

# MODIFICATIONS TO PROGRAMMES

<b>Section Approved:</b>	July 2011
--------------------------	-----------

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

- 1. Background**
- 2. Categories of Modifications**
- 3. Collaborative Partnerships**
  - 3.1 Minor Modifications
  - 3.2 Major Modifications
- 4. Minor Modifications**
  - 4.1 Unit Specifications  
*Table 1 Elements of Unit Specification requiring formal Minor Modification*
  - 4.2 Minor Modifications (other than Unit Specifications)  
*Table 2 Minor Modifications (other than Unit Specifications)*
  - 4.3 Consideration and Scrutiny of Minor Modifications
  - 4.4 Action Required following Approval
  - 4.5 Minor Modifications to Taught Postgraduate Research Programmes
- 5. Major Modifications**
  - 5.1 Amendments covered by Major Modifications  
*Table 3 Table of Major Modifications*
  - 5.2 Approval Mechanisms and Processes
  - 5.3 Stage 1: Strategic Approval
  - 5.4 Stage 2: Academic Scrutiny
  - 5.5 Scrutiny by FADC
  - 5.6 Scrutiny by PARM Standing Panel
  - 5.7 Scrutiny by Modification Panel Event
- 6. Organisation of Modification Panel Event**
  - 6.1 Formal Planning Meetings
  - 6.2 Modification Panels
  - 6.3 Panel Membership
  - 6.4 Additional Panel Members
  - 6.5 Nomination of External Assessors
  - 6.6 The Modification Event
  - 6.7 Aims of the Event
  - 6.8 Schedule for the Event
  - 6.9 Faculty/Programme "Observer" at Private Panel meeting
  - 6.10 Documentation for the Event
  - 6.11 Approval of Documentation prior to Submission to the Panel
  - 6.12 Decision Making Process
  - 6.13 Outcomes of the Event
  - 6.14 Reporting the Event
  - 6.15 Evaluation of the Event
  - 6.16 Preparation and Circulation of the Report
  - 6.17 Fulfilment of Conditions and Recommendations
  - 6.18 University Approval of the Panel's Recommendations
  - 6.19 Action Required following Approval of Modification

- 7. Modification of Non Award Bearing Programmes**
  - 7.1 Procedure
- 8. Modifications to Taught Postgraduate Research Programmes**

*List of abbreviations and glossary of terms*  
*Figure 1 Major Modifications Flowchart*

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

#### **New from September 2011**

- Collaborative Partner arrangements. Introduction of “Recognised Teacher Status” (RTS) to ensure partner staff have appropriate qualifications to deliver the programme. RTS triggers entitlement to a limited set of University resources.
- Further clarification of reports required to be submitted in respect of collaborative partner proposals (section 4.5.4)
- Amendment to the fees for external assessors for the 2011/2012 session.
- Document Approval checks (daffing):
  - required for all documentation, including programmes to be submitted for modification via Standing Panel
  - 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 October 2010**

- Introduction of new PARM procedures
- Introduction of PARM Standing Panel
- Revised proformas

# MODIFICATIONS TO PROGRAMME

## Notes:

- (i) *“Modifications” apply to all programmes, courses or routes that lead to named award titles within a Programme Specification. For the purpose of simplicity the information below refers only to “programme” but the processes apply to all of the above.*
- (ii) *This document provides guidance on the procedures to follow when undertaking modifications to a programme. For information on the operational procedures for the maintenance and updating of the University’s Academic Database resulting from approved changes to programme, please contact the Faculty/Campus Quality Assurance Administrator.*
- (iii) *These procedures relate mainly to award-bearing programmes and non-award-bearing programmes of 120 credits or more. See Section 7 for variant procedures governing the modification of non-award-bearing programmes of less than 120 credits.)*
- (iv) *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.*

## 1. **BACKGROUND**

Modifications are any changes to an approved programme of study which are undertaken between the approval (or last review) of the programme and its next scheduled review and which are recorded within the University’s Academic Database and the Programme Specification.

Amendments and improvements to programmes may be agreed between the cycle of formal reviews and are categorised according to their impact and level of complexity, with different levels of scrutiny.

For information on the modification process for provision offered by collaborative partners or the addition of **new collaborative partners** see [Section 3 below](#).

### 1.1 **Aim of the Modification Procedure**

The aim of the procedure for programme modifications is to enable:

- Programme Teams to fulfil their plans for the academic development of programmes in order to maintain academic standards and enhance the quality of the student experience
- the University to be satisfied of the appropriateness of planned modifications to the standards of its awards.

## 2. **CATEGORIES OF MODIFICATION**

Modifications can vary considerably in scale and impact on the student experience. In order to ensure that the locus of responsibility for the consideration and approval of modifications is appropriate to their specific nature, modifications are grouped into two categories for consideration and approval purposes:

- Minor Modifications
- Major Modifications

There exist, inevitably, some grey areas between categories of modification which depend upon interpretation as to what might be deemed significant or substantial and what might be deemed less so. In such circumstances the Programme Leader or Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator should consult, at the earliest opportunity, with the Centre for Academic Standards & Quality Enhancement (CASQE) to determine the most appropriate category.

### 3. COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS

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

#### 3.1 Minor Modifications

- (i) **Minor modification to MMU programmes franchised to "approved" collaborative partners.** Proposals (from partners and the MMU home programme team) should be submitted to the MMU Programme Committee for support prior to submission to the relevant MMU Faculty Academic Development Committee. Proposals from partners should be submitted to the Faculty via the MMU Link Tutor for the franchised programme.
- (ii) **Minor modifications to externally validated programmes offered by approved collaborative partners** will be considered using the same processes as for MMU "home" programmes. Proposals should be supported by the Programme Committee before being submitted to the relevant MMU Faculty Academic Development Committee. Proposals should be submitted to the Faculty via the MMU Link Tutor for the externally validated programme.

Where a programme is franchised or externally validated to more than one collaborative partner, **all partners must be consulted and agree to the changes prior to submission of a proposal.**

#### 3.2 Major Modifications

Major Modifications involving collaborative partners fall under the following four main categories

- (i) **Major Modifications to Externally Validated programmes offered by Approved Collaborative Partners**

Proposals will be considered using the same processes as for MMU "home" programmes. Proposals should be supported by the Programme Committee before being submitted to the relevant MMU Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator for processing. Proposals should be submitted to the Faculty via the MMU Link Tutor for the externally validated programme.

Where a programme is externally validated to more than one collaborative partner, **all partners (MMU and collaborative) must be consulted and agree to the changes prior to submission of a proposal.**

- (ii) **Major Modifications to MMU programmes franchised to Approved collaborative partners (excluding the approval of new collaborative partners)**

Proposals (from partners and the MMU home programme team) should be submitted to the MMU Programme Committee for support prior to submission to the relevant MMU Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator for processing. Proposals received from partners should be submitted to the Faculty via the MMU Link Tutor for the franchised programme.

Where a programme is franchised to more than one collaborative partner, **all partners (MMU and collaborative) must be consulted and agree to the changes prior to submission of a proposal.**

- (iii) **Major Modification proposals to extend approval for existing MMU programmes to be delivered by Collaborative Partners who have already been approved by the University through its Partner Approval Process.**

Proposals will be considered using the same processes as for MMU “home” programmes ([see section 5 below](#)). However, **additional information** relating to the physical and human resources specific to the proposal will be required.

- (iv) **Major Modification proposals to extend approval for existing MMU programmes or to approve new or existing awards within an MMU programme offered or delivered by a Collaborative Partner which has not been through the University’s Partner Approval Process.**

New partners must be approved at institutional level **before** the University can consider the “academic” element of a proposal. For guidance on this process:

- see the guidance on the [Partner Approval Process](#) in the Academic Regulations and Procedures Handbook

and contact the following at the **earliest opportunity**:

- Collaborative Partnership Office (*which will undertake initial research on the prospective partner*)
- CASQE (*to ensure that the Partner Approval Event can be timetabled into the approval process in a timely manner*)

Once the Partner Approval Process has been successfully completed, proposals will be considered using the same processes as for MMU “home” programmes ([see section 5 below](#)). However, **additional information** relating to the physical and human resources specific to the proposal will be required.

For more detailed guidance on the processes required for modifications involving collaborative partnership contact CASQE.

### **3.3 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.**

## 4. **MINOR MODIFICATIONS**

Minor Modifications cover the following changes to programmes, ***provided they are consistent with University regulations and codes of practice or that any variations from these have been approved by the Academic Development Committee.***

### 4.1 **Minor Modifications to Unit Specifications**

The guidance below refers to the approval/amendment of **individual** units. Where changes to, or addition of a range of new units is proposed (which together may affect the focus or philosophy of the programme) these may be subject to a **Major Modification** process. In such cases contact the Head of CASQE for advice.

#### 4.1.1 **Approval of New Units**

All new units introduced or amended outside the standard periodic review procedure must be formally approved using the **Minor Modification** process. Units are normally attached to a programme or *department* (see *Table 1 below for consultation/notification requirements*). Initiating the approval or amendment of a Unit Specification is, therefore, the responsibility of the “home” programme/department.

#### 4.1.2 **Discontinuation of Existing Units**

Discontinuation of an individual unit does **not** require a minor modification but appropriate consultation/notification must take place and the discontinuation must be reported to FADC and P&MI (see *Table 1 below*).

#### 4.1.3 **Modifications to Existing Units**

*Table 1* indicates those elements of the Unit Specification which may be changed by the Programme Team without a minor modification and those which require formal submission of a minor modification to the Faculty Academic Development Committee.

Minor changes to Unit Specifications (as indicated in *Table 1 below*) may be implemented without the need for a Minor Modification if agreed and minuted by the Programme Committee.

**Table 1 Minor Modifications to Unit Specifications**

ITEM	APPROVAL NEEDED  Yes/No	ACTION REQUIRED BY PROGRAMME LEADER	CONSULTATION/NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS <i>(where consultations are required, provide written support with Modification Proforma. Programme Leaders are responsible for ensuring that appropriate consultations take place.</i>
<b>WHOLE UNITS</b>			
Introduction of a New Unit	Yes	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<b>Consult:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External Examiner</li> <li>Library Services</li> <li>ICTS</li> <li>Learning &amp; Research Technologies</li> </ul>
Discontinuation of Existing Unit (active & non-active)	No	Report to Faculty for Academic Database update	<b>Consult</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programmes using the unit (including Combined Hons where applicable) on implications for existing students</li> </ul> <b>Notify</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P&amp;MI</li> </ul>
<b>ELEMENTS OF THE UNIT SPECIFICATION</b>			
Unit Code	N/a	Academic database function	
Unit Co-ordinator	No	Notify Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator to ensure Academic Database is updated	
Faculty/Dept	No	Notify Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator to ensure Academic Database is updated	
Level	N/a	Level cannot be changed. In order to offer similar content at a different level, a new unit specification will be required.	
Credits	N/a	Credits cannot be modified. Where changes are to be made to credits a new unit specification will be required.	
ECTS	N/a	Automatically calculated by Academic Database	
Unit Admin	N/a	Academic database function	
Quality Administrator	N/a	Academic database function	
Unit Title	Yes	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<b>Notify:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other programmes using the unit (including Combined Hons where applicable)</li> </ul>
Abbreviation	N/a	Academic database function	
Keywords	No	May be updated by Unit Co-ordinator without FADC approval	
Brief Summary	No	May be updated by Unit Co-ordinator without FADC approval	<b>Notify:</b> Other programmes using the unit (including Combined Hons where applicable)
Indicative Content	No	May be updated by Unit Co-ordinator without FADC approval	<b>Notify:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other programmes using the unit (including Combined Hons where applicable)</li> </ul>
JACS code	Yes	Does not require a minor modification to be submitted to FADC. Approval from P&MI MUST be received before changes made.	<b>Consult:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P&amp;MI</li> </ul>
External Examiner	No	Notify Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator to ensure Academic Database is updated	
External Examiner	No	Notify Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator to ensure Academic Database is updated	

ITEM	APPROVAL NEEDED  Yes/No	ACTION REQUIRED BY PROGRAMME LEADER	CONSULTATION/NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS <i>(where consultations are required, provide written support with Modification Proforma. Programme Leaders are responsible for ensuring that appropriate consultations take place.</i>
Email		updated	
Assessment Board	No	Notify Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator to ensure Academic Database is updated	
Learning Outcomes	Yes	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<b>Consult:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External examiner</li> <li>Any students affected</li> </ul> <b>Notify:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other programmes using the unit (including Combined Hons where applicable)</li> </ul>
Assessment	Yes	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<b>Consult:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External examiner</li> <li>Any students affected</li> </ul> <b>Notify:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other programmes using the unit (including Combined Hons where applicable)</li> </ul>
Learning Activities	No	May be updated by Unit Co-ordinator without FADC approval provided the Team adhere to the rules of the curriculum framework	<b>Notify:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other programmes using the unit (including Combined Hons where applicable)</li> </ul>
Learning Resources (including : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Essential Reading</li> <li>Further Reading</li> <li>Special ICTS Requirements</li> <li>Additional Requirements</li> </ul>	No	May be updated by Unit Co-ordinator without FADC approval. Relevant stakeholders must be consulted and approve changes	<b>Consult:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library</li> <li>ICTS</li> <li>Learning &amp; Research Technologies</li> </ul> as appropriate) before changes are made

#### 4.2 Minor Modifications to Programmes (other than Unit Specifications)

**Table 2** indicates changes to the programme other than those specifically relating to unit specifications which require submission of a formal minor modification request on a Modification Proforma together with evidence of consultation as indicated:

**Table 2 Minor Modifications to Programmes (other than Unit Specifications)**

	Minor Modification	Action Required by Programme Leader	CONSULTATION/NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultations/action required provide written support with Modification Proforma. Programme Leaders are responsible for ensuring that appropriate consultations take place.</i>
i	Changes to <b>specified programme specific</b> attendance regulations	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External Examiner(s)</li> <li>PSRBs (where relevant)</li> </ul>
ii	<b>Academic Partnership</b> Agreed progression routes to MMU programmes	Submit Minor Modification to FADC to amend Admissions Regulations	<b>Consult</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPO</li> </ul> <b>Documentation to be submitted with Modification Proforma</b>

	<b>Minor Modification</b>	<b>Action Required by Programme Leader</b>	<b>CONSULTATION/NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS &amp; OTHER ACTION</b> <i>(where consultations/action required provide written support with Modification Proforma. Programme Leaders are responsible for ensuring that appropriate consultations take place.</i>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Signed Due Diligence Form (abridged) – submit with Modification proforma</li> <li>Draft Memorandum of Understanding (prepared by CPO)</li> </ul>
iii	<b>Academic Partnership</b> Agreed articulation route for external students onto MMU programmes with advanced standing  <i>NB this does not apply to individual student applications for advanced standing</i>	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<b>Consult</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPO</li> </ul> <b>Documentation to be submitted with Modification Proforma</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Signed Due Diligence Form (abridged) – submit with Modification proforma</li> <li>Draft Articulation Agreement (prepared by CPO)</li> </ul>
iv	<b>Academic Partnership</b> International student exchange with state funded HEIs:  (a) to join an existing institutional arrangement at programme level or (b) to establish a separate arrangement at programme level	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<b>Consult</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPO/MMU International</li> </ul> <b>Documentation to be submitted with Modification Proforma</b> For (a): no additional documents required  For (b): Signed Due Diligence Form (abridged) – submit with Modification proforma
v	<b>Academic Partnership</b> Remote delivery of MMU taught provision by MMU staff  <i>ie changes to the delivery location (ie to external premises) of a unit or stage or programme provided that MMU retains responsibility for delivery and that such changes do not involve collaborative arrangements with specific partner organisation(s)</i>	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<b>Documentation to be submitted with Modification Proforma</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft Service Level agreement (Faculty to prepare in consultation with MMU Legal Department)</li> <li>Report on a visit to establish satisfactory quality of premises (to be prepared by MMU Programme Leader)</li> </ul>
vi	Changes to general admissions regulations consistent with existing programme entry requirements and with the implementation of such policies on entry requirements as the Academic Board or Faculty Board may from time to time determine.  <i>Notes:</i> (i) for admission/progression arrangements for groups/cohorts of students from a specific collaborative partner/feeder institution, see ii and iii in this table. (ii) Changes to A level entry points do not require a minor modification	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<b>Consult</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment &amp; Admissions</li> <li>Marketing &amp; Communication</li> </ul> <b>prior to making any changes</b>
vii	Changes to the general admissions regulations which affect the criteria by which the suitability of students for admission will be judged.  <i>Note:</i> (i) Changes to A level entry points do not require a minor modification	Submit Minor Modification to FADC	<b>Consult</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment &amp; Admissions</li> <li>Marketing &amp; Communication</li> </ul> <b>prior to making any changes</b>

### 4.3 Consideration and Scrutiny of Minor Modifications

#### 4.3.1 Responsibility for Approval

Responsibility for the consideration of Minor Modifications proposed by programme teams rests with Faculty Boards through their Faculty Academic Development Committees (FADC).

#### 4.3.2 Process

Before modifications are considered by FADC they must be discussed and formally endorsed by the full Programme Committee, including student members, which has responsibility for the programme undergoing modification.

All Minor Modifications must be submitted to FADC on the standard University Modification Proforma ([ARPH Appendix PARM13](#)).

Once FADC has scrutinised the proposal and made a decision on the proposal, the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator will inform the proposer of the outcome and, where appropriate, will report changes to eg:

- other MMU programmes affected by changes;
- staff responsible for the update of documentation and websites.

#### 4.3.3 Consultation

Depending on the nature of the proposal, a Programme Team is required to undertake a range of consultations (academic and the resources) to ensure that due regard has been given to ensuring that modifications are appropriate and sustainable in respect of the following:

- consistency and alignment with University policies, regulations and institutional codes of practice
- curriculum requirements and assessment practice
- alignment with any PSRB requirements
- impact on any current students affected by the changes
- availability of sufficient resources to implement and maintain the changes (eg library, media services, ICTS)
- potential consequences, if any, for other areas of the programme or, where relevant, other programmes.

#### **Academic consultations:**

##### **(i) Student Consultation**

###### **(a) Student Cohort(s) directly affected by proposed modifications**

Where, under this category of modification, a Programme Committee wishes to make changes in:

- assessment strategy,
- regulations
- a significant aspect of the curriculum
- award titles

affecting students **currently on the programme**, it must formally consult those students on the programme who may be **directly affected** by the proposed change(s).

***In any case where any students object to proposals to any part of the curriculum which they are currently studying, then the changes may not be implemented for that cohort without the express permission of ADC.***

###### **(b) Modifications which do not directly affect current students**

Student consultation should be undertaken through student representation on the “home” Programme Committee. Whilst it is good practice to survey current students to seek their views on proposed changes it is not necessary to seek their **agreement** to the following changes:

- New units for introduction in the first year of the programme
- Additional “option” units at any level which widen the student choice
- Amendments to existing units sought in preparation of a new academic year (ie prior to student enrolment on the unit)

(c) Proposals which require Specific/identified Student Cohorts to be notified following approval of changes

- Extreme and unavoidable circumstances where students have already enrolled on a unit.
- Any changes to the “**core**” units to be offered to students in the following year
- Changes to units **where students have already selected their options** but not enrolled – students must be **notified** of changes prior to enrolment

(ii) **External Examiner(s)**

The appropriate External Examiner(s) must be consulted on **all proposed changes to the curriculum** of award bearing programmes. Proposals in this field will, most commonly, take the form of the addition of new, or amendment to existing, Unit Specifications. However, there may be other changes which will require consultation with External Examiners and guidance should be sought from the Centre for Academic Standards & Quality Enhancement.

A consultation form, [ARPH Appendix PARM5](#), is provided for External Examiners to complete and return to the Programme Team. Where External Examiners have recommended changes to the proposal then the programme team should indicate on the Modification proforma:

- (a) whether or not these changes have been included in the Unit Specifications submitted to FADC/Standing Panel
- (b) where changes/recommendations have not been implemented, the rationale for non-inclusion.

(iii) **Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)**

Where changes to programmes/relevant awards are driven by the requirements of one or more PSRBs this should be clearly indicated on the Modification Proforma and any correspondence/evidence from the PSRB should be appended to the submission.

Where the changes are proposed by the University (at institutional or local level), the Programme Team should ensure that these do not jeopardise any approval/accreditation/ licence to practise conferred by PSRBs. The Programme Team should confirm that appropriate consultations have taken place with PSRBs and provide evidence of any correspondence/documentation from the PSRBs which will assist the FADC to come to a decision.

(iv) **Impact on other MMU Programmes**

Increasingly, and in line with the University's strategy, units approved within a Programme Specification are being shared across provision, both within the same Faculty and across the institution. Whilst this is positively welcomed by the University, it does bring with it additional responsibilities for the "owners" of units.

When planning a change to a Unit Specification, the Programme Team should ensure that all other "users" of that unit have been made aware of the proposed changes. "Users" **cannot require** the "owner" to amend or retain a unit to suit their own needs. The "home" programme team must notify interested parties about the proposed change.

All other MMU programmes affected by the proposed modification(s), **including those offered by Collaborative Partners**, should be listed on the Proforma with confirmation that they have been **notified** of the proposed change. In addition to individual courses which are known to "use" a unit, particular care should be taken to ensure that, where applicable, the following are **notified**:

- Combined Honours Scheme
- Foundation Year
- Faculty/University-wide Framework (eg OPPs)
- Collaborative Partners approved to offer relevant MMU provision

**Where modifications raise issues of structure for the Combined Honours Scheme (eg where the credit rating of a unit has been adjusted) the Combined Honours Leader must be consulted.**

*NB Discontinuation of units – whilst a minor modification is not required to discontinue a unit, the change must be reported to FADC **and all MMU programmes affected must be consulted on implications for existing students.***

(v) **Resource Consultations:**

(a) Unit Specifications

**Table 1** (above) specifies which elements of the Unit Specification may be changed without recourse to a minor modification and those which must be submitted to FADC for approval. It also indicates, where relevant, which Resource Providers/Stakeholders must be consulted (and confirm that they can support the proposed changes) and those which require notification.

**Any** changes to the Unit Specification, regardless of whether or not formal approval is necessary, **must be reported** to the Faculty to ensure that the academic database is updated and remains current for all users

(b) Other Modifications

For minor modifications (other than to individual Unit Specifications) guidance on which resource/stakeholders should be consulted by Programme Teams is outlined in **Table 2**. For any modifications which are not listed, Programme Teams should, in the first instance, contact Faculty/Campus Quality Administrators who will consult, as appropriate, with the Centre for Academic Standards & Quality Enhancement in order to clarify what consultations are required.

**A PARM Consultation Form (ARPH Appendix PARM4)** is available for use

by Programme Teams.

#### 4.3.4 Scrutiny and Approval by FADC

FADC is required to satisfy itself as to the academic validity and resource viability of proposed changes and should ensure that changes to programme regulations and the introduction of new syllabuses or units are consistent with University regulations and codes of practice and are formally supported by the external examiners.

Minor modifications must be approved **prior to their implementation. Retrospective approval must not be granted.**

Due to the constraints of fixed cycles of meetings the Chair of FADC may be asked to take action on behalf of the Committee to approve a Minor Modification which a Programme Team wishes to implement before the Committee's next meeting. Whilst in no way wishing to diminish the role of the FADC Chair in taking such action, the Academic Standards Subcommittee (ASSc) encourages Faculties to ensure that all Minor Modifications are given full and proper consideration. The ASSc would wish to discourage the approval of individual modifications through a series of actions by a FADC Chair on behalf of designated groups (e.g. programme committee, Faculty Academic Development Committee) except in exceptional circumstances.

#### 4.3.5 Timing of Approval of Minor Modifications

Approval of all minor modifications should be approved at the earliest possible opportunity and must be approved **before** the start of the academic year.

### 4.4 Action Required following Approval

Once Minor Modifications have been approved, the Faculty with administrative authority for approval must ensure that the academic database is updated and notify the following:

- Other programmes affected by the modification(s)
- Home Department(s)/Programme Team(s)

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

The Programme Specification must also be updated on an annual basis to include any modifications.

### 4.5 Minor Modifications to Taught Postgraduate Research Programmes

Minor modifications to postgraduate research programmes should be handled within the Faculty using similar procedures to taught programmes. Minor modification forms (suitably amended) should be submitted to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee.

## 5. **MAJOR MODIFICATIONS**

Major modification to a programme is a formal institutional procedure and should be undertaken by the Programme Team in consultation with:

- the Centre for Academic Standards & Quality Enhancement (CASQE),
- the Collaborative Partnership Office (CPO) (for collaborative proposals)
- the Centre for Learning and Teaching (CeLT),
- Planning and Management Information (P&MI) and
- the Faculty Executive Group

as part of the University's planning process. The nature and the extent of the modification will determine:

- (a) whether Strategic Approval, at University level, is required in advance of academic scrutiny/approval of the modification, and
- (b) the type of approval process required.

Although most categories of major modification will have clear approval pathways, others will require a judgement to be made by the Head of CASQE.

**Table 3** below outlines the range of modifications covered and the process involved.

If a Programme Team seeks a modification which does not fit within any of those listed in the table, contact CASQE for guidance.

## 5.1 Amendments covered by Major Modifications

Table 3

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultation/action is required, provide written support with Modification Proforma).</i>  <i>Unless stated, the Proposer (normally the Programme Leader) is responsible for undertaking action indicated</i>  <i>For further information on "Additional Documents Requested see notes at end of Table 3</i>	
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSc approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSc		Scrutiny by Standing Panel
1	<b>Changes to the programme philosophy, aims or learning outcomes</b> associated with significant adjustments to the content, structure, balance of curriculum, learning and teaching strategy and/or assessment scheme which extend beyond the category of Minor Modifications.		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓						<p><b>Required Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject External Examiners support for changes</li> <li>Resources/stakeholder support as required for approval of/modification to units (<i>see guidance for minor modifications to unit specifications</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F/CQA sends outline of proposal to Head of CASQE for decision on FADC or Standing Panel scrutiny</li> </ul>
2	<b>Changes to the general arrangements for any work-based learning</b> (supervised work experience or student exchange) which forms a compulsory element of the programme.		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓			<p><b>Required Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject External Examiners support for changes</li> <li>Resources/stakeholder support as required for approval of/modification to units (<i>see guidance for minor modifications to unit specifications</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F/CQA submits report outcome to CASQE for submission to ASSc</li> </ul>
3	<b>Changes to the assessment scheme</b> which affect the overall assessment strategy or the criteria for the recommendation of any award to which the programme may lead.		✓			✓	✓							<p><b>Required Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject External Examiners support for changes</li> <li>Resources/stakeholder support as required for approval of/modification to units (<i>as per guidance for minor modifications to unit specifications</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F/CQA sends outline of proposal to Head of CASQE for decision on FADC or Standing Panel scrutiny</li> </ul>

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultation/action is required, provide written support with Modification Proforma).</i>  <i>Unless stated, the Proposer (normally the Programme Leader) is responsible for undertaking action indicated</i>  <i>For further information on "Additional Documents Requested see notes at end of Table 3</i>	
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSc approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSc		Scrutiny by Standing Panel
4	(i) Changes to the specified MINIMUM programme length (Postgraduate only) or (ii) the inclusion of a MAXIMUM period within which students must complete the programme (nb this is only permissible to accommodate PSRB requirements)		✓	✓				✓	✓		✓			<p><b>Variation to Standard Processes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F/CQA sends proposals to ASSc Secretary. Secretary seeks recommendation of Head of CASQE prior to submission to ASSc</li> <li>ASSc Secretary notifies F/CQA of outcome</li> </ul>
5	Modifications to programme structure, assessment strategy, regulations and/or management which are <b>not consistent with University regulations</b> and/or codes of practice		✓	✓				✓	✓					<p><b>Variation to Standard Processes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F/CQA sends proposal and rationale for variations to ASSc Secretary. Secretary seeks recommendation of Head of CASQE prior to submission to ASSc</li> <li>ASSc Secretary notifies F/CQA of outcome of variation request</li> <li>Head of CASQE decides if the modification requires academic scrutiny and the level of that scrutiny.</li> </ul>
6	<b>Any significant combination of minor changes to the content of the programme</b> which do not affect award titles, unit titles, structures etc and which are consistent with University regulations and/or codes of practice		✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓						<p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F/CQA submits outline of proposal to Head of CASQE for decision on FADC or Standing Panel scrutiny</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External Examiners support for changes<sup>1</sup></li> <li>Resources/stakeholder support as required for approval of/modification to units (see guidance for minor modifications to unit specifications)</li> </ul>

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultation/action is required, provide written support with Modification Proforma).</i>  <i>Unless stated, the Proposer (normally the Programme Leader) is responsible for undertaking action indicated</i>  <i>For further information on "Additional Documents Requested see notes at end of Table 3</i>		
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSC approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSC		Scrutiny by Standing Panel	Scrutiny by full Faculty Modification Panel
7	<p><b>Open Professional Programmes (and similar provision):</b></p> <p>(i) <b>Introduction of any new award titles</b></p> <p>(ii) <b>Introduction of a new partner</b></p> <p><i>* proposed partner will either be completely new to the University or involved in collaborative arrangements which pre-date the introduction of the Partner Approval Process. In the case of the latter, the collaborative partner will not need to be approved at institutional level</i></p>	✓		✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓						<p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F/CQA submits SAF to Head of CASQE for decision on level of scrutiny in tandem with submission of SAF to P&amp;MI. The level of scrutiny is agreed by the Head of CASQE following confirmation that the SAF has been approved.</li> </ul> <p><b>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will depend on level of scrutiny required</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Documentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will depend on level of scrutiny required</li> </ul>
8	<p><b>Introduction of a new mode of attendance</b> (including an alternative full-time award on sandwich degree schemes) <i>(with or without changes to curriculum content)</i></p>	✓		✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓						<p><b>Process</b></p> <p>F/CQA submits SAF to Head of CASQE for decision on level of scrutiny in tandem with submission of SAF to P&amp;MI.</p> <p><b>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>External Examiners</b> support for changes <sup>1</sup></li> <li><b>Resources/stakeholder</b> support as required for approval of/modification to units <i>(see guidance for minor modifications to unit specifications)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Documents Required</b> <i>(where changes to curriculum)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement regarding coherence</li> <li>New/amended Unit Specifications</li> </ul>

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultation/action is required, provide written support with Modification Proforma).</i>  <i>Unless stated, the Proposer (normally the Programme Leader) is responsible for undertaking action indicated</i>  <i>For further information on "Additional Documents Requested see notes at end of Table 3</i>	
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSc approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSc		Scrutiny by Standing Panel
9	<p>(i) Changes in the name of a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>programme specification title</li> <li>an award subject title (including interim award titles) (eg Basket Weaving, History of Baskets)</li> </ul> <p>which do <b>not</b> affect the philosophy, market or balance of curriculum, <b>ie no changes to curriculum content</b></p> <p>(ii) Change to University award (eg BA, BSc, BEng etc) with <b>no changes to curriculum content</b></p> <p><i>NB change of name including amendment to content to reflect the change – see section 12 of this table</i></p>	✓		✓			✓				✓			<p>(i) <b>Process</b> CASQE reports Strategic Approval to ASSc <b>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External Examiner(s) to be consulted prior to submission of SAF<sup>1</sup></li> </ul> <p>(ii) <b>Process</b> CASQE reports Strategic Approval to ASSc <b>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External Examiner(s) to be consulted prior to submission of SAF<sup>1</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Documentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change of award (eg from BA to BSc) - the submission of a robust academic rationale in support of the change, where this is not evidenced by a change in the focus of content of an award. This should be submitted together with the SAF</li> </ul>
10	Introduction of a <b>new final award (up to 60 credits) where the content is already in approval</b> within the programme/network.	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓			<p><b>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External Examiner(s) to be consulted on changes prior to submission of SAF<sup>1</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following scrutiny by FADC, F/CQA submits report to CASQE for submission to ASSc</li> </ul>

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultation/action is required, provide written support with Modification Proforma).</i>  <i>Unless stated, the Proposer (normally the Programme Leader) is responsible for undertaking action indicated</i>  <i>For further information on "Additional Documents Requested see notes at end of Table 3</i>	
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSc approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSc		Scrutiny by Standing Panel
11	<b>Approval of new route</b> within a programme or network (with new content or a mixture of new and existing content)	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓					✓		<p><b>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>External Examiners</b> support for changes</li> <li>• <b>Resources/stakeholder</b> support as required for approval of/modification to units</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Documents required for Academic Scrutiny</b> <i>(where changes to curriculum to be made)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement regarding coherence<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• New/amended Unit Specifications</li> <li>• CVs of staff teaching new route<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>
12	<b>Changes in the title of a programme, or in the award(s) to which it leads,</b> which accompany a change to the philosophy, market and/or balance of curriculum.	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓					✓		<p><b>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>External Examiners</b> support for changes</li> <li>• <b>Resources/stakeholder</b> support as required for approval of/modification to units</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Documents required for Standing Panel</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement regarding Coherence<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Units all new &amp; existing units relating to revised titles only</li> <li>• CVs of staff teaching new content<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>
13	<b>COMBINED HONOURS</b> Approval of either: (i) A <b>principal subject/route within Combined Honours</b> where the provision is <b>already delivered/ approved</b> within another programme. or (ii) An <b>existing</b> approved principal subject/route within <b>Combined Honours</b> as a <b>single honours award</b>	✓		✓		✓	✓					✓		<p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CASQE reports Strategic Approval to ASSc Additional Documents</b></li> <li>• Programme specification for subject and for CH</li> </ul>

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION	
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSc approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSc	Scrutiny by Standing Panel	Scrutiny by full Faculty Modification Panel
14	<b>COMBINED HONOURS</b>  Introduction of a <b>new Principal Subject/route</b> within <b>Combined Honours</b> (ie where it is not already delivered within an existing programme specification)	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓					✓		<p><b>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject External Examiners support for changes<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• CH Chief External Examiner<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Resources/stakeholder support as required for approval of/modification to units</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Documents required for Standing Panel</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement regarding coherence<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• CVs of staff teaching on route<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>
15	<b>COMBINED HONOURS</b>  Discontinuation of a subject offered within Combined Honours	✓					✓				✓			<p><b>Consult with Head of Combined Honours prior to submission of SAF Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CASQE reports Strategic Approval to ASSc following approval by P&amp;MI.</li> <li>• Subject "home" faculty confirms to Combined Honours that the discontinuation has been approved.</li> </ul>
16	<b>ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIP</b>  Arrangement with another HEI with degree awarding powers to grant a second award for cognate but separate studies	✓					✓			✓	✓			<p><b>Consult with CPO prior to submission of SAF</b></p> <p><b>Additional Documents required for FADC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Memorandum of Understanding (<i>prepared by CPO. Signed after ratification by Standing Panel</i>) Plus</li> <li>• Signed Due Diligence Form (abridged) - if arrangements is with non-state funded institution (<i>prepared by the MMU Collaborative Partner &amp; approved by MMU Legal Dept. Signed after ratification by Standing Panel</i>)</li> </ul>
17	<b>ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIP</b>  Delivery of existing MMU collaborative provision by partner staff on premises not belonging to the partner	✓		✓			✓			✓	✓			<p><b>Consult with CPO prior to submission of SAF</b></p> <p><b>Additional Documents required for FADC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report on visit to establish satisfactory quality of premises (<i>prepared by MMU Link Tutor</i>)<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• Final unsigned contract between the MMU Collaborative Partner and the third party (<i>prepared by the MMU Collaborative Partner &amp; approved by MMU Legal Dept. Signed after ratification by Standing Panel</i>)</li> </ul>

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultation/action is required, provide written support with Modification Proforma).</i>  <i>Unless stated, the Proposer (normally the Programme Leader) is responsible for undertaking action indicated</i>  <i>For further information on "Additional Documents Requested see notes at end of Table 3</i>	
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSC approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSC		Scrutiny by Standing Panel
18	<b>ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIP</b>  Placement Learning	✓		✓			✓			✓	✓			<b>Additional Documents required for FADC</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of arrangement and responsibilities of MMU and the placement provider.<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>
19	<b>ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIP</b> <b>3 yr Undergraduate &amp; 4 year sandwich programmes</b> Approval of no more than 30 credits at any one level of a programme, with a maximum of 60 credits in total, delivered by an external partner as part of the curriculum of an MMU-based programme  <b>Masters programmes</b> Approval of no more than 40 credits delivered by an external partner as part of the curriculum of an MMU-based programme  <b>All other programmes</b> Approval of no more than 30 credits delivered by an external partner as part of the curriculum of an MMU based programme	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓			<b>Consult with CPO prior to submission of SAF</b>  <b>Additional Documents required for FADC</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final unsigned Service Level Agreement (<i>prepared by Faculty in consultation with MMU Legal Dept</i>)</li> <li>• Summary of arrangement and responsibilities of MMU and the placement provider.<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>
20	<b>ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIP AND COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP</b> <b>Early termination or amendment of a collaborative partnership arrangement</b>	✓				✓	✓			✓	✓			<b>Consult with CPO prior to submission of SAF. Inform Marketing &amp; Communication and Recruitment &amp; Admissions</b>  <b>Additional Documents to be submitted to FADC</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit Strategy to ensure quality of student experience for any students remaining on the programme.<sup>6</sup></li> <li>• Letter of Variation and Termination (<i>prepared and issued by CPO on completion of approval process</i>)</li> </ul>

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultation/action is required, provide written support with Modification Proforma).</i>  <i>Unless stated, the Proposer (normally the Programme Leader) is responsible for undertaking action indicated</i>  <i>For further information on "Additional Documents Requested see notes at end of Table 3</i>	
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSC approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSC		Scrutiny by Standing Panel
21	<p><b>COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP – FRANCHISE OR EXTERNAL VALIDATION</b></p> <p>Approval of collaborative provision involving a <b>NEW partner</b> to offer either :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- an <b>EXISTING</b> MMU programme or</li> <li>- a <b>NEW AWARD</b> within an <b>EXISTING</b> programme specification</li> </ul> <p>WHERE PARTNER APPROVAL PROCESS HAS <b>NOT</b> BEEN COMPLETED FOR THE NEW PARTNER</p> <p><i>* proposed partner will either be completely new to the University or involved in collaborative arrangements which pre-date the introduction of the Partner Approval Process. In the case of the latter, the collaborative partner will not be reviewed at institutional level.</i></p>	✓		✓	?	✓	✓	✓						<p><b>Consult with CPO and CASQE prior to submission of SAF</b></p> <p><b>The Partner Approval Process will need to be undertaken BEFORE academic scrutiny. This process is undertaken by CASQE in consultation with CPO and Faculty.</b></p> <p><b>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>External Examiners</b> support if changes to course are proposed<sup>1</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Documents required for Academic Scrutiny</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of Partner Approval Process (<i>report by CASQE</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Where changes to curriculum content required – revised unit specifications</b></li> <li>• CVs of staff teaching on programme<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• Report on partner's human resources inc staffing levels, staff development, staff links with MMU staff (<i>prepared by MMU Programme Leader or MMU Link Tutor</i>)<sup>7</sup></li> <li>• Report on physical resources to support the proposal (<i>prepared by MMU Programme Leader or MMU Link Tutor</i>)<sup>8</sup></li> <li>• Report on Programme Management arrangements (<i>by MMU Programme Leader or MMU Link Tutor</i>)<sup>9</sup></li> <li>• Draft Formal Agreement (<i>prepared by CPO &amp; CASQE in consultation with Programme Leader. Signed on approval of arrangement</i>)<sup>10</sup></li> </ul>

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultation/action is required, provide written support with Modification Proforma).</i>  <i>Unless stated, the Proposer (normally the Programme Leader) is responsible for undertaking action indicated</i>  <i>For further information on "Additional Documents Requested see notes at end of Table 3</i>	
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSC approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSC		Scrutiny by Standing Panel
22	<p><b>COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP – FRANCHISE OR EXTERNAL VALIDATION</b></p> <p>Approval of collaborative provision involving an <b>EXISTING, APPROVED</b>, partner to offer either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- an <b>EXISTING</b> MMU programme</li> <li>or</li> <li>- a <b>NEW AWARD</b> within an <b>EXISTING</b> programme specification</li> </ul> <p>* <i>partner will already have been through the Partner Approval Process and offering provision elsewhere within a Faculty or across the University</i></p>	✓		✓	?	✓	✓	✓						<p><b>Consult with CPO and CASQE prior to submission of SAF</b></p> <p><b><u>Consultations over and above SAF Consultations</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>External Examiners</b> support if changes to course are proposed<sup>1</sup></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Documents required for Academic Scrutiny</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of completion of Partner approval Process (report by CASQE)</li> <li>• <b>Where changes to curriculum content required – revised unit specifications</b></li> <li>• CVs of staff teaching on programme<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Report on partner's human resources inc staffing levels, staff development, staff links with MMU staff (prepared by MMU Programme Leader or MMU Link Tutor)<sup>7</sup></li> <li>• Report on physical resources to support the proposal (prepared by MMU Programme Leader or MMU Link Tutor)<sup>8</sup></li> <li>• Report on Programme Management arrangements (by MMU Programme Leader or MMU Link Tutor)<sup>9</sup></li> <li>• Draft Formal Agreement (prepared by CPO &amp; CASQE in consultation with Programme Leader. Signed on approval of arrangement)<sup>10</sup></li> </ul>

PROPOSAL		DOCUMENTS REQUIRED					APPROVAL PROCESS						CONSULTATION/ NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS & OTHER ACTION <i>(where consultation/action is required, provide written support with Modification Proforma).</i>  <i>Unless stated, the Proposer (normally the Programme Leader) is responsible for undertaking action indicated</i>  <i>For further information on "Additional Documents Requested see notes at end of Table 3</i>	
		SAF	Modification Proforma	Revised Programme Specification	Unit Specifications	External Examiner Support	Other (see end column)	Strategic Approval from P&MI	Consult Head of CASQE to determine level of scrutiny	ASSc approval of variation prior to Scrutiny	Scrutiny by FADC	CASQE Report to ASSc		Scrutiny by Standing Panel
23	Temporary Suspension of programmes, courses or routes leading to named awards					SEMINARS	✓							<p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process and consultation requirements for temporary suspension of a programme, course or routes leading to named awards is outlined in <a href="#">ARPH Section Programme Discontinuation and Suspension</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Documentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">ARPH Appendix PARM7</a> Application for Approval to Suspend Programmes, Courses or Routes</li> </ul>
24	Discontinuation of programmes, courses or routes leading to named awards	✓					✓				✓			<p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process and consultation requirements for temporary suspension of a programme, course or routes leading to named awards is outlined in <a href="#">ARPH Section Programme Discontinuation and Suspension</a></li> </ul>

### Notes of Guidance on Additional Documents requested in Table 3

- 1 External Examiner Feedback  
External Examiner(s) should be sent documentation together with the Feedback Form (PARM5 in ARPH Appendices). External Examiner(s) must comment on the proposal and where necessary, make recommendation. The Programme Team must also submit its response to the comments.
- 2 Statement of Coherence  
The statement should contain a brief background to, and overview of, the proposal including all salient points (two or three paragraphs maximum). It is recognised that the details of the proposal will be available with the documentation. However, this brief description provides the Panel with a very useful overview and enables members to focus in on what it is they are required to consider.
- 3 Staff CVs  
CVs for staff teaching on new proposals (MMU and collaborative) should be submitted in the MMU format (see ARPH Appendix DOC5 – for PARM events)

## For Academic Partnership and Collaborative Proposals:

- 4 Visit to Establish Satisfactory Quality of Premises  
Requirements will differ based on the subject provision; the report should confirm the physical resources in place to support the proposal and may include comments on general buildings, classrooms, specialist workshops, laboratories and disabled access.
- 5 Summary of Arrangement and Responsibilities of MMU and placement provider  
The report submitted to FADC should take cognisance of the University's ICP on Placement Learning; it should provide sufficient information to confirm that appropriate procedures are in place and the thresholds are met; and provide specific information on the roles and responsibilities of MMU and the placement provider. An exemplar checklist is available at: [http://www.mmu.ac.uk/academic/academic\\_policy.php](http://www.mmu.ac.uk/academic/academic_policy.php)
- 6 Exit Strategy to Ensure Quality of Student Experience  
Provide details of the arrangements in place to ensure that enrolled students are able to complete the Programme and are provided with appropriate support to ensure the quality of their student experience.
- 7 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 programme, how MMU will ensure that any staff who require staff development to attain the necessary level 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.
- 8 Report on partner's physical resources  
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.
- 9 Report on Partner's Programme Management Arrangements  
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". 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.
- 10 Formal Agreement  
All arrangements with collaborative partners must have a signed Formal Agreement in place prior to the commencement of the programme at the partner. This is a legal requirement. A CPA1 form (available from ARPH Appendices) should be completed by the Proposer (MMU academic staff member leading on the proposal) and submitted to Collaborative Partnership Office as soon as strategic approval has been secured. Evidence that the Formal Agreement is underway will be expected at academic scrutiny stage.

## 5.2 Approval Mechanisms and Processes

The type of amendment and the level of change proposed will determine how a Major Modification is scrutinised. For each proposal, CASQE is charged with responsibility for agreeing an approval process which is both appropriate and proportionate to the modification proposed. For some proposals the approval mechanism is clear cut and these are outlined in [Table 3](#) above. However, for others, the nature of the change or the amount of change may mean that the proposal does not easily fit in one of the identified processes. In such cases, the Programme Team should draft a Modification Proforma, outlining as much information as possible, and submit this to the Head of CASQE who will confirm the most appropriate method of approval.

### 5.2.1 Proposals Requiring Strategic Approval

Certain types of modifications will require the **strategic approval** of the University **before** they can be considered for academic scrutiny. For these modifications, the process is, therefore, a two stage process:

Stage 1: Strategic Approval  
Stage 2: Academic Scrutiny

### 5.2.2 Proposals **NOT** Requiring Strategic Approval

Where there is no requirement for strategic approval from the University, the Programme Team can move direct to Stage 2 – Academic Scrutiny.

### 5.2.3 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 the section of the **Regulations for Academic Awards for 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 R+D by the FEG:

- (i) Initial consideration of the proposal by the FADC 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 CASQE 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.

#### 5.2.4 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).

Where reasons for regulatory exemption derive from the requirements of a PSRB, and where, for example, a PSRB has established a programme in such a way as to ensure that the PSRB alone is able to take responsibility for, and maintain control of, programme regulation, the Programme Team must provide details at the earliest opportunity to CASQE so that ADC, through its Academic Standards Sub-committee may be consulted as part of the approval in principle process.

When making any modifications to a programme, the Programme Team should review any existing approved exemptions/variations from MMU regulations to ensure that these remain valid in light of the proposed changes. The Programme Team will be expected to confirm whether or not such exemptions/variations should continue following the approval of the modified programme.

Where a proposal requires a **new or additional** variation/exemption, the Programme Team must indicate the need for separate approval of any variations/exemptions **before** moving to Stage 2 – Academic Scrutiny. Where a request for variation or exemption from University regulations must be sought, this will be submitted to the next scheduled meeting of the Academic Standards Sub-committee for consideration. The Programme Team should be aware that this may lengthen the process.

Requests for variation/exemption should be submitted, in the first instance, to the Head of CASQE who will, if appropriate, make a recommendation 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 MMU Regulation(s) to be changed and the specific wording of the proposed replacement regulation(s)
- Evidence of the PSRB requirement for the variation/exemption (a letter from the PSRB or the specific PSRB Guidance or Section of their Regulations that requires a variation to the University's Regulations)

### 5.3 Stage 1: Strategic Approval

*Where SAF R+Ds are not required please go directly to [section 5.5](#) for details of Stage 2: Academic Scrutiny*

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

Strategic approval is necessary for any proposals involving:

- New award titles
- Amendment to award titles

- Changes to the mode of attendance
- New collaborative partners
- Any proposals which involve changes to funding or student numbers

**A Strategic Approval Form (SAF R+D)** must be completed for all proposals identified as Major Modifications which require strategic approval.

### 5.3.1 Strategic Approval at Faculty Level

Before any action can be taken, the Programme Team must ensure that their proposals align with the current Faculty Strategic Plan, via consultation with their relevant Head of Department and Dean of Faculty.

Once alignment is confirmed, the Programme Team must complete and submit a SAF R+D for consideration by its Programme Committee prior to submission to the Faculty Executive Group for approval at Faculty level.

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

#### (i) Consultation

The Programme Team must undertake the following consultations as appropriate:

- **Academic consultation** should seek to provide assurance that:
  - the University's subject provision, as proposed, remains valid and appropriate to the aims of the institution.
  - the academic development of programmes in one part of MMU 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** must be undertaken to ensure that there is a viable business plan to support the modifications. 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 (initially via the Head of Faculty/Campus SAS) to ensure that their proposals can be implemented and supported within the administrative resources available.

- **Student consultation.** The Programme Team must formally consult the students on the programme who may be **directly affected** by the proposed change(s). Such consultation may include giving students detail of the proposed changes and inviting his/her comments thereon and also meeting with student programme representatives to discuss the proposed changes. Details of any changes subsequently approved should be published and issued to all students on the programme. An indication as to how student comment on modification proposals was obtained should also be provided on the SAF R+D.
- **Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) consultation.** Although it is more common for modifications to be driven by the requirements of PSRBs, where this is not the case, the Programme Team should ensure that the proposed changes do not have any unforeseen consequences for the approval or accreditation of the programmes by relevant PSRBs
- **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.** The Programme Team should contact CELT at the earliest opportunity for advice on the development of curriculum and programme design.
- **Collaborative Provision consultation**  
The programme Team should contact the Collaborative Partnership Office at the earliest opportunity in relation to any proposals involving collaborative partners.

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 (two standard MMU consultation forms are available for this purpose - [ARPH Appendix PARM4](#) (for stakeholders) and [ARPH Appendix PARM5](#) (for External Examiners) 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 approval of the modification.

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

- an informative summary of developments/changes planned, eg a draft **Strategic Approval Form (SAF R+D)**
- any other information relevant to the particular stakeholder

(ii) Response to Consultation Process

Upon the receipt of external examiner and stakeholders' comments, the Programme Team must take careful account of such comments **and modify, where appropriate, its original proposal to reflect the comments provided**. The SAF R+D 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.

FEG Approval

Once consultations have been fully completed, the Programme Team should amend and finalise the SAF R+D (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 R+D **must** demonstrate how service providers, external examiners and other stakeholders (including other departments/ faculties providing cognate disciplines) have been consulted regarding the proposed changes 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 R+D 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**

5.3.2 Strategic Approval at University Level

P&MI will circulate the SAF 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. 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 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 R+D 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.

## 5.4 **Stage 2: Academic Scrutiny**

Once strategic approval has been received (or where it is not required) proposals are submitted for academic scrutiny. Academic scrutiny will be undertaken by one the following:

- FADC
- PARM Standing Panel
- Modification Panel Event

### 5.4.1 **Level/Nature of Academic Scrutiny**

**Table 3** above lists the most common types of major modification and the appropriate approval process. If a proposal does not align with those in the table, contact the Head of CASQE for advice.

The nature and type of major modification proposed will determine the level of academic scrutiny required. Although most categories of major modification will have clear approval pathways, others will require a judgement to be made by the Head of CASQE.

Where the process requires consultation with the Head of CASQE, this should be done at the earliest opportunity and should be undertaken via the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator.

Where the proposal requires

- (i) a **SAF**, this should be submitted to the Head of CASQE at the same time as it is submitted to P&MI. Although a decision on the nature of the scrutiny will not be made until Strategic Approval has been received, it will provide the Head of CASQE with sufficient time to make an appropriate judgement.
- (ii) a **Modification Proforma**, a draft version should be submitted to the Head of CASQE as soon as possible.

The Head of CASQE will advise the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator of the appropriate form of scrutiny required.

#### 5.4.2 Consultation with External Examiners

Any proposal submitted for consideration involving changes to awards, curriculum content, assessment strategies or the structure of a programme, route or award must include the written support of, and comments from the relevant subject external examiner(s).

The Programme Team must submit draft documentation to the F/CQA in sufficient time to enable the F/CQA to send the proposals to the relevant external examiner(s) for their comments and support.

For Major Modifications External Examiners should be requested to:

- (i) review the proposed curriculum content for the proposal;
- (ii) recommend support for, or changes to, any new units.

The documentation sent to External Examiners should provide sufficient information on the major modification proposed. For example, where a new route is to be introduced which will use a mixture of existing and new units, the External Examiner should receive **all** the units for the new route to enable them comment on the overall cohesion of the new route and to make their recommendations on the new units.

An External Examiner Consultation Form [ARPH Appendix PARM5](#) must be sent to the External Examiner(s) together with the relevant programme documentation.

Responses from External Examiner(s) must be included in the documentation submitted for academic scrutiny.

Where an External Examiner has recommended a change to the proposals or has raised issues which need to be addressed, the Programme Team must submit a written response to these indicating either how the changes have been implemented or why they have not been implemented.

#### 5.5 Scrutiny by FADC

The SAF or the Modification Proforma, together with associated documentation should be submitted to the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator who will check documentation and arrange for the proposal to be scrutinised by FADC.

Faculty/Campus Quality Administrators will hold a list of FADC dates and the required submission dates for these meetings.

FADCs may choose to consider the modification in one of the following ways:

- submission to full FADC
- submission to a sub-group of FADC
- submission to a Panel convened under the auspices of FADC

Having considered the proposal, and where appropriate, the FADC will make a recommendation to the PARM Standing Panel to ratify approval of the proposal.

Where conditions of approval are attached to the recommendation, these must be fulfilled & approved by the Chair of FADC before the recommendation is submitted to the PARM Standing Panel.

The Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator will include the recommendation, together with confirmation of compliance with any conditions, in a standard Faculty report to the next PARM Standing Panel for ratification.

Proposals **must not be implemented** until any conditions of approval have been approved by the Chair of FADC.

## **5.6 Scrutiny by PARM Standing Panel**

*For information on the remit and membership of the PARM Standing Panel see the Academic Regulations and Procedures Handbook Section [PARM Standing Panel](#).*

### **5.6.1 The PARM Standing Panel**

The PARM Standing Panel is a centrally-based panel comprising internal and external representatives. The Panel will meet on regular pre-determined dates through the year which are published, in advance, across the University.

The Panel undertakes a variety of actions in relation to the review and modification of existing programmes, and the approval of a limited range of new programmes and awards (OPP).

CASQE and Faculty/Campus Quality Administrators will hold the dates of PARM Standing Panel meetings for the academic year together with deadline dates\* for submission.

*NB The deadline dates will be for receipt, **by CASQE**, of finalised, completed and copied documentation.*

### **5.6.2 Preparation and Submission of Documentation for submission to PARM Standing Panel**

Appropriate documentation for the Standing Panel should be completed by the Programme Team and **submitted sufficiently in advance of the deadline 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, to the documentation. 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 Undergraduate and for Taught Postgraduate Programmes of Study and evidence of any approved variation/exemption
- Adherence to QAA's Academic Infrastructure, ie the Framework for HE Qualifications, Subject Benchmark statements, Code of Practice
- Consistency with proposed changes identified in the approved SAF R+D
- Consistency with faculty plans, the University's equality policies and institutional codes of practice.

- Evidence of External Examiner support for the proposed changes.

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

The F/CQA, CASQE Link Officer and CeLT will be responsible for undertaking the “daffing” of documentation.

**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 CASQE.**

Documentation must include either a SAF R+D or a Modification Proforma and any supporting documentation as indicated in [Table 3](#).

A student meeting (and subsequent report) is only required where the proposal directly affects existing students.

The Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator will be responsible for checking the completeness of documentation and for providing the requisite number of copies for CASQE to circulate to Standing Panel members. CASQE will circulate documentation to the PARM Standing Panel **two weeks** in advance of a Panel meeting.

### 5.6.3 Attendance at the PARM Standing Panel

The Programme Team will not be required to attend the PARM Standing Panel meeting to discuss its proposal with Panel members. A designated senior member of the Team (normally the Programme Leader) should be available during the Panel’s deliberations so that specific queries can be dealt with speedily in order to obviate the need for unnecessary delays or conditions. Should any specific issues arise, the Panel Chair may request that one or more persons are asked to attend the Panel meeting to discuss the proposal as s/he deems appropriate.

### 5.6.4 Outcome of the PARM Standing Panel

Having considered the proposal, and where appropriate, the PARM Standing Panel will make a recommendation to the ASSc to approve the proposal.

The outcome of the PARM Standing Panel’s scrutiny will comprise:

- A recommendation on whether or not the proposal should be approved (with or without conditions)
- **For collaborative partner proposals only** – a recommendation on whether the partner staff identified to teach on the programme are suitable for Recognised Tutor Status
- any conditions which must be fulfilled prior to commencement of the modified programme
- a deadline date for submission of the programme team’s response to any conditions
- any recommendations which must be considered as part of the programme’s annual monitoring exercise
- any good practice noted by the Standing Panel
- its recommendation to the University to approve or not approve the proposal.

## Report

The outcomes (action focused) will be recorded in a PARM Standing Panel Report which will be sent to the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator for circulation to the Programme Team and other interested parties.

## Response to Conditions

Where conditions are set, the Programme Team must provide a written response (plus any supporting documentation required).

The response must be recorded on Section B of the PARM Standing Panel Report template by the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator and returned, together with any supporting documentation, to CASQE by the deadline date. CASQE will seek approval of the Standing Panel Chair.

On receipt of the report and confirmation that the programme team has made a satisfactory response to any conditions, the Head of CASQE will make a recommendation to the Academic Standards Sub-committee to confirm the outcome of the Panel.

CASQE will report the final decision of ASSc to Faculty/Campus Quality Administrators who will, in turn, be responsible for advising all interested parties of the decision.

Proposals **must not be implemented** until any conditions of approval have been approved by the Standing Panel Chair.

## **5.7 Scrutiny by Modification Event**

Where modifications are considered to be significant enough, or there are additional factors (eg PSRB requirements for visit or panel event) the Head of CASQE may determine that a full Modification Event must be convened. Where the proposals require strategic approval, the SAF R+D must be submitted to P&MI and approved by the Deputy Vice Chancellor **before** the Modification Panel Event.

As soon as strategic approval is received and/or Head of CASQE confirmation of the appropriate process has been agreed, the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator will convene a Formal Planning Meeting with the Programme representatives, Senior Faculty/Campus SAS managers, CASQE and CPO (where relevant) to determine arrangements for the event, documentation, panel membership etc.

The Modification Event is organised and convened by the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator and will meet on a specified date with a remit to:

- consider documentation
- discuss the proposal with programme team representatives
- meet students (*where appropriate*)

The Panel will make its recommendations to the University in the form of a formal report.

## 6. ORGANISATION OF A MODIFICATION EVENT

### 6.1 Formal Planning Meeting

In preparation for a Modification 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 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.

### 6.2 Modification Panels

A Modification 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 the 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 modification(s) under consideration (or the requirements of any other relevant awarding body);
- be aware of the additional requirements involved in the modification 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).

### 6.3 **Panel Membership**

The composition of a Modification Panel should therefore normally include the following:

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

Exceptionally, the following panel members may also be required:

- Additional external assessor(s) – *where more than one discrete subject area is under scrutiny (seek the guidance of CASQE)*
- Academic Board Research Degrees Committee Representative (from another Faculty) - *for research proposals (see below)*
- CASQE representative – *where provision is 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 one independent **external assessor** 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 [form 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.

#### 6.4 **Additional Panel Members**

Additional external and/or internal members are appointed to the Panel as directed by 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 R+Ds 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.

## 6.5 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) 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 a Modification 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 PARM8](#) should be completed, signed by the Dean of Faculty or Head of Faculty/Campus SAS and submitted, together with a full CV, 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/Campus

Quality Administrator 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.

#### 6.5.1 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.

#### 6.6 **The Modification Event**

Once Strategic Approval is granted, the Head of Faculty/Campus SAS or their nominee (eg Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator) normally sends out the notice of meeting. Where more than one Faculty is involved, the Faculty 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.

## 6.7 **Aims of the Event**

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

- programme aims and learning outcomes
- curriculum content
- learning teaching and assessment strategies
- 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

## 6.8 **Schedule for the Event**

The schedule for a Modification 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 student representatives** of the programme (where appropriate) ((c. 30-45 minutes) including:
  - current students at different stages on the programme and (where appropriate) on different routes
  - recently graduated students
  - Combined Honours students (where relevant)
- iii **Brief Private Panel meeting** (c. 15 minutes) to reflect on proposed agenda for the meeting with programme team representatives in light of discussions with students
- iv **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)

- v **Final private meeting of the Panel** (c.15 minutes)  
*to take stock of its discussions and to reach a judgement on whether to recommend approval of the modifications and to formulate any conditions of approval and/or recommendations for further consideration*
- vi **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.*

## 6.9 **Faculty/Programme “Observer” at Private Panel Meetings**

The Panel may agree to 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 Leaders 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.**

## 6.10 **Documentation for the Event**

In organising an Event, the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator 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**

- o **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 proposed modification):*

- 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**

- **Course Development Plan**  
*There should be a single Plan for each Programme Specification under consideration demonstrating that the Programme Team's plans for modifying the programme will maintain academic standards and enhance the quality of the*

student experience. The focus of this material will depend on the scope of the modification but should include the following:

**Section 1: Background and context**

Provide a very brief summary of the history of the course(s) and an overview of how the course(s) is delivered, e.g. full and / or part time, distance / blended learning, traditional taught units or a mixture of theory and practice, PSRB accredited. Identify when the course(s) was validated or last reviewed

**Section 2: The Strategic Approval Form (SAF R+D)**

(as approved by P&M), which should a sound academic rationale for the developments and a robust business case to ensure their viability

**Section 3: An Analysis Key Issues relating to the Modification**

Provide a brief analysis of the factors affecting the Programme Team's decision to implement the proposed modifications to the course

**Section 4: Proposed Changes**

- Briefly state the modification and the proposed date of implementation, e.g. It is proposed to introduce, with effect from September 2010, a new award/route of BA (Hons) Clay Pots within the existing Shiny Pots Undergraduate Course.
- Provide details of transitional arrangements for current students transferring onto revised course.
- Provide outline diagrams of current and proposed course structure.
- List all changes to the course(s) as part of the proposal.

Note: This information is required for the University academic database and should include any changes to the course structure which will need to be recorded for the student record system and which might not necessarily be captured within a revised programme specification, eg units (ie removed, added, title changes). The information should be briefly outlined in bullet points in an appropriate format to allow the list to be extracted from the Course Development Plan and included in an Appendix to the Modification Report

- Routes/award titles (final and interim) - new
- Routes/award titles (final and interim) - amended titles
- Routes/award titles (final and interim) - discontinued
- Unit Specifications - new
- Unit Specifications – amended titles
- Variations to /exemption from University Regulations
- Changes to course structure (eg from 6x20 units to 4x30)

**Section 5: Action Plan**

Provide an action plan that addresses the issues raised in Section 3 include who is responsible for action, when and how the plan will be reviewed.

**Section 6: Appendices:**

- **Summary CVs of staff teaching on the modified course(s)** 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

and for proposals involving Collaborative Partnerships:

- **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.

- **CVs for collaborative partner staff teaching on the proposed arrangement;**
- **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.*

- **Subject External Examiner(s) Support for Changes**

*(completed External Examiner Consultation Forms together with feedback from the Programme Team regarding any recommendations made by the External Examiner(s))*

- **Programme Specification** (amended)

- **Unit Specifications**

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

Undergraduate Programmes

*All 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.*

- **Any additional briefing or supporting material specific to the proposal 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**

### **6.11 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, to the documentation. 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 Undergraduate and for Taught Postgraduate Programmes of Study and evidence of any approved variation/exemption
- Adherence to QAA's Academic Infrastructure, ie the Framework for HE Qualifications, Subject Benchmark statements, Code of Practice
- Consistency with proposed changes identified in the approved SAF R+D
- Consistency with faculty plans, the University's equality policies and institutional codes of practice.
- Evidence of External Examiner support for the proposed changes.

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

**The Faculty/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.**

### **6.12 Decision Making Process**

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Panel normally decides the outcome of the event, framed as a recommendation to the ADC's Academic Standards Sub-committee.

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 of approval of the proposed modification is more than a simple judgement that a programme continues to meet the specific requirements for an award. In order to be in a position to recommend the approval of a Modification, the Panel will normally be expected to satisfy itself, through consideration of documentation and open discussion, that the modified 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 a validated 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 development, and an atmosphere in which rational debate is encouraged.
- iv The admission of a student to a course or 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 and the University's assessment regulations

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, including any amendments which the Academic Board may make to them.
- viii The quality of the student experience is appropriate and there is explicit evidence of student satisfaction. It is expected that such evidence shall normally be provided through a meeting of the Panel with student representatives, although this arrangement may be varied in the case of programmes delivered by flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning);
- ix For **collaborative provision**, a **signed Formal Agreement must in place BEFORE** the delivery of the programme at a new partner organisation 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 modification. 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, i.e. attempted to construct a view of what happens in the intellectual development of students on the programme.
- iv Where significant modifications are proposed, the Team should be able to show that it has thought through the day-to-day experience of what it will be like to be a student on the modified 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.

### 6.13 **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.

#### **6.14 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 decision, any conditions of approval and recommendations, the deadline date for a response to any conditions and any good practice noted by the Panel.

#### **6.15 Evaluation of the Event**

An evaluation of the effectiveness of Modification Events should be conducted through *inter alia* 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.

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

### **6.16.1 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.

### **6.16.2 Draft Report**

Following the Modification 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 should 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 modification reports.

The purpose of the report is to provide an accurate summary of the main points of discussion, together with a 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 and of 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. Comments/changes to the draft report proposed by Panel members must also be approved by the Panel Chair prior to inclusion in the confirmed report.

### **6.16.3 Confirmed Report**

The confirmed report, together with the approved modified Programme Specification(s), 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
- 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*

## **6.17 Fulfilment of Conditions and Recommendations**

### **6.17.1 Conditions of Approval**

The Programme Team must submit a written response to any conditions of approval to the Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator 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 Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator 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.

#### 6.17.2 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 made.

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

Responsibility for the approval of Major Modifications lies with the Academic Board's Academic & Standards Sub-committee, which has delegated authority on behalf of the Academic Board's ADC and which must approve all recommendations for approval by this Sub-committee **prior to their implementation. Retrospective approval may not be granted.** All decisions by the Sub-committee are reported to ADC, and from ADC to the Academic Board.

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 recommendation of approval.

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 Panels each academic year and the status of the modified programme is then updated on the register of programmes in approval together with the date of the next review

#### 6.19 Action Required following Approval of Modification

Once a Modification has been approved via a Modification Event process, the home Faculty of the programme must notify the following:

- Other faculties affected by the modification(s)
- Home Department(s)/Programme Team(s) for inclusion in the Programme Log

The on-line definitive document is the "authoritative" version, 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, electronically, when the updated version is published.

## **7. MODIFICATION OF NON-AWARD-BEARING PROGRAMMES**

The modified 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

### **7.1 Procedure**

Modifications to non-award-bearing programmes should be handled as minor modifications with the following exceptions:

- Introduction of /amendment to a formal collaborative arrangement
- variation to University regulations

Faculties should contact CASQE for advice on the level of modification activity required in these circumstances.

## **8. MODIFICATIONS TO POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH PROGRAMMES**

The procedures and arrangements for modifications to research programmes are, essentially, the same as those for the University's taught provision. However, responsibility for discharging the central 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:

## Minor Modifications

STAGE/ACTIVITY	TAUGHT PROVISION	TAUGHT RESEARCH
Minor Modification proposals	Considered by FADC	Considered by FRDC

## Major Modifications

STAGE/ACTIVITY	TAUGHT PROVISION	TAUGHT RESEARCH
Initial consideration of SAF R+D	Faculty Executive Group	Faculty Executive Group
Submission to SAS following Faculty approval	Planning & Management Information (P&MI)	Submit to RED Office RED submits SAF R+D to P&MI
Consideration for "Strategic Approval by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC) for Strategic Planning	P&MI submits recommendations to DVC for Strategic Planning	P&MI submits recommendations to DVC for Strategic Planning
Faculty and CASQE notified of "Strategic Approval"	Planning & Development notify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• CASQE</li> </ul>	Planning & Development notify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• RED</li> <li>• CASQE</li> </ul> <i>(copied to CASQE to ensure all new proposals are captured for the academic database, conferments etc)</i>
Arrangements for consideration by FADC/ Standing Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F/CQA or</li> <li>• CASQE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty Research Office or</li> <li>• F/CQA</li> </ul> <i>as appropriate</i>
Where proposals go to Standing Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PARM Standing Panel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University Research Degrees Committee</li> </ul>
Checking documentation prior to submission for academic scrutiny	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F/CQA</li> <li>• CASQE Officer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F/CQA</li> <li>• RED Officer</li> </ul>
Approval of External Assessors for full Modification Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of CASQE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director of RED</li> </ul>
Event Panel :	<p>Nature of Panel Membership approved by Head of CASQE</p> <p>Panel must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair: Academic Board rep</li> <li>• Faculty/Campus Quality Administrator <i>(requests for Chair to be made to CASQE)</i></li> </ul>	<p>Nature of Panel Membership approved by Head of RED</p> <p>Panel must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair: Director of RED (or nominee)</li> <li>• RED Representative <i>(requests for chair to be made to RED)</i></li> </ul>
Confirmed Modification Event Report submitted to:	CASQE	RED <i>(with copy to CASQE as above to ensure all new proposals are captured for the academic database, conferments 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 Tutor Status
SAF N	Strategic Approval Form (New programmes)
SAF R+D	Strategic Approval Form (Review, Modification and Discontinuation)
SAS	Student and Academic Services

# PROGRAMME MAJOR MODIFICATION

## Stage 1 – Strategic Agreement

