the University Collaborative Course Leader. Incremental changes to courses, over time, either at the University or in collaborative delivery locations, should not result in different versions of the same course. For cross-faculty partnerships, where the relationship between 'host/home' and collaborative provision can be complex, advice on proposed modifications should be sought from Academic Quality and Standards.

6.8 Professional, Statutory and/or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs): Accredited Courses and Annual Review

Where a course is accredited by a Professional, Statutory and/or Regulatory Body (PSRB) the Course Leader is responsible for meeting the established routine, annual monitoring reports, statutory returns and any other periodic reporting requirements of the specific PSRB. In some cases there may be a specific requirement to produce an annual review report using a PSRB's specified format. However, a Course Improvement Plan should still be produced using the standard University template, to ensure actions can be monitored at departmental and institutional level. The PSRB annual review may be attached to the CIP and stored together on the Quality Framework Sharepoint Site. Additional reporting, to meet specific PSRB requirements and reporting schedules (e.g. Ofsted) may be completed at the discretion of the relevant department/faculty but will not be incorporated into the University's Annual Review process.

6.9 Where an annual PSRB report raises an issue and related action concerning academic standards, this would need to be included in the Course Improvement Plan and reported on at department level. Where an issue is raised through the annual review process that relates to practice and/or learning in the professional environment, this must be fully discussed with the PSRB (as applicable) and explicitly reported on at departmental level. If it has been agreed that a PSRB report can be used to replace the University's standard report, the PSRB report must be available for inclusion in the evidence base used to produce the Departmental Overview Report. Departments and faculties will wish to maintain oversight and monitor the outcomes of PSRB reviews and any resulting feedback. At institutional level, all PSRB approval, monitoring and review activity is routinely reported to the University Teaching Quality Committee, throughout the year. In addition, an annual Overview Report on PSRB activity

and the accreditation status of University courses is presented to UTQC as part of its oversight of annual review activity.

7 DEPARTMENT OVERVIEW REPORTS AND ACTION PLANS

- 7.1 Following completion of the course and module level stages of the annual review process (for onsite and collaborative provision) each department will produce a Department Overview Report. The departmental stage of review usually takes place between November and January each year. This stage of annual review is intended to operate in parallel with, and may be used to inform, faculty annual planning and portfolio development, as defined by the University's planning process. In addition, the University Strategy informs faculties' business planning process and a set of University performance indicators and targets are defined at faculty and departmental level which are relevant to annual quality review activity.
- 7.2 Authorship of the annual Department Overview Report is the responsibility of the relevant head of department, in liaison with the departmental quality lead and in consultation with the faculty Assistant Dean (Academic Development). Progress on the early stages of the annual review process, and plans for production of the department's Overview Report, should be discussed at Department Boards during the autumn. Presentation and discussion of the completed Overview Reports, subject to agreement of a final version of the Report, should take place at the Department Boards held in February and March each year.
- 7.3 Department Overview Reports are based primarily on the aggregation of information provided from the course level stage of the annual review process, including reviews of collaborative provision. Department Overview Reports are expected to identify courses and/or modules where student satisfaction and/or student success is particularly high or particularly low. Department Overview Reports may identify specific actions required at departmental level to address any concerns raised regarding the academic health of specific courses. Department Overview Reports also highlight areas of good practice that may be shared across the wider department, the faculty and the University. Departments are also expected to consider, engage with and report on specific University strategic enhancement themes, as agreed annually.
- 7.4 In producing the annual Departmental Overview Report, heads of department and departmental quality leads are expected to review and consider evidence provided by:
- Course Review Monitoring and Action Plans of onsite provision
 - Annual Reviews of Collaborative Partnerships and Provision
 - NSS/PTES survey results
 - Departmental Performance Reviews and Course Performance Profiles (produced annually by Strategic Planning and Intelligence to inform departments' business planning. The Reviews include a set of corporate KPIs linked to the University strategy)
 - External Examiner Summary Reports

8 GOVERNANCE OF THE ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

8.1 Department Boards

Departmental Overview Reports are presented and considered annually at the relevant department board in early spring, usually during February/March each year, for discussion and to allow the board to agree and finalise the department's Overview Report and Action Plan. The chair of each department board will lead discussions on the outcomes of the annual review process. Each board should review the level of the department's engagement with the annual review process and ensure that all the required reports and action plans (at course and module level) have been completed and submitted according to the agreed schedule. All course and module reports and associated action plans should be available on the Quality Framework Sharepoint Site for reference by members of the board. The board will review progress on the previous year's departmental Action Plan and should discuss whether any outstanding actions are to be carried forward into the current year's Action Plan. Actions identified through the annual review process should be updated regularly within the Department and progress should be monitored by the departmental board throughout the annual cycle. Any recommended actions for enhancement and development that a departmental board considers to be a matter for faculty and/or institutional level consideration will also be reported to the faculty leadership team/ appropriate faculty board, via the minutes of the department board.

8.3 University Annual Quality Review and Action Plan

Consideration of the outputs of the annual review process occurs at departmental, faculty and institutional level. Annual review activity culminates in oversight of the overall process through the University's governance structure. The University Teaching Quality Committee (UTQC) oversees the annual review cycle, on behalf of the University's Academic Assurance Committee (AAC) and reports the outcomes of annual review to both the Academic Assurance Committee (AAC) and the Board of Governors through the submission of the University Annual Quality Review Report and Action Plan. A diagram illustrating governance of the Annual and Periodic Review cycle is available [here](#).

9 ANNUAL REVIEW AND PERIODIC REVIEW

9.1 The annual review cycle underpins the six-yearly cycle of departmental Periodic Reviews. Information and action plans generated by previous years' annual review activity are a key source of evidence to demonstrate how academic departments manage the quality and standards of their provision. Effective annual monitoring and review activity provides significant source material for periodic reviews where the primary focus is maintaining and enhancing the student experience and the quality of courses. Annual review reporting forms a key part of the evidence base that is collated and scrutinised as part of the Periodic Review process.

Approved/updated	Version	Published by	Valid From
December 2015	1	AQS	December 2015
November 2017	2	AQS	November 2017
February 2018	3	AQS	February 2018

