



Hartpury Quality Enhancement Framework

Continuous Monitoring for Enhancement (CME)

This section of the Hartpury Quality Enhancement Framework (HQEF) provides an overview of the continuous monitoring for enhancement processes for all credit bearing modules and programmes leading to a Hartpury University Award.

1. [Key principles](#)
2. [Impact and Effectiveness](#)
3. [Institutional Oversight for Monitoring and Enhancement](#)
4. [External Reference Points](#)
5. [Periodic Strategic Review](#)
6. [Modules and Programmes](#)
7. [Programmes with External Partners](#)
8. [External Expertise](#)
9. [Appendix One: Mapping of HQEF to Sector Reference Points](#)

External Sector Alignment

[Appendix One](#) provides a detailed mapping of how the HQEF Continuous Monitoring for Enhancement reflects a holistic, evidence-based, and risk-informed approach to quality assurance and enhancement. It demonstrates alignment with:

- OfS ongoing registration requirements relating to student outcomes, academic experience, and standards (B1–B5)
- QAA Quality Code Core Practices concerning monitoring, assessment, student engagement, and governance.
- The Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) 2015, with alignment to Standard 1.9 (ongoing monitoring and periodic review)

Key Principles

- Principle 1: Continuous insight combined with strategic reflection**
Monitoring operates through regular 'in-year' review points with data and intelligence-led interventions. Annual strategic reflection focuses on what enabled success and what can be scaled institution wide.
- Principle 2: Early intervention**
Emerging issues are identified and addressed through a wide range of qualitative and quantitative data at programme and module level, supporting targeted intervention and enhancement.
- Principle 3: Evidence-informed enhancement**
Decisions are based on integrated academic, student experience, engagement, and outcomes data.

Impact and Effectiveness

The Continuous Monitoring for Enhancement (CME) framework is designed not only to assure academic quality and standards, but to deliver measurable and sustained improvement in student outcomes and the overall student experience. Its effectiveness is evaluated through a structured cycle of identifying areas for improvement implementing targeted actions, monitoring progress, and assessing impact over time.

Evidence of impact is demonstrated through improvements in key performance indicators such as student continuation, completion, attainment, satisfaction, and progression alongside qualitative feedback from students, staff, and external stakeholders. Integrated action planning at module, programme, and department level is actively monitored through in-year review points, with progress and effectiveness evaluated against agreed outcomes and timelines. Where actions are not achieving the intended impact, further intervention or adjustment is required.

The approach is subject to ongoing review, ensuring that it remains proportionate, effective, and aligned with regulatory expectations and institutional priorities. Through this iterative and evidence-informed process, the framework ensures that monitoring activity leads to meaningful enhancement and continuous improvement in the quality of academic provision.

Institutional Oversight of Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement

The framework supports the systematic identification and dissemination of good practice across the institution, enabling successful approaches to be scaled and embedded more widely.

Institutional oversight, through the Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee, ensures that emerging themes, risks, and areas of success are identified and addressed at a

strategic level, informing the **Annual Quality Report to Academic Board**.

Periodic Strategic Review

The periodic strategic review of programmes within a defined schedule of activity provides departments and schools with the opportunity to ensure their portfolio of programmes continue to be strategically and academically fit for purpose. The process is based on the following principles:

- A thorough review of each department portfolio ensuring that there is strategic alignment with Institutional priorities.
- The purpose and aims of the programmes remain relevant and aligned with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and the Hartpur Academic Framework (HAF).
- The content and learning outcomes remain appropriate and to consider the cumulative effect of changes made over time.
- Programme structures and content continue to be aligned with university regulations and where exceptions are required, there is a clear rationale and implementation plan.
- Where relevant, programmes continue to meet the requirements of Professional Accrediting Bodies (PABs).
- All publicly available programme information remains up-to-date and accurate, in line with our responsibilities under Consumer Protection Law.

Curriculum Development Recommendations

A key part of PSR discussions will include curriculum development recommendations identified by the Review Panel or through the standard Curriculum Monitoring for Enhancement processes at Hartpur. These recommendations often lead to subsequent curriculum modification activity supported by the Curriculum Scrutiny Panel and approved through the Curriculum Validation Committee.

Institutional oversight of Periodic Strategic Review

The Higher Education Executive receives notification in the year prior to scheduled review. This allows for the early identification of key industry figures and organisations that should be involved in the review and how the initial student consultation will be conducted.

The Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee will receive school periodic strategic reports and action plans. Through the review and enhancement process, action plans are updated showing how impact has been assessed within specified timelines.

Modules and Programmes

Monitoring and enhancement happen at module, programme, department and school levels and provide the opportunity to pause and reflect on our education provision—what is working well and what changes need to be put in place? Analysis and action planning is based around a portfolio of evidence related to baseline regulatory requirements/benchmarks in addition to key institutional enhancement activities. The approach is based on the following principles:

Evidence-informed approach

The process uses a range of data that underpins each area of focus, allowing for both a local and strategic approach to review and enhancement. Data is reviewed as it becomes available, providing the opportunity to make recommendations and actions at a point when it will have the most impact.

Proportionate

The process takes account of the differences in size and shape of each department - it is not a 'one-size-fits-all' approach. It is important that all departments reflect on all data, but **action plans and intervention meetings** will only be required where the data identifies the outcomes are borderline or below benchmark or Institutional KPI.

Timely

The process is designed to enable discussions at the time the data becomes available. This avoids any duplication of effort, and the outcomes of the discussions can be implemented 'in-year' without having to wait until the end of the academic cycle.

Connected

Established Institutional reporting mechanisms are integrated into the monitoring and review process avoiding repetition and allowing for a strategic focus. This provides a consistent institution-wide approach to action-planning and monitoring, which is captured through department/school action plan or log.

Areas of focus under review

The areas of focus are reviewed each year by the Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee and Academic Board to ensure they remain fit for purpose and there are clear links to external regulatory requirements and institutional enhancement activity/benchmarks.

Action Planning

We take a collaborative approach when developing action plans allowing for a shared responsibility for all actions. It is designed to be a live, working document with the focus on developing a limited number of SMART actions that each programme/department/school can confidently conduct. It should focus on how any intervention strategies have been implemented and how impact has been assessed within specified timelines.

Institutional oversight of modules and programmes

At each meeting of the Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee an overview of discussions with departments will be presented on a specific area of focus including assurance that where programmes have been identified as 'at risk' for falling below benchmark or Institutional KPI, action plans specifically address areas for improvement along with timescales for evaluation.

Programmes with External Partners

We continue to work with a wide range of partners in the UK and overseas. These collaborations allow our students to gain valuable experience in a work environment or study.

We take a risk-based approach to managing our partnership arrangements as outlined in the HQEF Academic Partnerships. A key consideration when reviewing partnership activity is whether collaboration with a partner poses a risk to the University's academic standards and student experience, and by implication the reputation of the University. The need to protect these is of paramount importance and must be the primary consideration in the evaluation of the benefits of any form of collaboration.

Programmes leading to Hartpury University Award

All taught education partnerships have a Moderator and Link Tutor appointed by the Academic Partnerships Committee. The Moderator will normally be a senior academic from a different department with tenure for the lifetime of the agreement.

The Moderator (supported by the Link Tutor) makes an **annual visit** to the partner organisation and provides an annual report for review by the appropriate departmental Committee before submission to the **Academic Partnerships Committee**. Through the report, each Moderator will provide an analysis of:

- the quality of programmes and standards achieved by students at the partner institution is commensurate with those within the University.
- effectiveness of communications, management and operational arrangements that underpin the provision.
- any additional support needed for the partner institution in implementing and maintaining Hartpury University's quality assurance and enhancement requirements.

Any actions agreed by the department in response to a Moderator's report **must be integrated into the Review and Enhancement action plan** in line with those provided by External Examiners or Professional Accrediting Bodies.

Details of all formal partnerships are published on our Academic Partnership webpages.

Institutional oversight of programmes with external partners

The Academic Partnership Committee (APC) has institutional oversight of low and medium risk partnership arrangements (including study abroad and articulation arrangements). This includes scrutiny and, where appropriate, approval of agreements for new and/or existing provision with partners.

For high-risk partnerships, Institutional oversight for monitoring and review is provided by the Academic Partnership Development Group (APDG) as outlined in the HQEF Academic Partnerships.

The Academic Partnership Committee ensures there is cyclical review of all partnership provision and associate governance arrangements outlined in the Academic Regulations and HQEF Academic Partnerships. The Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee receive regular reports from the Academic Partnership Committee formally reporting to Academic Board via the Annual Quality Report.

External Expertise

External expertise plays a fundamental role in maintaining academic quality and standards by providing independent, sector-aligned benchmarks against which institutional provision is evaluated. They ensure that academic standards remain comparable with those across the UK higher education sector, while offering objective scrutiny that validates internal processes and decisions. As a result, external reference points are integral to continuous monitoring and enhancement, supporting both assurance and the ongoing development of high-quality academic provision.

External Examiners

External examiners are appointed as experts in their field, drawn from higher education, industry, or professional bodies and provide valuable independent oversight and advice. Their comments are a vital component of the review and enhancement process, providing independent, expert assurance of academic standards and the quality of assessment practices.

Their insights offer an objective evaluation of whether standards are being maintained appropriately and consistently, while also identifying good practice and areas for improvement. By informing action planning and contributing to evidence-informed decision-making, external examiner reports play a key role in strengthening academic rigour, enhancing the student experience, and supporting the continuous improvement of programmes.

Specific duties of external examiners, as well as expectations for engagement and support are set out in the HQEF External Examining.

Professional Accrediting Bodies (PABs)

Professional accrediting body comments are a crucial element of the review and enhancement process, providing authoritative external validation that programmes meet sector-specific standards and professional expectations. Their feedback ensures that curricula remain current, relevant, and aligned with industry requirements, while also identifying areas for development in content, delivery, and student outcomes. By informing action planning and supporting continuous improvement, professional body input strengthens the academic and professional credibility of programmes, enhances graduate readiness, and ensures ongoing alignment with regulatory and accreditation requirements.

All programmes that receive accreditation through a professional accrediting body have a clear schedule for review that is managed within each department and reported to the **Academic Partnership Committee annually**.

The HQEF Professional Accrediting Bodies sets out the specific arrangements engagement with bodies that endorse and accredit curriculum.

Institutional oversight of external expertise

External Examiners

The Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee (ASEC) oversees External Examiner activity, endorses annual reports prior to publication, monitors resulting actions, and provides a thematic analysis to Academic Board through the Annual Quality Report.

Each Head of Department has responsibility for considering External Examiner annual reports and producing the institution's responses. They ensure specific actions are integrated with the wider programme monitoring and enhancement action plans with updates reported to the Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee.

Professional Accrediting Bodies

The Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee has an overview of Professional Accrediting Body activity and receives notification of the outcome of each engagement. It is responsible for monitoring any action plans and highlights good practice or issues requiring enhancement. The Academic Partnership Committee is responsible for ensuring PAB specific actions are integrated with the wider programme monitoring and enhancement action plans with updates reported to each meeting.

Appendix One: Mapping of HQEF CME to Sector Reference Points

HQEF CME Element	OfS Conditions	QAA Quality Code	ESG 2015
Integrated monitoring processes	B1, B3, B5	Core Practices 1,2,3	ESG 1.2, 1.9
In-year monitoring & data-led interventions	B3, B4	Core Practices 3,5	ESG 1.7, 1.9
Annual strategic reflection	B1, B3	Core Practices 1,2	ESG 1.1, 1.9
Early intervention	B2, B3	Core Practices 2,5	ESG 1.6, 1.9
Evidence-informed enhancement	B3, B4	Core Practices 3,5	ESG 1.7
Institutional oversight	B1, B5, C1	Core Practice 7	ESG 1.1
Annual Quality Report	B3, B5	Core Practice 7	ESG 1.9, 1.10
Multi-level monitoring	B1, B3	Core Practices 1,2,3	ESG 1.2, 1.9
Evidence-informed approach	B3, B4	Core Practices 3,5	ESG 1.7
Proportionate monitoring	B3	Core Practice 2	ESG 1.9
Timely review	B3	Core Practice 3	ESG 1.9
Connected processes	B1, B5	Core Practice 7	ESG 1.1
Action planning	B3	Core Practices 3,5	ESG 1.9
Periodic Strategic Review	B1, B5	Core Practices 2,6	ESG 1.2, 1.10
Benchmarks & PAB alignment	B5	Core Practices 1,2	ESG 1.2
Consumer protection	C1, C2	Core Practice 6	ESG 1.8
Partnership oversight	B1, B5, E10	Core Practice 7	ESG 1.10
External examining	B5	Core Practice 4	ESG 1.3, 1.9
PAB accreditation	B5	Core Practices 1,2	ESG 1.2, 1.10
External reports review	B5	Core Practice 7	ESG 1.9
Student engagement	B1	Core Practice 5	ESG 1.3
External reference points	B5	Core Practice 1	ESG 1.2