

Programme Monitoring & Periodic Review

A practical approach to quality gates, programme evidence, ongoing monitoring and corrective action.

1. A programme quality file

Each programme and study pathway should have one record connecting public claims, curriculum documents, delivery roles, student protections and quality evidence. If a programme is a catalogue concept rather than an operating offer, the file identifies that status distinctly.

Evidence block	Minimum content
Identity and status	Programme name, level, field, version, public route and availability status.
Award and authority	Exact awarding body, type of award, jurisdiction, validated partner evidence and permitted wording.
Curriculum	Outcomes, modules, credits or workload, assessment approach and relevant prerequisites.
Delivery	Modality, provider, teaching support, LMS arrangements and student access requirements.
Student terms	Admission criteria, published fees, refund terms, support, complaints and appeals.
Review record	Reviewer role, evidence, improvement findings, action owners and next review.

2. Quality gate before delivery

- Confirm the issuing authority, award title and programme permission where a qualification is advertised.
- Confirm whether the current page is informational, enquiry-only, accepting applications, or operating.
- Validate curriculum against published learning outcomes and appropriate level expectations.
- Test student journey: enquiries, identity handling, secure data, LMS access and escalation.
- Confirm assessment integrity, fair marking, academic support and records retention.
- Publish only verified programme-specific claims and working links.

3. Term-level and annual monitoring

Timing	Review activity	Recorded output
Before publication	Content and recognition-claim check	Page sign-off record
Before intake or delivery	Readiness and learner protection check	Authority / delivery gate
Each teaching period	Assessment moderation, learner pulse, digital accessibility, complaints	Issue and response log
Year-end	Trend analysis, student feedback, teaching quality, graduate outcomes if available	Annual programme review
When serious issue occurs	Risk triage, student protection and corrective action	Escalation and closure evidence

4. Annual review questions

- Did the advertised programme specification match the delivered learning experience?
- Were learning outcomes and assessments suitably mapped and documented?
- Were students supported fairly and effectively, including accessibility?
- Did data reveal unusual withdrawals, failed assessments or unresolved service issues?
- Were partner dependencies and academic decisions managed according to executed agreements?
- What improvements were completed and how was effectiveness checked?

5. Corrective action records

Every finding should include a unique case ID, description, impact severity, responsible function, action, due date, evidence of implementation, result of verification and close date. High-risk issues involving qualification claims, data exposure or student safeguarding require immediate escalation.

Publish only real results

An annual report should be published only after the relevant operating period and underlying evidence exist. Empty reporting periods are described transparently; historical statistics from other institutions must never be used.