Higher Education Services
Annual Monitoring
Review Process

July 2025

DOCUMENT INFORMATION AND VERSION CONTROL

Name of policy/procedure:	Higher Education Services Annual Monitoring Review
Document owner:	Academic Registrar
Date of creation:	28th July 2025
Equality Impact Assessment date and reference	28th July 2025
Date of last review:	28th July 2025
Reviewed by:	Prof. Dr Alison Watson
Date of next review:	28th July 2028
Related documents:	Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee Terms of Reference

Version	Author	Date	Brief summary of changes
1	A. Watson	28/07/25	Original version

Contents

Higher Education Services Annual Monitoring Review Process

1.0 Introduction

1.1 FutureLearn's annual monitoring review process is shaped by the sector recognised standards set by the Office for Students, along with the general conditions of registration. It also aligns with the expectations outlined in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. These key national benchmarks guide all higher education providers in England, to define how academic standards are set and upheld, and how high-quality learning experiences are ensured.

1.2 This process forms part of FutureLearn's broader quality and standards framework, which encompasses a range of policies, regulations, procedures, and processes aimed at protecting academic integrity and promoting excellence in teaching and learning. As such, this process should be considered alongside other relevant documents within the framework. This process applies to FutureLearn's validated provision only and does not include those under a contractual arrangement through Brunel, University of London or the University of Roehampton.

- [Higher Education Services Academic Regulations & Regulatory Framework](#)
- Office for Students Regulatory Framework: [Securing student success: Regulatory framework for higher education in England](#)
- Quality Code for Higher Education: [UK Quality Code for Higher Education 2024](#)
- Framework for Higher Education: [The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies](#)
- Benchmark Statements: [Subject Benchmark Statements](#)

2.0 Purpose

2.1 Through annual reviews of programme outcomes and learner feedback, FutureLearn is able to:
- assess data to validate the integrity and rigour of the qualifications it delivers to students;
- examine the effectiveness of the educational experience provided to students;
- encourage open dialogue around the performance of individual modules and entire programmes;
- highlight and share successful practices across the provision;
- reinforce transparency and responsibility in academic delivery;
- detect potential challenges and foster a shared commitment to addressing them;
- make proactive, evidence-based improvements to course offerings;
- facilitate thoughtful planning at both the programme and partnership level.

3.0 Principles

3.1 The annual monitoring review process is designed to:
- enable continued enhancement in the overall quality of provision and the student experience;
- identify areas of good practice for dissemination and areas requiring improvement;
- identify and mitigate against risk;
- ensure open and honest discussion about programme performance among relevant stakeholders.

4.0 Quality Monitoring and Reporting

4.1 As part of the Higher Education Services ongoing quality assurance process, a suite of analytical reports is compiled to facilitate the annual monitoring review process. These documents, presented in a colour-coded dashboard format and including longitudinal analysis, evaluate performance against Office for Students benchmarks for key quality indicators. Each year, the Student Engagement, Quality and Programme Committee (SEQPC) formally endorses a timeline for the release of these reports. This

timeline is shared with the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee, and the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

4.2 Regardless of the type of partnerships with FutureLearn, the annual monitoring process is important and required for all programmes to enable changes through FutureLearn policies or influence changes through partner committees. Reporting is divided into two, programme insights and module insights.

4.3 Programme-level metrics include:

- total enrolments
- entry qualifications of new students
- withdrawal figures
- retention statistics
- proportions of high-class degrees and pass rates
- employment outcomes, including percentage of those in graduate-level roles and those engaged in work or further education
- student survey indicators such as overall satisfaction, teaching and learning quality, assessment, and feedback, and academic support
- data disaggregated by diversity attributes
- feedback from the Annual Rolling Action Plan (ARAP).

4.4 Module-level metrics include:

- proportion of submissions and non-submissions
- success rates (both overall and based on submission rates)
- distribution of grades within the A to C range
- all of the above, broken down by frequency of study, with further segmentation by student demographics such as gender, age group, ethnicity, and declared disabilities
- feedback from end-of-module evaluations
- feedback from module leader reports
- feedback from external examiners
- feedback from SEQPC minutes and actions.

5.0 Evaluation and Impact

5.1 The interpretation of trends is guided by the following evaluation framework:
- **Green:** Performance surpasses targets. This may require notes on best practices and proposals for sharing successful strategies.
- **Amber:** Sits on the minimum threshold. Target improvement initiatives are recommended.
- **Red:** Falls below the minimum threshold. This must be accompanied by a reflective explanation and a corrective action plan.

6.0 Annual Monitoring Review Meetings

6.1 The annual monitoring review meetings bring together academic teams, professional services, and management in a spirit of collegiality, fostering a vibrant academic environment where ideas are freely exchanged, perspectives are valued, and collaborative dialogue drives continuous improvement. This shared commitment to open discussion strengthens both individual and collective learning across the academic community.

6.2 Risk modules and programmes are examined, and actions are put in place to target areas of concern and recover underperformance.

6.3 Attendees include:

- Director of Academic Affairs
- Vice President Higher Education Services
- Head of Programmes
- Programme Leaders
- Academic Registrar
- Academic Quality Lead
- Student Services Team Leader
- Admissions Team Leader
- Exams and Assessments Team Leader

6.4 The outcomes of the annual monitoring review meeting are reported into the SEQPC and the Academic Standards and Quality Committee. This provides an assurance of completeness of the annual monitoring and review process. It also summarises the overall academic quality of learning opportunities.

7.0 Academic Standards and Quality Annual Enhancement Plan (ASQAEP)

7.1 The ASQAEP pinpoints and addresses significant matters that influence academic standards across the Higher Education Services division. It focuses on areas requiring strategic action, close oversight, and continuous review especially those that shape students' academic experiences and achievements. While its primary direction stems from insights gathered through the annual monitoring review meetings, the Quality Enhancement Plan also aligns with, and is influenced by, the following:

- FutureLearn's Learning, Teaching, and Assessment Strategy, particularly with regard to:
  - ensuring that frameworks, policies, and systems underpin effective teaching, learning, and assessment practices aligned with regulatory standards;
  - promoting student support, achievement, and retention, leading to successful academic completion and enhanced career prospects.
- elements of FutureLearn's Five-Year Strategic Plan that relate to academic delivery and student success;
- the enhancement cycle, which encompasses annual programme evaluations, rolling action plans, and scheduled periodic reviews;
- external evaluations conducted by professional bodies;
- emerging matters that substantially affect academic operations or outcomes.

7.2 ASQAEP employs a data-driven methodology, analysing key performance metrics and leveraging the academic leadership and subject knowledge of Programme Leaders to guide improvement efforts. It informs decision making and proposes targeted actions across various governance levels, drawing on the work of committees such as the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee, and the Student Engagement, Quality and Programme Committee, as well as partner boards and committees.

7.3 Intended as a dynamic and responsive framework, the ASQAEP evolves through ongoing revision and updates after each Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting. Its priorities and strategies are shaped by themes identified in the annual monitoring review process. At the conclusion of each academic year, a comprehensive review will assess the ASQAEP's impact in strengthening systems and processes, with a focus on improving student outcomes including the varied experiences of learners across programmes, modes of study, and student demographics.

8.0 Reporting Framework

8.1 A series of annual reports and supporting datasets are produced in alignment with FutureLearn's internal review mechanisms and the reporting needs of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

These reports provide oversight across key academic and operational areas and are scheduled throughout the academic year as follows:

Annual Report on Admissions and Academic Partnerships	March
Annual Report on Assessment Misconduct	March
Annual Report on Student Appeals and Complaints	March
Annual Awards Board Report: Awards and Withdrawals	June
Annual Report on Learning, Teaching and Assessment	June
Annual Report on Student Continuation, Completion and Progression	June
Annual Report on Student Engagement, Quality and Programme Standards	November
Annual Report on Annual Monitoring and Review	November
Annual Report on Graduate Outcomes	November

9.0 Monitoring

9.1 The policy will be kept under review and formally reviewed every three years by the Academic Registrar.