

# APPROVAL AND VALIDATION OF NEW PROGRAMMES

Section last updated:

July 2011

*Click on section number below for quick link or scroll down for full text.*

- 1. Aim**
- 2. Collaborative Partnerships**
  - 2.1 Partner Approval Processes for Collaborative Partners
- 3. Stage 1: Strategic Approval**
  - 3.1 Strategic Approval at Faculty Level
  - 3.2 Strategic Approval at University Level
- 4. Stage 2: Academic Scrutiny (Approval Event)**
  - 4.1 Formal Planning Meeting
  - 4.2 The Academic Approval Panel
  - 4.3 Panel Membership
    - 4.3.1 Additional Membership
  - 4.4 Nomination of External Assessors
    - 4.4.1 Payment of External Members
  - 4.5 Academic Scrutiny Event
    - 4.5.1 Aims of the Event
    - 4.5.2 Schedule of the Event
    - 4.5.3 Faculty Observer at Private Panel Meetings
    - 4.5.4 Documentation for Event
    - 4.5.5 Approval of Documents prior to Submission to the Panel
    - 4.5.6 Decision Making Process
    - 4.5.7 Outcome of the Event
    - 4.5.8 Reporting the Outcome
    - 4.5.9 Evaluation of the Event
  - 4.6 Preparation and Circulation of the Event Report
    - 4.6.1 Confirmation of the Outcome
    - 4.6.2 Draft Report
    - 4.6.3 Confirmed Report
  - 4.7 Fulfilment of Conditions of Approval and Recommendations
    - 4.7.1 Conditions of Approval
    - 4.7.2 Recommendations
  - 4.8 University Approval of the Panel's Recommendation
- 5. Action Required following Approval of a New Proposal**
- 6. Approval of Non-Award Bearing Programmes**
- 7. Strategic Approval and Academic Scrutiny of Taught Postgraduate Research Programmes**

*List of abbreviations and glossary of terms*

*Figure 1 Diagram of Programme Approval processes*

*[Click here for link to the CASQE webpage with Practice Guidance Notes for staff embarking on PARM events](#)*

*[Click here for a link to the appendices listed in this section](#)*

**New from September 2011**

- Collaborative Partner arrangements - Introduction of MMU “Recognised Tutor Status” (RTS) to ensure partner staff have appropriate qualifications to deliver the programme. RTS triggers entitlement to a limited set of University resources. Recommendations relating to suitability of collaborative partner staff should be made at the PARM event by the Panel on receipt of CVs (at appropriate level and in MMU required format)
- Further clarification of reports required to be submitted in respect of collaborative partner proposals
- Amendment to the fees for external assessors for the 2011/2012 session.
- Document Approval checks (daffing) - documents should be sent to CeLT for checking of curriculum design and content at the same time that the F/CQA and CASQE Officer undertakes “daffing”.

**New from September 2010**

- Updated PARM procedures

## APPROVAL AND VALIDATION OF NEW PROGRAMMES

Notes:

- (i) *Terminology refers throughout to “programmes” as the processes in this section relate to the introduction of a new award/series of awards which will result in the approval of a new Programme Specification.*

*The introduction a new award within an existing Programme Specification is classed as a Major Modification. See the relevant section of the [ARPH Modifications to Programmes](#)*

- (ii) *The following processes have, primarily, been developed to accommodate programmes where the locus of responsibility resides with a designated Faculty. It is recognised that some deviation from the procedures may be necessary to accommodate the specific circumstances of University-wide programmes. Where such changes are required, these should be approved, on a case by case basis, by the Head of CASQE.*

There are many drivers for the process of curriculum design, not least the need to respond to external needs, requests or requirements. The development of proposals for new taught provision should be a carefully considered process. For further information see the Curriculum Development section of the ARPH.

### 1. AIM

The aim of strategic approval and academic scrutiny is to ensure that the design, academic standards and quality of learning opportunities of new taught programmes are appropriate to the awards to which they lead and are informed by reference to institutional regulations and policies, national benchmarks and relevant professional and employment demands.

The achievement of this aim is monitored by the Academic Board through its consideration of an annual evaluation report from the Academic Development Committee's (ADC) Academic Standards Sub-committee on the processes of programme approval and review procedures.

This institutional approval should only take place after a period of reflection on curriculum design and research into target markets undertaken by the Programme Team in consultation with the Centre for Learning and Teaching (CeLT), the Centre for Academic Standards & Quality Enhancement (CASQE), the Collaborative Partnership Office (CPO) (for collaborative proposals), Planning & Management Information (P&MI) and the Faculty Executive Group as part of the University's planning process.

Foundation Degree proposals must comply with the QAA Foundation Degree Benchmark Statement:

<http://qaa.ac.uk/reviews/foundationDegree/>

Approval for **honours degree programmes** should, normally, always include the curriculum and student support arrangements for **Combined Honours** subject provision.

The approval process for new proposals involves two stages:

- Stage 1: Strategic Approval
- Stage 2: Academic Scrutiny

Success, through both stages of the process, results in the **validation** of the named course(s).

The approval processes for new proposals for MMU home programmes and collaborative provision are summarised in [Figure 1](#) (at the end of this document). Before a proposal may be considered for formal Academic Scrutiny it must be granted Strategic Approval by the Deputy Vice Chancellor for Strategic Planning.

## **2. COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS**

Collaborative provision is defined in the Academic Regulations and Procedures Handbook Section on [Academic Partnership Guidance](#).

### **2.1 Partner Approval Process for Collaborative Partners**

All new collaborative partners must be approved at institutional level before the University can consider the “academic” element of a proposal. This process is known as the **Partner Approval Process**.

For guidance on any approval arrangements involving collaborative provision please contact the Collaborative Partnership Office (CPO). The Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator (F/CQA) should contact CASQE for advice on the approval status of a proposed collaborative partner if CPO determines that a Partner Approval Process needs to be undertaken.

Guidance on the Partner Approval Process can be found in the Academic Regulations and Procedures Handbook [Partner Approval Process](#).

#### **2.1.1 Existing/Approved Partners**

The approval process for new collaborative provision with partners who have already been through the Partner Approval Process will, generally, follow the same processes as those for an MMU “home” programme. However, there will be additional document requirements which will relate to the specific partner physical resources for the particular proposal under consideration.

Where an approval involves a collaborative arrangement with an existing partner whose approval pre-dates the introduction of the Partner Approval Process, the collaborative partner will not need to be approved at institutional level.

#### **2.1.2 New Partners**

Where an approval involves a new collaborative partner, which has not been through the Partner Approval Process, this process must be undertaken BEFORE the Academic Scrutiny stage (see [Section 4](#) below).

## **2.2 Recognised Tutor Status**

With effect from September 2011, collaborative partner staff teaching on MMU-approved provision may be eligible for MMU “Recognised Tutor Status” (RTS). Conferment of RTS entitles partner staff to access a limited set of MMU resources. In order to obtain RTS, staff CVs (in the recognised MMU format for PARM events) must be submitted for consideration by the PARM Approval Panel. The Panel will, if appropriate, make a recommendation to the University that they are suitable for RTS. RTS for staff approved in these circumstances will be effective until the next periodic review of the approved

programme. A record of RTS approved staff will be held by the Collaborative Partnership Office.

### 3. **STAGE 1: STRATEGIC APPROVAL**

All new proposals must promote the University's strategic objectives and follow institutional planning processes. They must, therefore, be supported by the Dean of Faculty and be included in the Faculty Strategic Plan, as approved by the Deputy Vice Chancellor, **prior** to submission for formal Strategic Approval.

#### 3.1 **Strategic Approval at Faculty Level**

Once the proposal has been included in the Faculty Strategic Plan, the Programme Team must complete and submit a **Strategic Approval Form (SAF-N)** for consideration by its Programme Committee and the Faculty Executive Group.

In preparation for this the Programme Team must consult with appropriate stakeholders/ resource managers and other interested parties with regard to their proposals.

##### 3.1.1 **Consultation**

The Programme Team must undertake the following consultations:

- **Academic consultation** should seek to provide assurance that:
  - the disposition of the University's subject provision remains valid and appropriate to the aims of the institution.
  - the academic development of programmes in one part of MMU must have regard to similar provision elsewhere in MMU in order to avoid duplication, eliminate potential confusion to applicants, demonstrate comparability of academic standards internally and provide for appropriate institutional academic cross-fertilisation on a subject basis and the dissemination of best practice.
- **Resources consultation** aims to ensure that there is a viable business plan to support the proposal. This includes consultation with relevant services and support areas to ensure that all resource stakeholders affected have the opportunity to evaluate and fully cost their proposed contributions **in advance** of planned programme developments which will impact upon their work, to provide evidence of the University's ability to fund and resource developing provision and to foster close and integrated working relationships between programme providers and service providers.
- **Administrative consultation.** The Programme Team must formally consult with the relevant senior Faculty/Campus SAS management teams (via the Head of Faculty/Campus SAS) to ensure that their proposals can be implemented and supported within the administrative resources available.
- **Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) consultation.** Where it is intended to seek PSRB accreditation/approval for a new programme, the Programme Team should undertake full consultations with the relevant body to

ensure that appropriate account is taken of both its validation and regulatory requirements.

- **CASQE consultation.** The Programme Team should consult CASQE if proposals involve:
  - the inclusion of a new University award (ie an award such as BA, BSc or MA which is not currently approved by the University and included in the [Regulations for the Academic Awards of the University](#))
  - any variations to the approved University regulations and codes of practice.
- **CELT consultation.** To ensure full engagement with the University's commitment to equal opportunities, it is good practice for the programme team, at the earliest stage of considering the design of a proposal for a new programme, to consult the Centre for Learning and Teaching on possible curriculum content, their delivery and assessment methods, to identify potential barriers to the participation of disabled students or those from under-represented groups. Please see the [Guidance Note on Inclusive Curriculum Design](#) for more information and details of contacts. The process of curriculum design leads to a request for the Strategic Approval of the proposal by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and, following his agreement, to the full Academic Scrutiny of the planned programme by a panel of internal and external representatives. If in agreement, the Panel then recommends validation. Validation places the new programme on the register of the University's approved programmes.

The complex aims of the consultation process will, inevitably involve the Programme Team and stakeholders in discussions and paperwork which can become protracted if issues are not addressed clearly and within a reasonable timescale.

Stakeholders being consulted (a standard MMU consultation form is available for this purpose - [ARPH Appendix PARM4](#) (for stakeholders) should be requested to respond to the relevant department or faculty within a maximum period of two weeks from its receipt. Inevitably, in some cases, where complex issues require face-to-face discussions, this timescale may not always be practicable. It is critical that programme teams build sufficient time for eliciting and acting upon consultation within their preparations for the Event.

In order for stakeholders to respond appropriately they should receive a consultation form together with:

- an informative summary of developments planned, eg a draft **Strategic Approval Form (SAF-N)**
- any other information relevant to the particular stakeholder (eg information on any new subject areas to the Library)

### 3.1.2 Response to Consultation Process

Upon the receipt of Stakeholders' comments, the Programme Team must take careful account of such comments **and modify, where appropriate, to reflect comments.** The SAF-N subsequently submitted by the Programme Team to its FEG must provide, in the relevant sections of that form, succinct evidence of the consultations that have taken place, ie names of persons consulted/responding, brief outline of comments and action taken to address issues raised.

### 3.1.3 FEG Approval

Once consultations have been fully completed, the Programme Team should amend and finalise the SAF-N (taking account of the outcome of the consultations) and submit it to its FEG for consideration.

In addition to the basic programme information and details of the proposal, the SAF-N **must** demonstrate how service providers and other stakeholders (including other departments/ faculties providing cognate disciplines) have been consulted regarding the proposed development and how any resource or strategic implications have been addressed as a result of the consultation.

**Additional documentation required for collaborative provision and for academic partnership** arrangements, is determined by the level and complexity of the arrangement. Contact the Collaborative Partnership Office and CASQE for details.

Following approval by the Faculty, **a signed hard copy of the SAF-N PLUS an electronic copy** should be submitted to Planning and Development (P&MI) for University Strategic Approval. In addition, where new collaborative partners are involved, **confirmation from CPO that the partner has passed, as a minimum, the Due Diligence stage of the Partner Approval Process**

### 3.1.4 Approval of a New University Award

*This applies to any award or qualification not within the current list of approved academic awards ie not, for example, a BA or BSc simply within a new subject area. If in doubt, check section of the **Regulations for the Academic Awards of the University**:*

[http://www.mmu.ac.uk/academic/academic\\_policy.php](http://www.mmu.ac.uk/academic/academic_policy.php)

Only the Academic Board may approve a new University Award. If this is proposed, the following procedure should be followed in tandem with initial scrutiny of the SAF-N by the FEG:

- (i) Initial consideration of the proposal by the **Faculty Academic Development Committee** using **Appendix PARM14 “Request for New University Award”**, which requires a rationale for the proposed new award, how it aligns with the QAA’s Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, MMU’s Academic Framework and a descriptor for the award.
- (ii) Submission of the request form, **signed by the Dean of Faculty**, to CASQE.
- (iii) Initial consideration by the Head of Academic Standards & Quality Enhancement prior to submission to the Academic Development Committee (ADC). ADC will, if appropriate, make a recommendation to the Academic Board.
- (iv) The Academic Board considers, and if appropriate, approves the proposal. **At this point, the proposal is incorporated into Academic Award Regulations of the University.**

### 3.1.5 Variation or Exemption from the University Regulations

All MMU programmes (and other programmes leading to MMU awards(s)) are required to be fully compliant with the University Assessment Regulations for either Undergraduate or Taught Postgraduate Programmes of Study (as appropriate).

Variation/exemption from any University regulations will only be considered where a professional, statutory or regulatory body (PSRB) requires different regulations in order for a programme to be accredited/approved to provide students with “licence to practise” in a particular professional field. Where a variation must be sought these must be considered, and if appropriate, approved by the Academic Standards Sub-committee of the ADC **in advance** of the Academic Scrutiny process.

The Programme Team must indicate the need for separate approval of any variations/exemptions before moving on to Stage 2: Academic Scrutiny as part of the SAF-N submission.

Requests for variation/exemption should be submitted, in the first instance, to the Head of CASQE who will, if appropriate, make a recommendation for approval to the Academic Standards Sub-committee.

Submissions should provide enough evidence to allow a recommendation to be made and should include, as a minimum:

- A brief pen picture of the programme and its intended student audience
- A rationale for the proposed variation/exemption
- Details of the specific regulation(s) to be changed and the specific wording of the proposed replacement regulation(s)
- Evidence of the PSRB requirement for the variation/exemption

### 3.2 Strategic Approval at University Level

P&MI will circulate the SAF-N to Deans of Faculty (together with any staff nominated by Deans) for consultation. At the same time the form will be published on the P&MI website for information <http://www.mmu.ac.uk/sas/pmi/planning/parm-approvals.php> . It is incumbent on Deans (and/or nominees) to contact P&MI with any concerns or comments.

At the end of the consultation period, the SAF-N will be considered by the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor. Any comments received from Deans and nominated staff will also be submitted and taken into consideration in the decision making process.

The final decision on Strategic Approval is published on the P&MI website and reported to both the appropriate faculty and to CASQE.

Any queries regarding the approval of the SAF-N during this stage should be directed to P&MI.

The DVC reports annually to the Academic Board on those programme proposals for which Strategic Approval has been granted.

Strategic Approval is only granted for a specified period of time. For example, Strategic Approval given during the 2011/12 academic year would normally remain valid for the

2011/12 and the 2012/13 academic years ie the intended year of approval and the following year. Should the valid Strategic Approval period expire before Stage 2 (Academic Scrutiny) has taken place, the University will require evidence that the Academic Rationale and Business Plan for the proposal remain current in the light of the passage of time.

The DVC reports annually to the Academic Board on those programme proposals for which Strategic Approval has been granted.

#### **4. STAGE 2: ACADEMIC SCRUTINY (APPROVAL EVENT)**

Academic Scrutiny will take the form of a Faculty-based Approval Panel Event. A panel, comprising internal members of the University and external subject specialists who will receive programme documentation and meet with the programme team to discuss the proposals and formulate a recommendation to the University.

In preparation for this, the Faculty must convene a Formal Planning Meeting.

##### **4.1 Formal Planning Meeting**

In preparation for an Approval Event, and in order to ensure that all necessary arrangements are made and requirements completed, the Faculty/Campus SAS, via the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator, must convene a Formal Planning Meeting. The meeting will comprise as a minimum:

- Programme representative(s) (normally the Programme Leader)
- A senior Faculty/Campus SAS Manager
- Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator

In addition the following should be made aware of the meeting so that they may attend if they want to or if the nature of the modification is such that input from them is required:

- Head of Department or equivalent
- CASQE representative
- CPO representative

The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that appropriate arrangements are made for the event including:

- an appropriate timeline for the approval process;
- where new collaborative partners are involved, confirming with CPO/CASQE the status of the Partner Approval Process with a view to ensuring that this is completed **before** the Modification Date for Modification event;
- ensuring collaborative partners understand all procedures and are fully involved in the process;
- practical arrangements for the event;
- documentation for the event (including any additional documentation required for collaborative partner proposals)
- arrangements for seeking External Examiner support for changes;
- panel membership;
- programme team representation;
- compliance with regulatory regulations and/or PSRB requirements;

- arrangements for approval of any new university awards, variations from regulations, codes of practice etc.

A formal record is made of this meeting using a *Formal Planning Meeting Proforma* by the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator and circulated to all relevant parties.

## 4.2 **The Academic Approval Panel**

A Panel must:

- be able to make impartial judgements on the comparability of a programme, in terms of standard and content, with similar programmes offered elsewhere in higher education in the UK, and be able to consider the programme in a national perspective;
- address the requirement in QAA's Code of practice for independence and externality;
- include members familiar with current developments in the field of study;
- include at least one member, where appropriate, with relevant experience of industry, commerce, public service or the professions;
- include members with an understanding of current practice and developments in teaching, learning and assessment in higher education;
- be aware of the University's requirements for the award(s) relevant to the proposal(s) under consideration (or the requirements of any other relevant awarding body);
- be aware of the additional requirements involved in the approval of programmes involving collaborative provision as set out in the Institutional Code of Practice for Collaborative Provision (see the section on Collaborative Provision in the Handbook).
- be aware of the requirements of any professional, regulatory or statutory bodies associated with the programme and the requirements of the University as set out in the Institutional Code of Practice for Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (see relevant Section of the Handbook).

## 4.3 **Panel Membership**

The composition of an Approval Panel should therefore normally include, as a *minimum*, the following:

- A Senior University Representative (Chair)
- Two External Assessors
- Faculty Academic Development Committee Representative
- Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator

Exceptionally, the following panel members may also be required:

- Additional external assessor(s) – *where significant discrete subject areas are being considered (seek the guidance of CASQE)*

- Academic Board Research Degrees Committee Representative (from another Faculty) - *for research proposals (see below)*
  - CASQE representative – *where provision in particularly complicated or requires PSRB involvement*
- i    **A Senior University representative**, who shall chair the Event.  
The person appointed under this category by the Head of CASQE (in consultation with the Faculty) is a representative (but not necessarily member) of the Academic Board from another faculty. The University Representative is not expected to possess relevant subject expertise although the use of independent internal expertise is encouraged wherever appropriate and the person so appointed may have appropriate experience in other features of the proposal such as the level of study, the awarding body requirements (eg BTEC), or the mode of delivery. CASQE maintains a database of approved chairs who are trained and updated annually.
- The University Representative should be able to participate in the process impartially and effectively, bringing detachment and objectivity to his/her task of leading the event.
- ii    two independent **external assessors** of high academic/professional standing in a relevant subject area.
- The role of the external assessor is to assist the Panel in fulfilling its terms of reference by providing an independent academic and/or professional perspective of the proposal(s) under consideration. External assessors are appointed because they possess the same sort of attributes as external examiners and are able to draw upon subject expertise and knowledge of good practice and make appropriate comparisons between MMU proposals and similar programmes, either at their own institution or at other institutions, eg where they may be serving as an external examiner. Nominations for external assessors are submitted for approval to the Head of CASQE on [ARPH Appendix PARM8](#).
- iii    a **Faculty Academic Development Committee representative**. The person appointed under this category by the Chair of FADC is a senior member of the home Faculty, independent of the Programme Team, who acts as a representative (but not necessarily a member) of the FADC.
- iv    The **Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator** who attends to ensure compliance with University regulations and QA procedures and services the event.

and, if the Panel is considering a programme leading to a Master's Degree (by research) or Master of Research,

- v    a **member of the Academic Board Research and Enterprise Committee's Research Degrees Committee** from another faculty (if not covered by i above)

#### 4.3.1 Additional Panel Members

Additional external and/or internal members are appointed to the Panel as directed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or the Head of CASQE where the nature of the

programme modification merits it. For example, specific consideration of the need for additional Panel members should be given for the following types of programme:

(a) Professionally accredited programmes

In those cases where a joint MMU/PSRB Event is planned or where the programme leads to a professional award only, the Programme Team/Faculty is expected to liaise with the relevant professional body at an early stage during the Strategic Approval process in order to provide the opportunity for appropriate representation on the Panel. This ensures both that the University aligns its procedures and timescale to any professional requirements and that the professional body has confidence in the University's approval process. Where a PSRB nominates more than one independent external assessor to serve on the Panel, or in cases of representation by more than one PSRB (eg a professional body and the HPC), and at least one of the PSRB nominees fulfils the University's criteria for the appointment of external assessors, the number of MMU-nominated external assessors may be reduced, provided that there remains on the Panel at least one external assessor independent of both the Programme Team and (except as a provider of programmes accredited by the PSRB) the PSRB.

In the case of some joint events, therefore, the Panel will include external members jointly serving institutional and professional body objectives. In other cases the interests of the professional body are invested in a distinct subset of the Panel.

(b) Foundation Degrees

Where employer representation is a required or significant element in programme design, development, operation and/or purpose.

(c) Large/complex provision

For the University Combined Honours Programme, the University Foundation Year or in other cases where a complex proposal is being considered which encompasses a number of different subject areas, consideration must be given, during the strategic approval stage (ie within the SAF-Ns submitted by the Faculty), to the necessity of Panel expertise in each of the component subject areas, particularly where the programme for the event provides an opportunity for subject-focused discussions. It may be possible, however, for large and/or complex multidisciplinary provision to be considered by a Panel comprising generic rather than subject-specific expertise in cases where there are satisfactory arrangements for the quality assurance of the component subject curricula undertaken by "home" contributor programmes. In this case, the limited role required of the Panel's scrutiny and consideration must be clearly explained and understood.

#### **4.4 Nomination of External Assessors**

External Assessors should hold relevant academic posts, or otherwise demonstrate that they have the appropriate standing, experience and expertise in the subject/award under consideration. Their own academic qualifications should be of a level equivalent to the proposal under consideration (ie an external assessor scrutinising a masters proposal should, at least, hold masters level qualifications themselves). External

Assessors with particular professional status or background may be appointed to focus on the proposal's relevance to the specific professional field.

External assessors nominated by the Faculty for appointment by the Head of CASQE must exercise independent judgement, and so **should not have any current or recent (at least 5 years) association with the Department or Programme Team** (for example, by acting as an external examiner or have been an employee of MMU) which might be seen to compromise their objectivity.

The standard form for the nomination of external members is provided as [ARPH Appendix PARM8](#).

The Faculty should contact a proposed external member in the first instance in order to ascertain whether the person concerned is willing to be nominated to serve on an Approval panel. The Faculty must ensure in such circumstances that external nominees are made fully aware of the commitment in time which participation in programme review may involve, ie normally at least one half-day visit to the University and time for scrutiny of programme documentation.

Once the Faculty has established a nominee's suitability and availability, a nomination form [ARPH Appendix PARM8](#) should be completed, signed by the Dean of Faculty or Head of Faculty/Campus SAS and submitted to CASQE for the approval of the Head of CASQE.

Letters of appointment to external assessor nominees approved by the Head of CASQE are sent out by officers of the CASQE and are copied to the relevant Faculty Officer who arranges for the external assessor to be contacted with regard to the detailed arrangements of the Event.

Faculties should make every endeavour to ensure that appropriate External Assessor nominees are appointed as early as possible and their nomination is submitted well in advance of the date of the event.

#### 4.4.1 Payments to External Assessors

2011/12

##### **MMU-Based Events and Collaborative Partner Events based in the UK**

For Faculty-based Panel events held at the University or in collaborative partner accommodation within the UK, the University will pay:

- a standard fee to External Assessors of £100 per day  
PLUS  
an additional £50 for each programme/proposal considered by the Panel (up to a maximum of £200)
- reasonable travel and subsistence expenses ie:
  - standard MMU mileage rates
  - standard train fares and, where appropriate, air fares
  - taxi fares
  - standard rate hotel accommodation

## **Faculty-based Panels held Overseas**

The events held overseas, the University will pay:

- a standard fee of £300 plus an additional £50 for preparation per event.
- reasonable travel and subsistence expenses ie
  - standard MMU mileage rates
  - standard train fares and, where appropriate, air fares
  - taxi fares
  - standard rate hotel accommodation

External Assessors claiming travel and substance costs must attach appropriate receipts to claim forms in order to obtain reimbursement.

### **4.5 The Academic Scrutiny Event**

Once Strategic Approval is granted, the Dean is responsible for convening the Panel on behalf of the Chair, although in practice the Head of Faculty/Campus SAS or their nominee (eg the Faculty Quality Administrator) normally sends out the notice of meeting. Where more than one Faculty is involved, the Dean with management responsibility for the programme convenes the Panel and provides for representation from other Faculties as appropriate. It is appropriate for one Panel to consider two or more related programmes provided that it has sufficient internal and external representation and that the event is of appropriate structure fully to address all issues.

#### **4.5.1 Aims of the Event**

The aims of the Event are to determine the academic viability and appropriateness of the proposals, with particular regard to:

- programme aims and learning outcomes in relation to the proposed award(s)
- curriculum content
- learning teaching and assessment
- student admission, retention, progression and success
- student support arrangements
- employability
- learning resources
- quality and standards
- examples of innovation, good practice and systemic processes for the enhancement of the quality of student learning opportunities in the presentation of the proposal

#### **4.5.2 Schedule for the Event**

The schedule for an Event needs to reflect the scope and complexity of the programme under consideration. A typical programme might comprise a half day event as follows:

- i **Initial private meeting of the Panel** (c. 30-45 minutes)

*to identify issues raised by its reading of programme documentation and to formulate a detailed agenda of issues to explore with programme representatives;*

ii **Panel meeting with key programme representatives** (c. 90 minutes) including:

- the relevant Head or nominee
- Programme Leader designate
- Other members of Programme Team with key responsibilities
- Members of the partner organisation(s) including a representative of the senior staff (for collaborative proposals)
- Dean of Faculty (where relevant or required)

iii **Final private meeting of the Panel** (c.15 minutes)

*to take stock of its discussions and to reach a judgement on whether to recommend the programme for validation, and to formulate any conditions of approval and/or recommendations for further consideration*

iv **Oral feedback**

*to programme representatives of the outcome of the Event with an indication of the nature of any conditions of approval and/or recommendations for further consideration. The outcome may be described in general terms, pending the circulation of a report by the Panel Secretary, or in more precise detail if a Panel has formulated an agreed wording.*

#### 4.5.3 Faculty/Programme “Observer” at Private Panel Meetings

The Panel may wish to agree for a programme or Faculty representative to be present with silent observer status at private meetings of the Panel. The presence, with silent observer status, of a person with a direct interest in the process and the outcome of the panel’s deliberations contributes to the development of confidence in the work of Panels within the institution. Whilst Heads of Department/Programme Leader designate may be seen as having this direct interest, it is recognised that there are others of whom this may be equally true.

An observer with silent status should not participate in debate or discussion but may respond and offer information if it is requested by the Panel. With regard to the question of the confidentiality of matters raised in private session, it is considered that the observer can report to colleagues the substance of the debate but without attributing comments/views to individual members of the Panel. It is, however, to be noted that the Panel retains the right to specify that a certain matter is to be treated as confidential. Those persons requesting and being granted the opportunity to be present with silent observer status at private meetings of the Panels should note that it is **open to a Panel Chair to ask them to withdraw when, in the judgement of the Panel Chair, this seems appropriate.**

#### 4.5.4 Documentation for the Event

In organising an Event, the Faculty should ensure that all participants are made aware of the purpose of the Event and each participant’s distinctive role within the process.

A Panel needs to have sufficient programme and supporting information to carry out its role, ie to determine the continued academic appropriateness of the existing

programme(s) as modified. Documentation for the Panel should therefore comprise the following as a *minimum*:

### **General Information**

- **Event Programme and Agenda**

*Including details of venue, timings, agenda headings*

*The agenda should normally address the following issues (although these may require some amendment depending on the nature of the proposal):*

- Introduction and Context
- Consideration of Proposal(s)
  - Programme aims and learning outcomes
  - Curriculum content
  - Learning, teaching and assessment
  - Student admission, retention, progression and success strategies including, for Foundation Degrees, the named progression route(s) for successful students
  - Student Support arrangements (including PDP arrangements)
  - Employability
  - Combined Honours and Foundation Year (*if relevant*)
  - Collaborative Provision and Academic Partnership (*if relevant*)
  - Placement and work-based Learning arrangements including student exchange (*if relevant*)
  - Quality and Standards including:
    - The student voice
    - MMU equality policies
    - processes for the systematic enhancement of the students' learning opportunities
    - staff development
- Ethical Issues
- Any specific issues for consideration raised by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor through the Strategic Approval process
- Event Outcome:
  - Panel's recommendation to the University
  - Condition(s) of approval (with deadline for fulfilment)
  - Recommendations to be addressed explicitly in the next annual monitoring exercise
  - Examples of innovation and good practice
  - Confirmation of next review date

- **Panel membership list**

*with an indication of the function of each member, eg Chair of the Panel, External Assessor, FADC representative.*

- **List of Programme Team members** and other colleagues (eg from placement institutions) attending the discussions with the Panel

- **For external members:**

- a copy of the University Regulations for either Undergraduate or Taught Postgraduate Programmes of Study (as appropriate);
- general briefing information about the University (and/or collaborative partner(s)) and the location of the Event.

### **Proposal Documentation**

- **Strategic Approval Form (SAF-N)**

*The strategic rationale and business plan as approved by the Deputy Vice Chancellor*

- **Programme Specification**

*For 2011/12 the Programme Specification will be available in paper form and is available as [ARPH Appendix DOC2](#).*

- **Unit Specifications**

*For events held during 2011/12 the following unit specification proformas should be used:*

Undergraduate Programmes

*Undergraduate programmes to be approved must align with the revised University curriculum structure. An on-line unit proforma is available from the P&MI website and should be used for all MMU-based 15, 30 and 60 credit units:*

[https://www.pmi.mmu.ac.uk/mmu\\_academic\\_database/mmu\\_ad\\_home.asp](https://www.pmi.mmu.ac.uk/mmu_academic_database/mmu_ad_home.asp)

Postgraduate Programmes

*For approvals in 2011/12, the existing paper-based unit specification proforma available from the [ARPH Appendices DOC3](#) on the CASQE webpage should be used.*

Collaborative Programmes – all levels

*For approvals in 2011/12, the existing paper-based unit specification proforma available from the [ARPH Appendices DOC3](#) on the CASQE webpage should be used.*

*NB The only exception is where partners are using units already approved (or proposed) for MMU-based delivery.*

- **Staff CVs**

*Staff CVs must be submitted on the MMU CV format for PARM events – [ARPH Appendix DOC5](#). This is particularly important for collaborative partner staff when seeking Recognised Teacher Status*

- **Any additional briefing or supporting material specific to the programme deemed necessary to assist the Panel**

*eg Subject Benchmark statement(s), institutional codes of practice on collaborative provision and/or placement, work based learning.*

- **Any additional documentation required by PSRBs.**

- **Where the proposal involves the approval of arrangements with Collaborative Partners:**

- **Report on Partner's Human Resources**

*The report should focus on resources in place to ensure that the partner can deliver the particular programme/proposal under consideration. It should include information on the staffing levels within the subject area generally and, in particular, those to be attached to the proposal; the effect of any other teaching commitments on their ability to deliver the MMU programme; an assessment of whether the partner staff are suitably qualified to teach the MMU-approved programme, how MMU will ensure that any staff who require staff development to attain the necessary level to teach MMU programmes will be undertaken; what staff development activities are available for partner staff at the partner and at MMU; how will MMU ensure that any future staff employed by the partner to deliver the MMU programme are suitably qualified.*

- **Report on the relevant physical resources available at the partner institution for delivery of the proposed arrangement**

*The report should focus on the specific resources in place to support the programme/proposal under consideration. As part of the Partner Approval process the University will have received (i) information on the general resource provision eg buildings, classrooms, lecture theatres etc and (ii) an assessment of learning support resources by the MMU Library. The aim of this report is supplement the information already received; it should address any specific requirements to support the programme and must be completed by an academic with knowledge of the subject-based resource requirements. Requirements will differ based on the subject provision but may include: science laboratories; computing facilities (specific hardware and software requirements); teaching kitchens; sports equipment; books and e-resources; student access to MMU facilities which will depend on the nature of the partnership.*

- **Details of programme management arrangements, particularly where the programme relates to more than one partner**

*This report should focus on the partner's programme management arrangements (including assessment of students). Programme management arrangements will vary depending on whether the proposal is "externally validated" or a "franchise" and if there will be more than one partner involved. Outline how the partner will manage the programme and how, particularly in the case of franchises, these arrangements will link into MMU home programme. Indicate how MMU staff will be involved in these arrangements.*

#### 4.5.5 Approval of Documentation Prior to Submission to the Panel

Programme documentation for consideration by a Panel **must** be submitted sufficiently in advance of the provisional date of the Event to permit a judgement to be reached as to whether the documentation complies with MMU requirements and regulations and to require amendments where appropriate. A Document Approval Form DAF1 (*ARPH Appendix PARM9*) will be used to record and convey Faculty/CASQE officers' comments on draft programme documentation. The purpose of this prior scrutiny is to ensure that the focus of the Event is on academic issues rather than matters of regulation or other technicalities. It will focus on ensuring`:

- Adherence to documentation templates and completeness of documentation provided
- Engagement with the University Assessment Regulations for either Undergraduate or Taught Postgraduate Programmes of Study and evidence of any approved exemption/variation.
- Adherence to QAA's Framework for HE Qualifications and relevant Subject Benchmark statements
- Consistency with proposed changes identified in the Strategic Approval
- Consistency with faculty plan(s), the University's equality policies and institutional codes of practice.

At the same time, a copy of the documentation should be submitted to CeLT for checking of curriculum content and design.

**The Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator should check that any changes or additions required as a result of the officers' scrutiny have been made prior to the distribution of documentation to the Panel.**

#### 4.5.6 Decision Making Process

There should be no ambiguity at the final Panel meeting about the basis for the outcome of the Event and the status of any conditions or recommendations.

A Panel's **recommendation for validation** is more than a simple judgement that a programme meets the specific requirements for an award. In order to be in a position to recommend the approval of a proposal, the Panel will normally be expected to satisfy itself, through consideration of documentation and open discussion, that the programme meets the following criteria established by the Academic Board:

- i A programme leading to an academic award of the University (or other validating body) must conform in terms of standard and learning outcomes to the requirements of the Academic Board's (or other validating body's) definitions of the award.
- ii A programme must have aims and learning outcomes which the curriculum, structure, learning and teaching methods and forms of assessment are designed to fulfil. The aims will include the development to the level required for the award of a body of knowledge and skills appropriate to the field of study and reflecting academic developments in that field. The aims will also include the University's general educational aims. The learning outcomes will specify in more detail the knowledge and skills to be developed by the programme and evaluated in the assessments.
- iii The Department or equivalent body offering an approved programme must be able to provide the student with proper academic supervision, adequate learning resources and appropriate pastoral support, opportunities to participate in an informed way in programme management, and an atmosphere in which rational debate is encouraged.
- iv The admission of a student to a programme of study leading to an award will be based on the reasonable expectation that the student will be able to fulfil the objectives of the programme and achieve the standard required for the award and must comply with the University's admission policy.
- v Opportunities to gain an award of the University must be made available to students without any form of discrimination on non-academic grounds and must comply with the University's equal opportunities policy.
- vi There must be an expectation that the quality of teaching on an approved programme will be maintained and where possible enhanced. The teaching staff must be properly qualified and experienced, and their teaching must be invigorated and informed by their active participation in research or related scholarly or professional activities.  
  
For **collaborative provision**, staff must be able to demonstrate, through their qualifications and experience, that they are suitable for "Recognised Tutor Status".
- vii Programme regulations must comply with the regulations for the Academic Awards of the University, and the University's assessment regulations.
- viii For **collaborative provision**, a **signed Agreement must in place BEFORE** the delivery of the programme may commence.

A guiding principle in judging the academic worth of a programme is "confidence" in the Programme Team, as reflected iii and vi above, although this must not be the sole factor

in determining the approval of a proposal. Some features of a Programme Team are particularly important in determining an outcome of approval:

- i The Team should reveal a shared understanding of the principles, philosophy and processes underpinning the modified programme.
- ii Staff should be capable of delivering the quality of teaching needed and have the capacity to renew or develop their experience and knowledge in the relevant professional/academic field.
- iii The Team should show that it has genuinely thought through the coherence of the academic programme, ie attempted to construct a view of what will be happening in the intellectual development of students on the programme.
- iv The Team should show that it has thought through the day-to-day experience of what it will be like to be a student on the programme.
- v It should have taken detailed account of issues of implementation, including resourcing and student support.
- vi In cases of collaborative provision, the effectiveness of procedures to involve the partner(s) in all of the above. In its discussions, the Panel will expect the formal assurance from a senior member of the partner organisation that specific time and support will be provided for staff teaching at HE level to maintain appropriate development in research and scholarly activity. In addition, the home faculty and department will be expected to indicate how it will work with partner staff to promote an HE culture.

#### 4.5.7 Outcome of the Event

There should be no ambiguity about the basis for the outcome of the Event and the status of any conditions or recommendations.

**Approval** may be **recommended either without condition or conditional** upon the fulfilment of certain requirements. Conditions of approval should be used for requirements which must be fulfilled in order to ensure that the modified programme meets the standard required for the award. *Changes which are desirable in order to enhance the quality of the programme of study, but which do not affect the threshold standard, should be identified as recommendations which should be considered through the Continuous Monitoring and Improvement process..*

**For collaborative provision only** – In addition to the making a recommendation for continued approval (including validation of any new elements to be offered) by a collaborative partner, the Panel will be required to make a **second recommendation** on whether the collaborative partner staff are appropriately qualified and, therefore, are eligible for “Recognised Tutor Status”.

**Conditions** should be expressed precisely and have a realistic date set for their achievement. The Programme Team must be able to understand clearly what action is required and the timescale. The deadline and locus of responsibility for the fulfilment of any conditions should be made explicit by the Panel, as should the means by which the fulfilment of conditions will be deemed satisfied. Recommendations to the Academic Quality and Standards Sub-committee that conditions have been satisfied may be made

on the basis of a judgement reached by the Panel Chair, the Panel as a whole or another person or group - (FADC for example) as may be specified in the conditions. **The new or modified programme may not commence until this has been confirmed by a signed report from the Panel Chair.**

**Recommendations to the Programme Team** - the Panel may construct recommendations which the Programme Team must normally consider and address explicitly in the course of its continuous monitoring and improvement processes. The Team is not required to implement the recommendations but evidence of its consideration of them will be sought through the continuous monitoring and improvement process and at the next review of the programme. Where a Panel recommends, in the light of its discussions, that the Programme Team makes a significant change to the programme prior to its next intake (eg change of title), a deadline should be set for the Team to respond to such a recommendation so that programme details may be confirmed at the earliest opportunity.

**Recommendations to the Faculty/University** – the Panel may, occasionally, wish to raise issues/make recommendations which are more appropriate for consideration at Faculty or University level. These will be submitted either to the FADC or ADC's Academic Standards Subcommittee as appropriate. It is important that any such issue is **not** included as a condition that the Programme Team will be unable to fulfil as this will delay the completion of the approval process.

**Identification of Good Practice** – is an important part of the Panel's consultations and is reported through the Academic Standards Sub-committee and added to CeLT's database of good practice, for wider dissemination.

**Deferral of Recommendation or Recommendation for Non Approval** - A Panel may encourage the submission of revised programme proposals within a specified timescale and give an analysis of those areas where the proposal was found to be lacking together with guidance as to how deficiencies may be redressed. In such circumstances a Panel may recommend that it be reconvened in full to consider the revised proposals or that the process is completed by email communication.

#### 4.5.8 Reporting the Outcome

Once the Panel has agreed the outcome of the event, the Programme Team is invited to rejoin the Panel to receive oral feedback. The Chair will briefly outline the Panel's validation decision, any conditions of approval and recommendations, the deadline date for a response to any conditions and any good practice noted by the Panel.

#### 4.5.9 Evaluation of the Event

An evaluation of the effectiveness of the Event should be conducted through the completion by participants of evaluation questionnaires ([ARPH Appendix PARM15](#)) with a view to CASQE identifying aspects of the processes which require development and proposing action to be taken in response. The evaluation will contribute to the annual review of the operation of programme approval and review procedures considered by the Academic Standards Sub-committee.

## **4.6 Preparation and Circulation of the Report of the Event**

### **4.6.1 Confirmation of the Outcome**

Within a week of the event, written confirmation of the outcomes of the Panel's deliberations to be recommended to the ADC should be approved by the Chair and circulated to Panel members and the Programme Leader.

### **4.6.2 Draft Report**

Following the Event a draft report must be prepared by the Faculty. The nature of this report is directive and need not reflect the entire range of discussion at the meeting, but must ensure that all agenda items are addressed. The MMU template for Faculty Programme Approval/ Review/ Modification Reports is provided as [ARPH Appendix PARM10](#) of the Academic Regulations and Procedures Handbook to ensure coverage of appropriate issues and to accord with national requirements for the publication of summaries of programme approval reports.

The purpose of the report is to provide an accurate summary of the main points of discussion, together with clear justification for the Panel's decisions and recommendations. The report should be organised thematically following the template provided, rather than as a chronological record of discussions. The nature of the report generally and, the conclusion in particular, will need to reflect the specific characteristics of the programme(s) considered and the nature of the Event.

The draft report **must** be approved by the Chair and circulated electronically to all Panel members, for comment, prior to confirmation, together with an Event evaluation questionnaire ([ARPH Appendix PARM15](#)). Comments/changes to the draft report proposed by Panel members must all be submitted to the Chair and approved prior to inclusion in the confirmed report.

### **4.6.3 Confirmed Report**

The confirmed report should be circulated electronically to all members of the Panel, the Head of Department (and Head of Department of Partner if collaborative provision) and to the Programme Team members who attended the event and must be:

- discussed at FADC\*,
- sent to the relevant CASQE officer for consideration by the Head of CASQE and
- sent to the Head of Learning and Teaching, so that good practice identified in the report may be included in the Centre for Learning and Teaching's Good Practice Database

\* *submission to FADC and CASQE may be in tandem to avoid any undue delay in the University approval process*

## **4.7 Fulfilment of Conditions and Recommendations**

### **4.7.1 Conditions of Approval**

The Programme Team must submit a written response to any conditions of approval to the Head of Faculty/Campus SAS or nominee by the deadline set by the Panel. The response must be accompanied by any relevant supporting documentation

required by the Panel (eg updated definitive document). Once the Faculty is satisfied that the response is appropriate, the response and supporting documentation, together with Section C (Response to conditions) of the PARM Report is submitted to the Panel Chair\* for approval. If satisfied that the conditions have been fulfilled, the Panel Chair will sign Section C and return it to the Faculty.

On receipt of the Chair's approval, the Head of Faculty/Campus SAS or nominee will submit an electronic copy of the updated PARM Report (ie with completed Section C) and a copy of Section C signed by the Chair.

#### 4.7.2 Recommendations

The Programme Team's response to any recommendations made by the Panel is by demonstrating, as part of the annual monitoring exercise, that it has given appropriate consideration to each of those recommendations.

#### 4.8 University Approval of the Panel's Recommendation

Responsibility for the validation of new programme proposals lies with the Academic Board's ADC Academic Standards Sub-committee, which has delegated authority on behalf of Academic Board's ADC and which must approve all recommendations for validation **prior to the programme's commencement**. Retrospective approval may not be granted.

On receipt of the confirmed report, the Head of CASQE will, if appropriate, make a recommendation to the Academic Standards Sub-committee to confirm the Panel's validation recommendation. All decisions by the sub-committee are reported to ADC, and from ADC to the Academic Board.

CASQE maintains a register of PARM events to monitor the submission of reports and the fulfilment of conditions of approval. The Head of CASQE will report to the Academic Standards Sub-committee on compliance with conditions and on an overview of the conditions, recommendations and good practice identified by University Panel's each academic year. The newly validated programme is then added to the register of programmes in approval, together with the date for first review.

## 5. **ACTION REQUIRED FOLLOWING APPROVAL OF A NEW PROPOSAL**

Once a proposal has been approved, the home Faculty of the newly validated programme must notify other faculties affected by the proposal(s).

The on-line definitive document is the “authoritative” version of the programme, and the only source for all other versions of programme information. It should be updated annually to include any/all modifications.

The on-line Programme Specification should also be updated annually as appropriate prior to the implementation of modifications.

The annual consensus date for all updates to definitive documentation is **31 August**.

A list of modifications approved throughout the year should be included at the front of each on-line definitive document.

The previous version of the definitive document should be archived when the updated version is published.

## 6. **APPROVAL OF NON-AWARD-BEARING PROVISION**

*This section has not been updated for September 2011. It will be included within the review of Professional Development Programmes (including Open Professional Programme, Continuing Profession Development Networks etc) during 2011/12 and will be subject to change.*

The procedures set out below relate to credit-rated non-award-bearing programmes. Non-award-bearing signifies that successful completion of the programme does not render students eligible for an award of the University or of any other awarding body, nor does it confer any professional status. Successful completion may, however, be recognised through the issuing of a transcript or certificate/diploma of credit. Non-award-bearing programmes shall comply with appropriate University regulations. Non-award-bearing programmes of 120 credits or more shall be subject to normal quality assurance arrangements for taught programmes

### 6.1 **Programmes of 40 credits or Less**

A **Strategic Approval Form (SAF-N)** to be completed incorporating full and evidenced consultation with service providers and other internal and external stakeholders.

Signed Strategic Approval Form together with draft PS1, entry profile and unit specifications, considered for approval by FEG.

Notification of FEG approval to CASQE with updated PS1 appended.

### 6.2 **Programmes of more than 40 credits (and less than 120)**

A **Strategic Approval Form (SAF-N)** must be completed, incorporating full and evidenced consultation with service providers and other internal and external stakeholders.

The signed SAF-N, together with a draft PS1, entry profile and unit specifications, must be considered at a Faculty Event. The Faculty Panel should comprise internal staff (including FADC representative(s)) not involved in the delivery of the programme and should normally include appropriate representation from another faculty. The Panel should be chaired by the Dean or nominee. Additional independent members, including external assessors, may be appointed as appropriate at the discretion of the Dean of Faculty.

A report of the Faculty event making recommendation of approval, if appropriate, should be considered and approved by FADC.

Notification of FADC approval should be sent to CASQE with the updated PS1 appended.

## 7. **STRATEGIC APPROVAL AND ACADEMIC SCRUTINY OF POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH PROGRAMME PROPOSALS**

The procedures and arrangements for Strategic Approval Academic Scrutiny of taught research programmes are, essentially, the same as those for the University's taught academic provision. However, responsibility for discharging the Student and Academic Services (SAS) functions for these processes lie with the Research, Enterprise and Development (RED) Office rather than CASQE. The following provides a brief guide to where responsibility lies within the Academic Division for research proposals as resolved by the Academic Board in June 2003:

| STAGE/ACTIVITY  | TAUGHT ACADEMIC PROVISION   | TAUGHT RESEARCH PROVISION  |
|---|---|--|
| Initial consideration of SAF-N  | Faculty Executive Group   | Faculty Executive Group  |
| Submission to SAS following Faculty approval                          | Submit to P&MI  | Submit to RED Office.<br>RED submits SAF-N to P&MI   |
| Consideration for "Strategic Approval by the Deputy Vice Chancellors" | P&MI submits recommendations to DVC (Strategic Planning)  | P&MI submits recommendations to DVC (Strategic Planning)   |
| Faculty & CASQE notified of outcome of DVC consideration              | P&MI notifies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• CASQE</li> </ul>                               | P&MI notifies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• RED</li> <li>• CASQE</li> </ul> <i>(CASQE to be notified of RED proposals to ensure all new proposals are captured for the academic database, conferment etc)</i> |
| Arrangements for event  | Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator  | Faculty Research Office or Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator as appropriate   |
| Checking documentation prior to submission to the Panel               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator</li> <li>• CASQE Officers</li> </ul>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator</li> <li>• RED Officers</li> </ul>   |
| Approval of External Assessors for Full Review Event                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of CASQE</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director of RED</li> </ul>  |
| Approval of, & membership of full Review Event Panel :                | Nature of Panel Membership. Panel must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair: Academic Board</li> </ul> | Nature of Panel Membership. Panel must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair: Director of RED</li> </ul>   |

| STAGE/ACTIVITY                       | TAUGHT ACADEMIC PROVISION   | TAUGHT RESEARCH PROVISION   |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                      | rep from <i>Standing Pool of Chairs held by CASQE</i><br>• Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator | or nominee ( <i>requests for chair to be made to RED</i> )<br>• RED Representative                                      |
| Confirmed Event Report submitted to: | CASQE   | RED<br>( <i>with copy to CASQE to ensure all new proposals are captured for the academic database, conferment etc</i> ) |
| Report & response to conditions      | Approved by Academic Standards Sub-committee  | Approved by University Research Degrees Committee   |
| Final approval notified to Faculty   | Notification from CASQE   | Notification from RED   |

For further information about taught research programmes see the ARPH Section on Quality Assurance Processes for Research Programmes.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSARY OF TERMS

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| ADC     | Academic Development Committee                                     |
| AME     | Annual Monitoring Exercise   |
| APD     | Academic Practice Development                                      |
| ASSc    | Academic Standards sub-committee                                   |
| ARPH    | Academic Regulations and Procedures Handbook                       |
| CASQE   | Centre for Academic Standards and Quality Enhancement              |
| CeLT    | Centre for Learning and Teaching                                   |
| CPO     | Collaborative Partnerships Office                                  |
| DAF     | Document Approval Form   |
| DVC     | Deputy Vice-Chancellor   |
| EQAL    | Enhancing Quality and Learning                                     |
| FADC    | Faculty Academic Development Committee                             |
| FEG     | Faculty Executive Group  |
| FHEQ    | Framework for Higher Education Qualifications                      |
| HPC     | Health Professions Council   |
| ICP     | Institutional Code of Practice                                     |
| ICTS    | Information and Communication Technology Services                  |
| NSS     | National Student Survey  |
| PARM    | Programme Approval, Review and Modification                        |
| PDP     | Personal Development Planning                                      |
| P&MI    | Planning and Management Information                                |
| PRES    | Postgraduate Research Experience Survey                            |
| PSRB    | Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body                        |
| QAA     | Quality Assurance Agency   |
| QAP     | Quality Action Plan (at programme level)                           |
| QLS     | The University's student and course management system              |
| RAE     | Research Assessment Exercise                                       |
| RDC     | Research Degrees Committee   |
| RED     | Research Enterprise and Development                                |
| RTS     | Recognised Teacher Status  |
| SAF-N   | Strategic Approval Form - New Programmes                           |
| SAF R+D | Strategic Approval Form - Reviews, Modifications, Discontinuations |
| SAS     | Student and Academic Services                                      |

Figure 1

# PROGRAMME APPROVAL

## Stage 1 – Strategic Approval

