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1 UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES FOR THE MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT OF QUALITY

1.1 Principles

1.1.1 The University has in place a number of key strategy documents which inform and underpin the institution’s approach to quality management enhancement. These include the following:

- University Strategic Framework, 2015-20
- Learning and Teaching Strategy, 2015-20

1.1.2 The following principles form the basis for the University's academic quality assurance and enhancement procedures:

(i) Quality Assurance and enhancement is a shared activity, owned and carried out at the closest possible point to the process of learning and teaching. It is a professional exercise rather than a management function. All academic staff are involved in the achievement and maintenance of standards and the enhancement of quality.

(ii) Quality Assurance and enhancement should be regarded as a holistic process of review, approval of goals, evaluation and reconsideration and re-approval of goals, a dynamic cycle generating continuous improvement in the design and delivery of core activities. It involves responsive action based on critical, confident self-appraisal.

(iii) The University's internal quality assurance and enhancement mechanisms operate, where relevant, in conjunction with professional bodies and take account of external quality agencies, such as QAA and OFSTED and, in the case of Professional Service Departments, external professional bodies. At the same time the University promotes autonomy in learning and teaching and recognises the need to be open to experimentation and change.

(iv) Effective action rests on sound planning where the setting of goals and resource planning are closely aligned to ensure the quality of the learning experience.

(v) "Gold plating", through the employment of unnecessary bureaucratic procedures to guarantee a good external review outcome is avoided by the development of targeted and proportional quality mechanisms.

1.1.3 The University is committed to providing a fair environment in which everyone is treated with dignity and respect. This means sustaining a culture that is free from discrimination linked to age, caring responsibilities, disability, gender identity or reassignment, marital status (including civil partnership status) pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex or sexual orientation, or any combination of these characteristics.

1.1.4 The University takes a proactive approach to promoting equality and is committed to a range of actions intended to create a welcoming and positive environment for all staff, students and stakeholders. In designing programmes every effort should be made to ensure that programme content and approaches to learning and teaching promote equality across all the characteristics above.

1.1.5 With regard to disability, reasonable adjustments should be made to the delivery of programmes, including the approaches to learning and teaching and assessment, for the individual needs of disabled students. Anticipation of potential adjustments should form part of the planning for all programmes but in particular those in which
field work, placement, work experience or study abroad form an integral part of the programme.

1.2 Enhancement

1.2.1 The University seeks to create and maintain an ethos, which expects and encourages the enhancement of student learning opportunities at all levels of the University. All review and approval processes include opportunities to identify and in some cases to commend good practice. Good practice is reflected in summation reports at Faculty and Institution level and these are considered through the formal committee structure. Opportunities for sharing good practice also exist through staff development activities and through conferences and forums, such as the Annual Learning and Teaching Conference and the Collaborative Partners Forum.

1.2.2 The University seeks the integration of enhancement initiatives in a systematic and planned way at institution level. The enhancement of the student experience is at the heart of the University’s strategic planning. Students and the student experience are at the centre of the Strategic Framework for 2015-2020.

1.2.3 A significant element in the University’s enhancement strategy is the identification of areas that require action on a University level to bring about enhancement for improvement. Such activities are identified and given goals and outcomes by the Senior Management Team, supported through the University’s committee structure, and managed, evaluated, and disseminated using a project management methodology, by key personnel and working groups.

1.3 The Regulatory Framework

1.3.1 The University has a full set of Academic Regulations that are approved by Academic Board. These are set out in the Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards.

1.3.2 The procedures that must be followed to ensure that the University’s regulations are met are set out in the Assessment Procedures. This is available on the QSO website and must be followed. Relevant University Regulations are included in the Assessment Procedures for ease of use and are shaded in grey.

1.3.3 A number of programmes require Special Regulations that extend or set aside the University’s regulations, either in response to external professional and regulatory bodies or to meet other specific requirements. These must be approved by the Academic Board and have the same status as any other regulation.

1.3.4 The following procedure is to be used to approve Special Regulations.

(i) Special Regulations will be approved as part of the validation process. Additional regulations must be detailed in the programme specification and identified explicitly as such. It will be the responsibility of the Validation Panel to ensure that additional regulations are as far as possible consistent with each other and to ensure that variation from Frameworks and Schemes occurs only where such an arrangement is unavoidable and taken on academic grounds.

(ii) Variations to regulations that are not approved explicitly as Special Regulations by the Validation Panel will not apply.

(iii) Special Regulations are approved by the Academic Board on the recommendation of the Education and Student Experience Committee, following scrutiny.

(iv) Special Regulations will be appended to the Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards and shown on the QSO website.
1.4 **Annual Review Cycle**

1.4.1 It is the role of the Academic Board to plan the University’s academic activities including the structure, nature and content of study programmes, schemes and academic infrastructures. The Academic Board retains overall responsibility for the standards of the University’s awards and the quality of its programmes and determines where authority lies and which categories of people are involved regarding the maintenance of standards and the management and enhancement of the quality of the student experience.

1.4.2 The Education and Student Experience Committee has oversight of and is responsible for assuring the Academic Board that standards are being maintained and the quality of the student experience is being managed and enhanced.

1.4.3 The Quality Monitoring and Review Sub Committee is responsible for keeping the University’s academic infrastructure under review and making appropriate recommendations for modification which, following consideration by the Education and Student Experience Committee, will be considered for approval by the Academic Board.

1.4.4 The Academic Board, through its Education and Student Experience Committee, oversees the annual cycle of monitoring and evaluation of the key elements of quality management, including:

- The annual monitoring of programmes;
- The annual summary report on the conduct of quality matters where authority is delegated to Faculties;
- The annual monitoring of professional service departments;
- The annual report on the external examiner system;
- The annual review of key aspects of the quality assurance system, including the operation of:
  - University Regulations;
  - the Programme Planning Process;
  - the Validation Process;
  - Collaborative Provision;
  - the Periodic Programme Review process;
  - research programmes;
  - complaints procedures;
  - appeals process.

1.4.5 Annual monitoring of programmes draws on a number of sources of information, including:

- University monitoring data for retention, progression, achievement (MIRS)
- Careers and employability data
- (Annual) University Student Survey (USS)
- The National Student Survey (NSS)
- The Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (implemented from 2015)
- The Postgraduate Research Experience Survey
- Staff views gathered through the annual monitoring process
- Student Staff Liaison Minutes (retained by Academic Schools/Centres)
- External Examiner reports (published on website)
- The outcome of Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) engagement
1.4.6 All reviews and evaluations lead to action plans, which include an indication of what must be achieved to complete the action, the responsibility with whom the action rests, and the date by which completion is expected. All action plans must be completed with actions identified as completed or carried over.

1.4.7 Evaluation of activities is integrated and reported to the Academic Board through a number of mechanisms, including:

- Annual Report on the Maintenance of Academic Standards and the Management and Enhancement of the Quality of the Student Learning Experience;
- Annual Report on External Examining activity for the Academic Board by the Director of Quality and Standards.
### 1.5 Definitions

Figure 1-2 sets out the definition of terms used in this manual.

**Figure 1-1 Definitions**

| **Accreditation** | The process by which the University allows greater autonomy in areas of quality assurance to partners that are working with the University to confer a University award, and which over a period of time have demonstrated their ability to have management of quality and enhancement delegated to them. The University does not at the present have such arrangements. Offering validated programmes does not in itself evidence the capacity to so act. |
| **Advanced Standing** | The use of Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) to gain entry to a programme at a stage of a programme later than the normal admission stage. This is normally through Recognition of Prior Certificated Learning (RPCL), but can be through Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning (RPEL). Advanced Standing does not result in the award of credits by the University. |
| **Articulation agreement** | An articulation agreement is a formal agreement that allows specific credit that has been gained from one higher education institution to be transferred to another institution as advanced standing. The right to such advanced standing applies to all students covered by the agreement, who have gained that specific credit, without a further consideration of that credit, subject to any limitations set out in the agreement. An articulation agreement is therefore covered by Chapter B10 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, as the University in receipt of the credits will need to assure itself of the quality and standards of the learning that is undertaken at its partner and cannot do this though an assessment of the achievement of the individual student. It contrasts therefore with RPL (qv) where there is no prior commitment to offer a student advanced standing and where entry is dependent on an assessment of the achievement of a student, and with a Progression Accord (qv), where no credit is being imported and where there may be additional hurdles, such as an interview. |
| **Blended learning** | Programme delivered using a combination of traditional classroom-based learning and distance learning, normally using such information technologies as video-conferencing, audio-conferencing, Internet, CD-ROM, and other media, and underpinned by effective learner support systems. |
| **Characteristics Statements** | The QAA has published characteristic statements for four areas of academic activity (i) Doctoral degrees, (ii) Master's degrees, (iii) Foundation degrees, (iv) Qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body. It is University policy that its awards should be consistent with these. |
| **Collaborative provision** | Collaborative Provision is an arrangement in which a higher education institution enters into partnership with another organisation to offer academic programmes together. Collaborative programmes are primarily those where students are registered as students of the University but study in whole or in part at another organisation. Students are registered as students of the University and receive an award from the University, the standard of which is guaranteed by the University as equivalent of the awards it delivers entirely itself. |
| **Credit** | Credit is an educational currency that provides a means of quantifying learning achieved at a given level of study. It is awarded to students who have demonstrated that they have attained the specified intended learning outcomes of a module/programme. The amount of credit attributed or awarded is based upon an estimate of the notional average time which it would take the student to acquire the specified learning at a given level. Credit is awarded for achievement at or above a threshold or pass level. One credit is attributed to 10 hours of notional learning time at a specified level. |
120 credits are attributed to the learning acquired at a particular level in a full-time academic year of approximately 30 weeks. One full-time academic year involves 1200 hours of notional learning time; one full time week involves 40 hours of notional learning time.

Students using RPL for Advanced Standing may “reuse” credits that have already been used for other awards but only on one occasion. Credit cannot be re-used for other purposes except to support an RPEL application. Only the credits and not the marks or grades derived from those credits can be re-used.

Where credits are re-used for Advanced Standing it is expected that they will only be used for a purpose different from their original use. This is an academic decision to be taken when the admission decision is made.

The University currently manages the majority of its taught awards through the Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards. This sets out the architecture of taught undergraduate and taught postgraduate awards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HE qualifications as set out in the FHEQ</th>
<th>FHEQ Level</th>
<th>Minimum credits</th>
<th>Minimum at award level</th>
<th>FQ-EHEA cycles</th>
<th>ECTS credit ranges from the FQ-EHEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD/DPhil就这样</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not typically credit-rated</td>
<td>Third cycle (end of cycle) qualifications</td>
<td>Not typically credit-rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional doctorates (e.g. EdD, DBA, D ClinPsych)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research master’s degrees (e.g. MPhil, MLitt)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not typically credit-rated</td>
<td>Second cycle (end of cycle) qualifications</td>
<td>The minimum requirement is 60 ECTS credits; however a range of 90-120 ECTS credits is more typical at second cycle level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught MPhil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught master’s degrees (e.g. MA, MSc, MRes)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated master’s degrees (e.g. MPharm)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate diplomas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate certificates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degrees with honours (e.g. BA/BSc Hons)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>First cycle (end of cycle) qualifications</td>
<td>180-240 credits ECTS credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degrees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate diplomas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate certificates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Degrees (e.g. FD)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Short cycle (within or linked to the first cycle) qualifications</td>
<td>Approximately 120 ECTS credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomas of Higher Education (Dip HE)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher National Diplomas (HND)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher National Certificates (HNC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance learning</td>
<td>Distance learning is a mode of study in which students undertake programmes of study outside and institutional environment and usually without face-to-face tuition. Distance Learning programme documentation requires specific information detailing how the distance learning programme will operate and be managed and how quality and standards are to be assured. Academic standards for distance learning and the quality of provision should be equivalent to those offered at the University. Distance-learning materials required for the operation of the programme must be prepared in advance of the validation process and must be presented with the proposal at these events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Framework for Higher Education Qualifications | The main purposes of *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ)*, as summarised form page 6 of the second edition of the framework (August 2008) are:  
- To provide reference points to set and assess standards  
- Assist in indicating progression routes  
- Promote a shared understanding of expectations associated with typical qualifications.  
The framework provides level descriptors at levels 4-8. The design of University programmes embeds the FHEQ. Level descriptors must be utilised in programme design.  
This is subsumed within Part A of the *UK Quality Code for Higher Education* (qv).  
See also Higher education credit framework for England. |
| Franchise | A collaborative provision arrangement where a partner works with the University to confer a University award or credit that has been developed within the University. |
| Higher education credit framework for England | The *Higher education credit framework for England: guidance on academic credit arrangements in higher education in England* (August 2008) offers guidance for programme credit arrangements. Please note that the University does not offer all these awards. |
| Intended learning outcome | Intended Learning Outcomes identify what a successful student is expected to achieve on the completion of an award. They embody the educational purposes and values of the overall learning experience within a programme of study and provide the strategic framework for the process of learning. |
| Level | The University recognises the following higher education levels of achievement:  
Level 0: University learning, such as a Foundation Year of a degree, that does not result in the award of HE credit but may comprise the first year of a four-year programme of study.  
Level 4: Certificates of Higher Education  
Level 5: Foundation degrees, Diplomas of Higher Education  
Level 6: Ordinary (Bachelors) degrees, Bachelor’s degrees with Honours, Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas, Professional Graduate Certificates in Education |
| **Level 7**: Masters degrees, Postgraduate Certificates, Postgraduate Diplomas, Post-graduate Certificates in Education |
| Level 8: Doctorates |
| **Module** | A module is a component of study within a programme. Each module has its own aims and intended learning outcomes which are assessed during that module. A University module normally represents a notional 200 hours of study and carries 20 credits. |
| **Non-credit bearing programmes and courses** | Programmes and courses that do not carry HE credit but result in an award of the University and are subject to the same regulations. These may be allocated to Levels 4-8 in the Framework for Higher Education (QAA). Where a programme or course does not carry credit, these will follow the same planning, approval and review processes as would a credit-bearing programme with a comparable learning time. Courses which offer an attendance certificate are classed as non-credit bearing courses and must follow the appropriate planning, approval and review process. The FDQ will advise as to what constitutes a course for this purpose. |
| **Pathway** | A pathway is normally used to denote a route through a programme that carries a discrete award of the University. |
| **Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body** | A Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) is an organisation which is authorised to accredit, approve or recognise specific programmes. Faculty Quality Committees have responsibility for the oversight of the reports by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies. Annual reports regarding PSRB activity are received by the Quality Monitoring and Review Sub Committee. |
| **Programme** | A programme is an approved curriculum which provides a coherent academic experience, expressed in its generic aims and objectives, followed by a registered student and leading to a named award. A programme is also a term used for the work in one subject within a combined honours degree. It may also refer to the main pathways through a modular scheme, which may itself include several subjects. A programme normally comprises a minimum of 60 credits and normally corresponds to qualification in the FHEQ. |
| **Progression agreement** | A formal agreement that allows a student who completes one qualification entry to another, subject to any limitations imposed by the accord. Where limitations exist, they may include specific levels of achievement on the award that has been completed, or additional hurdles such as an interview. Unlike an Articulation Agreement (qv), the institution receiving the student does not take any responsibility for the standards of the award to be achieved for entry. |
| **Quality Strategy Group** | A Group, comprising key members of the Quality and Standards Office and the Faculty Directors of Quality, which meets monthly to consider key strategic and operational issues relating to academic quality. It is not a decision-making body and it is not a substitute for University-wide consultation or for the deliberative function of University committees and sub-committees. |
| **Recognition of prior learning (RPL)** | A process that recognises learning undertaken outside the programme of study being taken. This can be through either  
| | - the recognition of prior certificated learning (RPCL), where no credit is awarded by the University  
| | - the recognition of prior experiential learning (RPEL), where credit is awarded by the University.  
| **The accreditation of prior learning** | is governed by a number of principles, as follows.  
| | - Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) may take one of two forms, Recognition of Prior Certificated Learning (RPCL) and the Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning (RPEL).  
| | - RPL may be used either for advanced standing into a programme or for the award of credit.  
| | - Decisions regarding RPL are a matter of academic judgement normally made by academic staff.  
| | - Decisions regarding RPL should be transparent, and demonstrably rigorous and fair.  
| | - Information available to students should be accessible and explicit and clearly define the roles and responsibilities of those administering RPL.  
| | - Where for academic reasons, a programme does not allow RPL to be used, or where opportunities for RPL are limited, this should be stated clearly in the validation document together with the appropriate academic rationale.  
| | - The opportunity for RPL and Advanced Standing is limited in the following ways. Where the award is classified, RPL and Advanced Standing is limited to 50 per cent of the modules contributing to the classification. Where the award is unclassified, RPL and Advanced Standing is limited to 50 per cent of the modules comprising the programme.  
| | - The smallest unit for which RPL may be used is for a module, unless specifically approved by the QSO to meet the requirements of an external regulatory body. In this instance, it is a requirement that the intended learning outcomes of the element of the module for which RPL is sought are specified.  
| | - Learning used for RPL should normally have occurred during the previous five years.  
| | - Before RPL can be awarded, the University must be satisfied by the authenticity of the application. The identity of the applicant and the ownership of the certification must be established and there may be a need to contact other institutions. Only originals of certification or evidence certified by the awarding body must be considered as part of an RPCL claim.  
| **Regulations** | A set of rules and requirements approved by Academic Board that must be followed. These may relate to the whole of the academic portfolio or be specific to a programme. Regulations cannot be set aside or qualified by a subsidiary process. The University’s regulations are set out in the *Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards*.  
| **Special Regulations** | This denotes a regulation that is approved to extend or vary the University regulations for a programme or group of programmes.  
| **Scheme** | A Scheme is an arrangement to manage programmes with a particular philosophy and academic structure. All Schemes fall within the regulatory requirements of the *Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards*. The Academic Board, acting on the recommendation of the appropriate committee, has the authority to establish a Scheme.  
| | *Protocols* refers to a procedure relating to the management and operation of a Scheme, have no regulatory force. A scheme Protocol cannot over-ride a regulation. |
### Short Course
A short course is a course of study of no greater than 400 hours learning time, usually but not always credited, and which normally leads to a University Certificate.

### Suite
The term used for a cluster of programmes within a scheme, which have core modules in common.

### Subject benchmarks
'Subject benchmarks provide a means for the academic community to describe the nature and characteristics of programmes in a specific subject. They also represent general expectations about the standards for the award of qualifications at a given level and articulate the attributes and capabilities that those possessing such qualifications should be able to demonstrate.' (The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education).

Where they exist, subject benchmarks should be consulted in the designing of programmes and, where appropriate, reflected in the aims and intended learning outcomes for those programmes. Unquestioning adherence, however, is not required. Programme designers are encouraged to use them selectively - to adopt those which apply to the design of their particular programme and where necessary to give reasons why others are not applicable or relevant. It is important that programme documentation is clear and explicit about how the relevant benchmark statements have been used.

### UK Quality Code for Higher Education
The UK Quality Code for Higher Education sets out the formal expectations that all UK higher education providers reviewed by QAA [The Quality Assurance Agency] are required to meet. It is the nationally agreed, definitive point of reference for all those involved in delivering higher education programmes that lead to an award from, or are validated by, a UK higher education awarding body (a provider entitled to award degrees). All higher education providers reviewed by QAA must commit to meeting the expectations that it sets out.

**Part A: Setting and maintaining threshold academic standards**
- Qualifications Frameworks
- Characteristics Statements
- Credit Frameworks
- Subject Benchmark Statements

**Part B: Assuring and enhancing academic quality**
- B1: Programme design and approval
- B2: Recruitment, Selection and Admission to Higher Education
- B3: Learning and teaching
- B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement
- B5: Student engagement
- B6: Assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning
- B7: External examining
- B8: Programme monitoring and review
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B9:</td>
<td>Academic appeals and student complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10:</td>
<td>Managing Higher Education Provision with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11:</td>
<td>Research degrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part C: Information about higher education provision**

| Validation | Mechanism for the approval of an academic programme of study. |
2 STUDENT REPRESENTATION, ENGAGEMENT AND PARTNERSHIP

2.1 Principles

2.1.1 The University is committed to ensuring that students are provided with the opportunity to contribute to the shaping of their learning experience, individually, collectively and through the Students’ Union. One of the principles of the University’s Learning & Teaching Strategy (2015-20) is to work with students as partners:

“We recognise that student representation, engagement and partnership have important roles in improving the student experience and delivering an excellent education and outcomes”

2.1.2 The role of student representative is vital to assure a high-quality student experience and to support student retention and success. The following principles provide the framework for student representation within the management of the learning experience.

(i) Student participation and partnership is an essential core component in the design, delivery, review and enhancement of a high-quality educational provision.

(ii) There must be student engagement and representation on all University Academic Board committees and sub-committees, key Faculty committees and in all aspects of programme management.

(iii) Student engagement in reviewing the learning experience is a key aspect of the normal operation of the University; it should enable student involvement in the proactive decision-making processes that underpin their educational experience both within their programme of study and across the wider University.

(iv) The diverse nature of the student population requires that innovative and flexible approaches are adopted in order to overcome the barriers to participation such as mode or location of study.

(v) Students and staff are provided with sufficient information, background knowledge, training and on-going support to enable them to work together as full partners in the production of a high-quality student experience.

(vi) A successful student representation policy recognises that students must be made aware of the outcomes of their involvement in the quality assurance process.

(vii) The operation of student representation will be monitored by partnership between the Quality Standards Office and the Students’ Union in order to ensure that students are enabled to make an effective contribution to the provision and enhancement of a high-quality educational experience.
2.2 Student Partnership Agreement

Our shared mission is to pursue excellence in higher education: transforming individuals, creating knowledge, enriching communities and building a sustainable future. This Partnership Agreement is part of this vision and was developed in equal partnership between Canterbury Christ Church University, Christ Church Students’ Union and students.

**WE VALUE**
- The development of the whole person, respecting and nurturing the inherent dignity and potential of each individual
- The integration of excellent teaching, research and knowledge exchange
- The celebration of being a part of a community which recognises the power of higher education to enrich individuals
- Our friendly, inclusive and professional community of students and staff, preparing individuals to contribute to a just and sustainable future.

**THE UNIVERSITY**
To this end the University undertakes to provide students with:
- A high quality, holistic student experience and opportunities in relation to learning and the wider experience of university
- Access to appropriate support, information, advice and guidance on all aspects of studying, living and working before, during and after their programme.

**STUDENTS**
To this end students undertake to:
- Be proud ambassadors for the University and the Students’ Union and represent them in a manner that best promotes their respective reputations
- Take responsibility for managing their own learning, actively engaging in their programme and supporting their student representatives to help create meaningful dialogue and impactful change.

**THE STUDENTS’ UNION**
To this end the Students’ Union undertake to:
- Represent the interests of students at the University at local and national levels, and champion student representation
- Provide independent advice on academic issues
- Provide a wide range of services and opportunities to support active student and community engagement.
2.3 Student Representatives

Introduction

2.3.1 There will be four strands of elected student representatives:
- Programme Representatives;
- School Representatives;
- Faculty Representatives;
- University Representatives.

2.3.2 All representatives will be elected through a transparent and independent democratic process. All students in the cohort to be represented will be eligible to nominate and elect their representatives and to stand for election.

2.3.3 The purpose of all student representatives is to act as a voice for the students, providing feedback to the University and Christ Church Students’ Union on key issues which affect the student experience and to work proactively to develop and enhance the wider University experience. The system will be most effective when student representatives communicate regularly with the cohort being spoken for.

2.3.4 The Students’ Union has a key role in the training and supporting of student representatives, working across the University to provide administrative support, expert advice and to facilitate the creation of a network of representatives.

2.3.5 The names and contact details of all student representatives will be held by the Students’ Union and by the University’s Quality and Standards Office, and will be publicised to the student body via the virtual learning environment and any other suitable medium. The Students’ Union and the Student Communication Unit will support this activity.

2.3.6 Student representation is to be approved as an item for inclusion in section 6.1 of the HEAR and student representation is a suitable volunteering activity for progression through the Christ Church Extra Award.

Programme Representatives

2.3.7 Both undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes will have Programme Representatives. There will be one or more Programme Representatives(s) for each level of a programme. Programme Student Representatives will represent students and act as their voice on a programme. Activities will include taking part in Staff-Student Liaison Meetings (SSLM) and other programme meetings. Programme Student Representatives will be expected to Chair SSLMs on a regular basis.

2.3.8 The number of Programme Representatives will be determined by the number of students at each programme level. There will be a minimum of one Programme Representative for every 40 students for each level of a programme, irrespective of whether it is a full-time and part-time programme.

2.3.9 Elections will normally be held towards the start of each level of a programme. The Students’ Union will identify and publicise a two-week period during which the elections will take place. Off-site students would be given a longer time in which to vote.

2.3.10 Prior to the elections and training of Programme Representatives, no programme should hold an SSLM or any other meeting requiring student representation.

2.3.11 There is no limit to the number of times that a student may serve as a Programme Representative.

2.3.12 The name, position and current institution of each external examiner will be communicated to all students through inclusion in the Student Programme Handbook and published via the virtual learning environment.
2.3.13 External examiners’ reports must be shared with Programme Representatives, through Student-Staff Liaison Meetings and any other mechanism deemed appropriate by the School/Centre. Programme Representatives and other students should be included in discussions during the formulation of the programme team’s response to External Examiners’ reports. The reports and the responses must also be available via the virtual learning environment.

2.3.14 Programme Representatives must be involved in discussions during the Annual Programme Monitoring process and participate in the creation of reports and responses to external examiners reports

School Representatives

2.3.15 There will, as far as the student population of a school allows, be one undergraduate and one taught postgraduate Student Representative for each School, who will normally represent the School on the Faculty Quality Committee and the Faculty Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee. The Chair of the Committees will ensure that both undergraduate and taught postgraduate population are represented. These School Representatives and such additional representatives as required, to ensure that School Representatives are not over-burdened, will sit on relevant School Committee and/or working groups.

2.3.16 School Representatives will normally be elected from Programme Representatives with existing experience of the role or from students who have participated in a form of academic quality assurance, for example, as members of University Approval panels. Any student is, however, eligible to take on the role of School Representative.

2.3.17 School Representatives can be serving concurrently as Programme Representatives.

2.3.18 Separate arrangements will be made for the representation of postgraduate research students through the Graduate School and the Postgraduate Research Association.

2.3.19 School Representatives should co-ordinate communication and meetings between the Programme Representatives within the School and create a supportive network.

Faculty Representatives

2.3.20 There will be Faculty Representatives elected as are required to enable students to sit on each Faculty Board and to represent the Faculty on those University Committees and Working Groups which require Faculty representation. This will include one undergraduate and one taught postgraduate representative on each Faculty Board. Separate arrangements will be made for the representation of postgraduate research students through the Graduate School and the Postgraduate Research Association.

2.3.21 Faculty Representatives will normally be elected from Programme and School Representatives with existing experience of the role or from students who have participated in a form of academic quality assurance, for example, as members of University Approval panels. Any student is, however, eligible to take on the role of Faculty Representative.

2.3.22 Faculty Representatives can be serving concurrently as Programme and/or School Representatives.

2.3.23 Faculty Representatives should co-ordinate communication and meetings between the School Representatives within the Faculty and create a supportive network.

University Representatives

2.3.24 Students are represented on a number of University Committees and Working Groups by Students’ Union Sabbatical Officers. Where additional student representation is required, and is not provided by Faculty Representatives, additional representatives will be directly elected.
2.3.25 University Representatives will normally be elected from Programme and School Representatives with existing experience of the role or from students who have participated in a form of academic quality assurance, for example, as members of University Approval panels. Any student is, however, eligible to take on the role of Faculty Representative.

2.3.26 University Representatives can be serving concurrently as Programme, and/or School and/or Faculty Representatives.

2.4 Election of Student Representatives

2.4.1 All representatives will be elected through a transparent and independent democratic process. All students in the cohort to be represented will be eligible to nominate and elect their representatives and to stand for election. The election process will be on-line and will be organised and run by the Students’ Union.

2.4.2 Deans, Heads of School, Programme Directors or Committee Chairs are responsible for providing the Students’ Union with the terms of reference of those committees on which student representation is desirable and/or essential. The Students’ Union will publicise the opportunity and request nominations.

2.4.3 All eligible students can volunteer for those committees whose remit is of interest to them e.g. equality & diversity, widening participation. The Students’ Union may also be provided with nominations by the person requesting representation.

2.4.4 The Students’ Union will set up the electronic election process and inform the relevant student cohort. Even if there is only one nomination an election will still be held with an option for students to vote RON (re-open nominations.)

2.4.5 All students will be invited to stand for election as School or Faculty Representatives. There will be a minimum of 12 School Representatives and 4 Faculty Representatives.

2.5 Training of Student Representatives

2.5.1 Training for all student representatives will be undertaken by the Students’ Union in partnership with the University. Training will be offered throughout the academic year in a timely manner and dates will be disseminated in appropriate and varied ways through the Students Union and the Student Communications Unit.

2.5.2 Online training is available for off-site students and those who are unable to attend. Before undertaking any representation role, the student should complete the training either in person or online.

2.5.3 Training will include guidance on Chairing Meetings and the development of Chairing Skills plus guidance on what is considered a general concern and how an individual student issue should be handled.

2.5.4 Training by the Students’ Union will take place regularly so these representatives will be ready to take up their positions in the following academic year.

2.6 Guidelines for Meetings Involving Student Representation

2.6.1 All student representatives should be informed of the agenda and provided with all relevant papers for each meeting that they attend. This must normally be done at least one week before the meeting and with sufficient time to allow consultation with the student body where required. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the student representatives are given the opportunity for briefing before a meeting.

2.6.2 The meeting dates and times must be published at the beginning of the academic year and the first meeting must not take place before there has been an opportunity for the student representatives to have undertaken training.
2.6.3 Where a student is required to travel to another campus to attend a meeting, travel expenses should be paid for a journey over and above their usual commute to University.

2.6.4 Student representatives should be enabled to contribute to the agenda or a meeting where appropriate.

2.6.5 Anonymity is maintained at all times.

2.6.6 Student representatives must not be required to take the meeting notes under any circumstances.

2.6.7 The Chair of a committee is responsible for ensuring that appropriate policies and procedures are made available to student representatives. These should include relevant details of University and School/Centre structures, details of roles, policies and procedures relating to the business of the committee.

2.7 Governance of the Student Representation System

2.7.1 A review of the system of student representation, including Student Programme, School, Faculty and University Representatives, will be undertaken annually by the Students’ Union and University in partnership. This will include gathering data regarding student representative attendance at meetings and feedback from all student representatives as well as from Programme Directors, Heads of School, Deans and Chairs of University committees.

2.7.2 The Students’ Union will also provide the opportunity for students to provide feedback throughout the year and the Students’ Union and University will work in partnership to resolve any issues as they arise.

2.7.3 The University will seek to ensure that student representation meets the requirements of statutory bodies.

2.7.4 The figures below set out the requirements for student representation on institutional and Faculty committees. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of the many possible types of student engagement in aspects of quality monitoring and review.

**Figure 2-1 Student Representatives Required for Institutional Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>SU Sabbatical Officer Requirements</th>
<th>Student Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>SU President</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SU President (Education and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellbeing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Student Experience Committee</td>
<td>SU President (Education and</td>
<td>1 student representative from each Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellbeing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Enterprise Strategy Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 Postgraduate research student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Enterprise Integrity Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 Postgraduate research student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise and Engagement Board</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 student member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning, Teaching and Assessment Working Group</td>
<td>SU President (Education and</td>
<td>1 student from each Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellbeing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee</td>
<td>SU President (Education and</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellbeing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services Quality Committee</td>
<td>One of the SU Presidents</td>
<td>1 student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Monitoring &amp; Review Sub-Committee</td>
<td>SU President</td>
<td>1 student representative from each Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Degrees Sub-Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2 postgraduate research students (representatives of the PGRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Ethics &amp; Governance Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 Postgraduate student (nominee from PGRA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.2  Student Representatives Required for Faculty Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>SU Requirements</th>
<th>Student Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Board</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>At least two students (taken from areas of study determined by the Faculty Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>A student representative from each school and centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>A student representative from each school and centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Research and Enterprise Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 Postgraduate research student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Ethics Panel</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 Postgraduate research student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8  Staff-Student Liaison Meetings

Introduction

2.8.1  Student-Staff Liaison Meetings play an integral role in the University’s approach to student engagement in academic governance. This policy has been drawn up in consultation with Programme Representatives and with the Students’ Union and represents the minimum standard that is required from each programme. Programmes may implement this guidance as appropriate to their needs and structure and are encouraged to develop the role of Programme Representatives beyond this minimum standard. It should be noted that Student-Staff Liaison Meetings should not be seen as the only way through which students should be engaged. The student body should be consulted proactively on key programme developments. It is the responsibility of the Head of School to ensure that the minimum standards are met.

2.8.2  Student-Staff Liaison Meetings are a forum for the active partnership between programme staff and Programme Representatives. Students should participate in:

- informing and enhancing teaching, learning, assessment and content of programme modules, through both formal and informal channels;
- providing advice from the student perspective with regards to programme planning and development;
- providing feedback on the availability, sufficiency and appropriateness of learning resources;
- informing and where appropriate improving the organisation and management of the programme;
- facilitating a fair and equal University experience for the diverse members of the student population;
- providing a written or verbal report on student views to all appropriate committees.
- providing feedback to the student body with regard to the meetings and the issues discussed.

Composition of Staff-Student Liaison Meetings

2.8.3  There must be a Student-Staff Liaison Meeting (SSLM) to cover each programme (or group of programmes). These should be held a minimum of one per term, to enable continuous consultation and feedback.

2.8.4  Student-Staff Liaison Meeting should comprise
(i) all Programme Representatives for the Programme;
(ii) the Programme Director;
(iii) sufficient members of the academic staff as determined by the Head of School in consultation with the Programme Director to enable the meeting to be effective.

2.8.5 Whilst the Student-Staff Liaison meeting will determine who should act in the role of chair, it is expected that this shall be a Programme Representative.

2.8.6 If a Programme Representative is unable to attend a SSLM due to being off-campus an alternative method, such as a live-stream should be found to ensure inclusion.

Timing of Staff-Staff Liaison Meetings

2.8.7 It is the responsibility of the Programme Director to set the meetings in a timely manner and circulate the details to all relevant Programme Representatives. The meeting dates, times and locations must be published in the Student Programme Handbook.

2.8.8 The first SSLM should not take place before the elections and opportunity for training of Programme Representatives has taken place.

2.8.9 Student-Staff Liaison Meeting dates, agendas, minutes and action points should be made available to Programme Representatives via the programme Virtual Learning Environment and/or any other suitable medium.

2.8.10 Student-Staff Liaison Meetings should normally be held in the location that the programme is delivered. Where a student is required to travel to another campus to attend a Student-Staff Liaison meeting, travel expenses should be paid for journeys over and above their usual commute to University.

Conduct of Meetings

2.8.11 Student-Staff Liaison Meetings are mechanisms for discussing matters relating to programmes and programme delivery; Student-Staff Liaison Meetings should be used to discuss matters of general concern not particular matters relating to individual students.

2.8.12 Staff and Programme Representatives should be able to contribute to the agenda making sure there is plenty of time to discuss all issues.

2.8.13 Programme Representatives and staff should not discuss students or staff by name during the meeting, making sure confidentiality is kept at all times.

2.8.14 Notes of the meeting will be taken by a person provided by the School/Centre and circulated to all parties to check the accuracy. Notes should be approved by the next meeting and actions confirmed. Under no circumstances should Programme Representatives be asked to take the notes.

Business of Meetings

2.8.15 In order for Student-Staff Liaison Meetings to be effective their business should include
- External Examiner reports and the response made by the School/Centre; these should also be made available to the wider student body via the virtual learning environment.
- summary reports on programme and/or module evaluation data.
- analysis of relevant NSS and USS data.

2.8.16 Heads of School/Centre are responsible for ensuring that appropriate School/Centre and University policies and procedures are made available to Programme Representatives. These should include relevant details of University and School/Centre structures, details of the role of the Programme Director and policies and procedures relating to student matters and quality processes. This information should also be available through programme handbooks.
2.8.17 Programme Directors should timetable feedback to the student body from Student-Staff Liaison Meetings to occur as part of the teaching week.

2.9 Other matters

2.9.1 Students should be informed how the feedback will be given, such as through the Virtual Learning Environment. Time should be set aside to enable feedback from Student-Staff Liaison meetings to be given to students where dissemination is to occur as part of the teaching week.

2.9.2 Where a student must travel to another campus to attend a Student-Staff Liaison meeting, travel expenses should be paid to those Student Programme Representatives having to travel over and above their usual commute to University.

2.10 Student Handbooks

2.10.1 There should be a student handbook for each programme of study developed using the University template, which can be found at http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/student-handbook.aspx

2.10.2 The student handbook should include outline details of the curriculum as well as the learning, teaching and assessments strategies adopted by the programme team. It should also include guidance on how to obtain both academic and non-academic support. It must inform students of all the University regulations that they will need to know about during their period of study, either directly, or by indicating where the information can be found.

2.10.3 The student handbook is to be approved as part of the programme validation process. The student handbook should be reviewed prior to each new cohort entry and updated as required.
# PROGRAMME APPROVAL

## 3 PROGRAMME APPROVAL

### 3.1 Programme Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The purpose of the programme planning process is to ensure that there is an in-principle case for inclusion of a programme in the University's academic portfolio, and time is not wasted developing programmes that do not meet the University’s strategic needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This process is overseen for the University by the Academic Strategy Committee, while oversight of the detailed activity of programme planning is delegated to faculties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1.1 The full planning process is required in the following instances:

- The development of a new programme;
- The modification of an existing programme, where the modification includes a revised title and/or where there are resource implications (including as part of Periodic Programme Review).

#### 3.1.2 Permission must be sought for the development of a new programme or a new collaborative partnership through the relevant Faculty.

#### 3.1.3 Programme proposers should complete the In-Principle Proposal Form for initial consideration by the Faculty Programme Planning Executive (or alternative Faculty body performing this function). The Head of School shall be consulted before submission. Each Faculty will specify how the in-principle form will be submitted to the Faculty Programme Planning Executive.

#### 3.1.4 The Faculty Programme Planning Executive will review the in-principle form to decide whether

- there is an appropriate rationale for inclusion in the faculty portfolio,
- there is sufficient evidence of market research
- there is likely to be sufficient resource.

#### 3.1.5 Once the Faculty Programme Planning Executive has made its decision, the officer nominated by the faculty will submit the in-principle programme proposal document; along with the Faculty Programme Planning Portfolio to the Academic Strategy Committee. This should be sent to the ASC Secretary by the specified committee deadline.

#### 3.1.6 The Dean will present the proposal and the Faculty Programme Planning Portfolio at the Academic Strategy Committee. The Academic Strategy Committee will, having considered the proposal in the light of the overall University portfolio, authorise the further development of the programme and the award title.

#### 3.1.7 Detailed further planning will be undertaken within the faculty. The programme proposer will fully complete the detailed Programme Planning form, and provide it to Finance and Number Planning, who will produce a finance annex and a student number annex. The template is available at [http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/academic-planning/academic-planning.aspx](http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/academic-planning/academic-planning.aspx).

#### 3.1.8 The completed document will be submitted to the Faculty Programme Planning Executive, for scrutiny and approval to proceed to validation. The Faculty Programme Planning Executive may require amendments to the form before approving it, and will specify the mechanisms for ensuring that the required changes are made. Once the Faculty Programme Planning Executive has approved the detailed planning form, the programme may be advertised 'subject to validation'.

#### 3.1.9 The approved planning document will be submitted to QSO as part of the materials for validation. No programme shall proceed to validation without the approval of the Academic Strategy Committee and the relevant Faculty Programme Planning Executive.
3.1.10 In order that programmes are properly planned in good time for the commencement, the Faculty Programme Planning Executive must normally have approved the detailed planning document nine months before the intended start date.

3.1.11 Where Chair’s actions are necessary to complete this process in a restricted time frame, it will be the responsibility of the faculty to ensure that these are sought and that they are communicated to the Quality and Standards Office.

3.2 The Programme Design process

3.2.1 When the Academic Strategy Committee has decided that a programme has a place in the University’s Academic portfolio, the process of designing the programme normally begins. Programme design occurs within schools, and is normally lead by the programme proposer / the person who will be the programme director.

3.2.2 The University provides some funding to aid programmes in securing external advice during the process of programme design. This may be used to pay an external programme development advisor to review documentation or discuss ideas. The appointment of such an advisor is delegated to the relevant Faculty Director of Quality. Applications should be made on the External Advisor Appointment form - [http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-validation.aspx](http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-validation.aspx)

3.3 External Assessor

3.3.1 An External Assessor must be appointed to participate in the validation process. They will participate both through the submission of a written report in advance of the meeting of the University Validation Panel and through attendance at the meeting of the University Validation Panel. Where an External Assessor is unable to attend the meeting due to unforeseen circumstances, the meeting may continue, subject to the External Assessor’s confirmation that the programme meets national and subject expectations, that it is fit for purpose and that resources are appropriate.

3.3.2 The criteria for the appointment of an External Assessor is as follows:

(i) An External Assessor must have either:
   - a significant academic career in an appropriate field of study which involves experience as a subject of programme manager (e.g. Head of Department, Programme Director, Pathway Director, Professional Lead), a significant research record of national standing, or experience of external examining;
   or
   - relevant professional experience where the field of study has a professional or vocational context, and where appropriate professional registration.

(ii) An External Assessor should normally have five years’ experience in the relevant academic area and a higher degree.

(iii) An External Assessor cannot be, or have been nominated as, or has been within the previous five years an External Examiner on any University award.

(iv) Former members of University staff should not be nominated to become External Assessors before a lapse of at least five years or sufficient time for students taught by that member of staff to have passed through the system, whichever is the longer.

(v) Former students should not be nominated to become External Assessors before a lapse of at least five years.

3.3.3 Where a ‘professional’ External Assessor is appointed, this will always be in addition to the appointment of an ‘academic’ External Assessor.
3.3.4 Using the form provided, the School will nominate an External Assessor meeting the above criteria for the validation. A CV will be required for each nomination. The nominations will be submitted to the Quality Officer managing the validation process at the earliest opportunity. Each nomination will be forwarded to the Quality Manager and the Assistant Director of Quality and Standards for approval.

3.4 Programme Documentation for Validation

3.4.1 The programme team should complete the following documentation

- The Programme Specification, Part One
- The Programme Specification, Part Two, including appendices
- Any relevant special regulations, or scheme protocols
- The programme-specific student handbook
- Staff CVs, for those members of the programme team who are not currently employed by the University, or for all staff where required by a relevant professional body (provided to the Chair for information only)
- The detailed planning form.

3.4.2 Templates for all these documents are available at http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-validation.aspx. A validated programme is a form of contract between multiple stakeholders whereby a programme is approved to provide a particular academic experience appropriate to the subject, students, and sector's expectations.

3.4.3 Distance learning: approval at validation will be required for cases where

- the technology to be used as part of the learning, teaching and assessment strategy is not supported by the University
- the technology to be used as part of the learning, teaching and assessment strategy is supported by the University but is being delivered outside the auspices of the University, such as at a collaborative partner
- a Programme Team seeks to rely on blended or distance learning to deliver the learning outcomes of a programme, module or course, as a substitute for the expected diet of face-to-face activity.

3.4.4 Where a Programme Team seeks to rely on blended or distance learning to deliver the learning outcomes of a programme, module or course, as a substitute for the expected diet of face-to-face activity, the validation event will see a sample of those activities that are used to supplement face-to-face activity. The decision as to whether a sample of work is required and the nature of that sample will be taken by the Faculty Director of Quality in consultation with the Quality and Standards Office, and will normally involve an illustrative module.

3.4.5 It is the responsibility of the faculty to ensure that programme validation documentation that is incomplete or of poor quality is not submitted to validation. Each faculty will specify mechanisms for signing off the programme documentation to proceed to validation.

3.4.6 Programme Validation documentation should be submitted via the office of the Faculty Director of Quality to the Quality Officer managing the validation process.

3.4.7 Documentation should be submitted as soon as possible before the validation event. In the event that documentation has not been received two weeks before a validation event, the event will be postponed, in order to give the panel sufficient time to read the documentation.
3.5 The Validation process

The programme validation process is designed to ensure that there is a strong academic rationale for a programme of study, that it aligns with national and subject expectations, including the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, and will provide an appropriate student experience.

The process is overseen for the University by the Education and the Student Experience Committee. Final approval of programmes, prior to commencement, is given by the Academic Board.

3.5.1 In conjunction with the Faculty Director of Quality, the Quality and Standards Office will arrange a date for the validation event. Programmes must normally have been considered by the Validation Panel at least 6 months prior to commencement unless there are exceptional circumstances.

3.5.2 The Quality and Standards Office will appoint a Panel to scrutinise the programme. The Panel will consist of

- A Chair (senior academic);
- An External Assessor (appointed in line with the University’s approved criteria);
- An internal panel member;
- A nominee of the Director of Quality and Standards Office (or senior member of the Quality and Standards Office);
- A nominee of the Director of Learning, Teaching and Enhancement (or senior member of Learning, Teaching and Enhancement);
- A student panel member.

3.5.3 All members of the panel will be independent of the faculty proposing the programme, and will be expected to attend the validation event. QSO will keep a list of relevant members who have the approval of their Head of School or Dean to participate and who have completed the necessary training.

3.5.4 All documentation will be provided for the panel electronically via Blackboard or via email to external assessors. Staff CVs will be circulated by e-mail.

3.5.5 It is expected that the event will be attended by

- The Programme Director
- The Head of School or nominee
- Sufficient programme team members so to be able to present the proposal.

3.5.6 The standard programme for the validation event is as follows

- Confirmation of the agenda by the Panel (in a preliminary private meeting)
- The validation meeting with the Presenting Team
- Consideration by the Panel of the evidence they have been provided with and the decisions they wish to take. This may or may not be done in private meeting
- A summation, by the Chair to the Presenting Team, of the main issues identified and a formal identification of the agreed conditions and recommendations to be implemented as well as an identification of points of commendation
- The agreement of the arrangements for resubmission and sign off of the documentation
- A tour of resources will be included where specialist resources are required to run the programme.
3.5.7 The terms of reference for the validation panel are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deriving its authority from the University's Academic Board, the validation panel will scrutinise programme proposals and documentation, and will:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ensure that programme design:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) offers explicit assurance that threshold standards are being set and will be maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) meets the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, including the Framework for High Education Qualifications for England, Wales and Northern Ireland, and relevant subject or qualification benchmark statements and or qualification characteristics documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) aligns with the University's Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards, or that appropriate special regulations are in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) leads to an appropriate award title that is supported by a relevant diet of modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) meets any relevant professional, statutory and/or regulatory body requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) has entry requirements that are fair and appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) has an appropriate mode of attendance and a realistic calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii) has a learning and teaching strategy that will enable students to achieve the learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix) has an assessment strategy that will provide students with a fair opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x) has in place plans systematically to engage students in appropriate decision-making fora and to make use of their feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xi) is supported an appropriately qualified and experienced staff team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xii) is supported by a resource base that will be appropriate to the subject matter and to delivering a student experience of high quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xiii) is supported by accurate and clear documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make a recommendation to the Academic Board for the approval or otherwise of the programme, identifying good practice and setting conditions of approval and/or recommendations for consideration as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish and implement arrangements to check that conditions have been met and recommendations appropriately considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.8 The possible outcomes of a Meeting of a University Validation Panel are as follows

- Recommendation for approval of the programme as described in the proposal, with or without conditions and recommendations to be implemented and signed off by the Chair of the University Validation Panel
- A requirement for resubmission of the proposal after major changes to the structure or further development of the programme have been carried out, to be sent to members of the University Validation Panel for their approval; confirmed with them and then signed off by the Chair
• A requirement for reconsideration of the entire proposal, after which a new proposal is submitted to another meeting of the University Validation Panel.

3.5.9 The panel will identify commendations for good practice in the proposal, conditions which must be addressed prior to the commencement of the programme, recommendations which the panel strongly advise the team to address as special notes which do not relate to the academic content of the proposal, but which must be resolved prior to commencement. The Panel will also specify mechanisms for determining where conditions and recommendations have been appropriately addressed and a deadline for the resubmission of the documentation.

3.5.10 The Quality and Standards Office will provide a written report within two weeks of the panel meeting.

3.5.11 By the agreed date, the programme team shall submit to the Panel Secretary in the Quality and Standards Office, the documentation, revised in the light of the conditions and recommendations, a schedule of amendments (via the written report), and for new programmes an external examiner nomination form.

3.5.12 Once the chair is satisfied that the conditions and recommendations have been addressed in line with the expectations of the panel, she or she will sign the validation off. The validation will then be reported to the next meeting of the Education and the Student Experience Committee which will recommend it for approval to the Academic Board.

3.5.13 Programme directors permitting a programme to commence prior to Academic Board approval may be subject to disciplinary action.

3.5.14 QSO will retain the definitive copy of the validation documentation and place it on the shared drive.
4  

CHANGES TO PROGRAMMES

Programme Modification

4.1  Purpose of Modification

4.1.1 Modification is necessary to keep module syllabus up to date, enhance the curriculum to promote innovation and to further embed university learning and teaching strategy, for example introducing an employability strand, creating an international opportunity. In addition, modification provides an opportunity in the early part of a newly validated programme to correct or make adjustments based on student evaluation, academic reflection or recommendations from an external stakeholder such as the External Examiner or Professional Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB).

4.1.2 A validated programme is a form of contract between multiple stakeholders whereby a programme has been approved to provide a particular academic experience appropriate to the subject, students, and sector's expectations and the programme team has undertaken responsibility to deliver and maintain that. Therefore, when a programme team needs or wants to make changes, there is a formal process attached to making changes. This process assures all parties that the changes are made in the best interests of the students and/or staff involved in the programme, that the programme remains a high quality experience, that it remains in line with sector expectations (academic, cultural, as well as regulatory and professional, where necessary) and that where a change may constitute a significant change to the student experience, that the appropriate measures to conform with the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) have been or will be put in place to avoid legal challenge.

4.2  Responsibility for Modification

4.2.1 It is the responsibility of a Programme Director to use the modification process as part of a cycle of continuous improvement linked to the Annual Programme Monitoring process. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Quality Committee to ensure that the changes will not constitute a risk to the student or institution in terms of the above considerations. It is the responsibility of the Programme Director to assure the Faculty Quality Committee that the proposed changes will improve the student and or staff experience and that potential risks have been identified and where unavoidable, that measures will be put in place to manage risk in line with the University’s Change Policy http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-modification.aspx.

4.2.2 The formal process ensures that all changes are recorded and provide a transparent history of the programme's evolution. When modifications can clearly demonstrate improvement to the student outcomes and experience, this feeds in to institutional quality reviews and to the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) submission. In this regard, the management of modifications by the Faculty Quality Committee should be seen as a service to the institution and to individual programmes, rather than an exercise in compliance.

4.3  Types of Modifications

4.3.1 Modifications fall into three categories.

4.3.2 Major Modification, where significant changes are being proposed, including:

- Changes to the programme aims and/or intended learning outcomes of a programme (which may or may not involve a change to the programme title);
- Introduction of a new pathway / route (single honours / combined honours);
- Modifications to programmes at level 8 and level 7 research degrees;
- Introduction of an additional mode of study;
- Changes to the programme duration;
The introduction of delivery of the programme at an additional University campus;
Addition of a Foundation Year (where the major modification is to the Foundation Year with implications for the relevant degree award(s));
Introduction of a placement component where the placement sits outside of the existing credits of the programme and is a required component to be successful in achieving the programme award title.

Additionally the Chairs of the Academic Strategy Committee, the Quality Monitoring & Review Sub-Committee and/or the Faculty Quality Committee (or the Faculty Modification Panel acting on behalf of the Faculty Quality Committee) may determine that the modifications being proposed to a programme are sufficiently extensive to require major modification. This may relate to modifications presented as a single package or as a result of a cumulative effect of modifications made.

4.3.3 Minor Modification, where changes are being proposed that do not fall into one of the other categories, including:

Type 1
- Replacement of a compulsory module, where this can be mapped to the existing stage and programme learning outcomes;
- Addition, removal or allocation to a different level of a compulsory module (includes an option module becoming a compulsory module);
- Change to module credit rating of either a compulsory or option module;
- Change to module aims and/or learning outcomes of a compulsory module;
- Change to indicative module content of a compulsory module (other than routine updating);
- Change to the programme Special Regulations;
- Addition of a 20 credit placement module;

Type 2
- Change to module title;
- Change to module indicative assessment (includes change to mode, weighting and word count / duration);
- Addition, removal or allocation to a different level of an option module;
- Addition or removal of pre-requisites / co-requisites;
- Change to module learning and teaching strategy (may or may not include a change to module duration hours);
- Change to indicative module content of an option module;
- Change to module aims and/or learning outcomes of an option module;
- Change to the semester in which a module will be delivered;
- Addition of new entry points for the programme;
- Change to timetabling band for a General Modular Scheme programme;
- Change to the programme specification not covered elsewhere.

4.3.4 Routine Updating, where an approval process does not need to be followed, including:
- Change to Module Indicative Resources;
- Change to Academic Responsibility at either the module or programme level.

4.3.5 Separate processes exist if the sole change is to modify the programme / pathway title and for programme suspension / withdrawal / closure.

4.3.6 The general principle with regard to all modifications is that they will apply to the next entering cohort and not for any current students. However there are sometimes circumstances when modifications do need to be made affecting current students and prospective students once the admissions cycle has begun. The University has approved a Change Policy to cover circumstances where it is necessary to make a change in the running
of an existing programme. This can be read in full at: [http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-modification.aspx](http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-modification.aspx). In such circumstances, consideration should also be given as to whether there are any students currently on an interruption. Where this is the case, appropriate arrangements must be put in place to communicate with them regarding the modifications.

4.4 Approval Process for Major Modifications

4.4.1 For a major modification, the University’s validation procedure should be followed as set out in chapter 3 of the Quality Manual, except that:

- In-Principle approval is not required unless there are resource implications and/or a change to the programme title is being proposed as part of the changes;
- Detailed programme planning form is not required unless there are resource implications;
- The documentation requirements will comprise of the following:
  - Rationale document outlining the modifications proposed for consideration by the Major Modifications Panel and the rationale for them;
  - Current programme specification
  - Draft revised programme specification (including the required appendices) with the proposed changes clearly identified;
  - Revised programme student handbook;
  - Evidence of student consultation;
  - Blended / distance learning materials (where relevant);
  - Detailed programme planning form (where required).

4.4.2 The remit of the Major Modification Panel will be to consider the proposed modifications only. Prior to submission the programme documentation should be reviewed to ensure it continues to align to the current University regulations. It will not be a requirement for other aspects of the programme to be modified to reflect changes to University strategy and policy unless they directly relate to the proposed major modification. The Major Modification Panel may however make recommendations regarding aspects of the programme that are not part of the proposed modifications that will need to be taken into consideration when reviewing the programme prior to the next scheduled Periodic Programme Review.

4.4.3 As a Major Modification Panel will only consider the proposed modifications to the programme, it will not constitute a re-validation of the programme. A Periodic Programme (and Partnership) Review will need to be undertaken in the sixth year of operation of the programme as set out in Section 10 of the Quality Manual.

4.5 Approval Process for Minor Modifications

4.5.1 Minor modifications are a matter for consideration and approval by the appropriate Faculty Quality Committee, following recommendation by the Faculty Programme Modification Panel.

4.5.2 The membership of the Faculty Programme Modification Panel will be approved by the Faculty Quality Committee but as a minimum should comprise of the Faculty Director of Quality (Chair), Faculty Director of Learning and Teaching, at least one senior academic (normally a Head of School, Subject Director or equivalent) and at least one student representative.
4.5.3 The general principle is that modifications will apply to new students only. Where it is deemed necessary to modify a programme for existing students and for incoming students minor modifications must normally have been considered by the Faculty Quality Committee at least 6 months prior to commencement of the stage / level of the programme to which the modification applies, unless there are exceptional circumstances. Individual programmes should however consider key programme / scheme dates such as module option choice dates when considering timelines for approval of minor modifications as these may require modifications to be submitted for approval at an earlier point in time.

4.5.5 In consultation with the Faculty Director of Learning and Teaching and Faculty Director of Quality, the Programme Director must complete Section A of the Modifications Proposal Form along with Appendix 1 (Programme Modifications Log). The form should be signed by the Head of School and submitted for consideration by the Faculty Programme Modification Panel.

4.5.6 Where a module is a validated part of more than one programme, the Programme Director for the parent programme must agree the proposed change with its counterparts. A modification to all programmes will be necessary, and this may require a modification by another Faculty. If systematic change cannot be agreed, an additional module(s) will be created and a new module code(s) will be required.

4.5.7 The role of the Faculty Programme Modification Panel will be as follows:

(i) To consider the proposed modification(s) in light of any previous modification(s) made to the programme(s) concerned since the validation event / last Periodic Programme Review and either confirm that the proposal can be considered under the Approval Process for Minor Modifications, a Programme Modification Review Exercise is required or refer for consideration as a Major Modification;

Where it is identified that the proposed modification(s) can be considered under the Approval Process for Minor Modifications, the role of the Faculty Programme Modification Panel will also be as follows:

(ii) To identify any aspects of the proposal that require amendment / further review prior to consideration by the Faculty Quality Committee;

(iii) To confirm the appropriateness of the mechanisms set out for student consultation to support the proposed modification or identify an alternative student consultation process and request that this be undertaken prior to submission of the proposed modification to the Faculty Quality Committee;

(iv) To confirm that the proposed modification can proceed for consultation with the External Examiner;

(v) To confirm that the Programme Director can proceed with updating the Programme Specification in mark-up.

4.5.8 In considering (i) above the Faculty Programme Modification Panel will have reference to a Programme Modifications Log, which will outline all modifications made to the programme since the last Validation Event or Periodic Programme Review Event.

4.5.9 The Faculty Programme Modification Panel will consider the volume of modifications undertaken since the last approval / review event. It will be the responsibility of the Faculty Programme Modification Panel to have oversight of the modifications made and to ensure that where a range of modifications have been made that the programme aims and learning outcomes are still fit for purpose. As part of this consideration greater weight will be given to
Minor Modifications Type 1 as these relate to compulsory modules. The Faculty Programme Modification Panel may determine that the volume of the changes proposed taking in to account the cumulative effect of changes already made require either consideration by a Major Modifications Panel (see above) or that a Programme Modification Review Exercise (see below) is required.

4.5.10 In the event that the Faculty Programme Modification Panel determines that the proposal can be considered under the Approval Process for Minor Modifications, consideration will be given to the proposed student consultation arrangements. The level of student consultation required will depend on whether the proposed modification presents a material change to the published information students have previously been provided with and therefore represents a change in the student contract or whether the proposed modification presents a non-material change or constitutes a change due to circumstances outside the University’s control that it could not plan for such as changes to PSRB requirements.

4.5.11 The Change Policy (http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-modification.aspx) sets out examples of types of modifications that would be considered as material changes and examples of types of modifications that would be considered non-material.

For non-material changes, the consultation process is as follows:

- all current students that have the potential to be affected by the proposed modification(s) should be consulted and given the opportunity to comment on the proposed modification(s);
- the consultation process must be undertaken in a manner that can be evidenced i.e. through a meeting that is minuted with the minutes capturing both the proposal and student feedback or through a written consultation undertaken by e-mail or via the Virtual Learning Environment;
- the views of the students must be taken in to consideration when finalising the Modification Proposal Form for consideration by the Faculty Quality Committee but a majority agreement will be considered acceptable for the approval of a non-material change.

For material changes, the consultation process is as follows:

- all current students that will be affected by the proposed modification should be consulted and given the opportunity to comment on the proposed modification(s);
- the consultation process must be undertaken in a manner that can be evidenced in respect to individual students;
- the views of the students must be taken in to consideration when finalising the Modification Proposal Form for consideration by the Faculty Quality Committee. For the approval of a material change the Faculty Quality Committee will need to be assured that all students currently on the programme that will be affected by the proposed modification(s) have agreed to the change or that alternative arrangements have been put in place to the satisfaction of an individual student where they expressed dissatisfaction with the change.

4.5.12 The Faculty Programme Modification Panel will either confirm that the proposed student consultation arrangements are appropriate or indicate where changes to the proposed student consultation process will be required. The Programme Director is responsible for ensuring the specified student consultation process is undertaken.

4.5.13 In the event that the Faculty Programme Modification Panel determines that the proposal can be considered under the Approval Process for Minor Modifications and following initial consideration of the proposed modification and the arrangements for student consultation, the Modification Proposal Form will be referred back to the Programme Director for completion of Section B of the Form. Section B requires consultation to take place with students and the current External Examiner and requires the current programme specification to be updated to reflect the proposed modification(s). If additional resources are needed that cannot be met within the existing School / Centre budget, a detailed programme planning form will also need to be approved by the Faculty Programme Planning Executive.

4.5.14 On completion of Section B and accompanied by the required supporting evidence, the proposal will be returned for consideration by the Chair of the Faculty Programme Modification Panel, who will either confirm that the proposal can proceed for consideration by the Faculty Quality Committee or refer back to the Programme Director for further amendment prior to submission to the Faculty Quality Committee.

4.5.15 The Faculty Quality Committee is the decision-making body with respect to the approval of modifications. The Faculty Quality Committee has the discretion to refer the proposal for consideration by a Programme Modification Review Exercise or Major Modification Event.

4.6 Programme Modification Review Exercise

4.6.1 In the event that the Faculty Programme Modification Panel requires a Programme Modification Review Exercise to be undertaken the Programme Director will be notified. The following documentation will be required to support the process:

- Programme Modifications Log – outlining all approved modifications since the last Approval / Review Event;
- Previous Programme Modifications Proposal Forms;
- A summary of cumulative totals of the volume of changed credit and the types of module from which it was derived, i.e. compulsory or option, during the period under consideration;
- The programme specification approved at the last Approval / Review Event;
- The current programme specification;
- Minutes from the Faculty’s modifications approval process for the period under consideration;
- External examiner’s written endorsement of the current appropriateness and coherence of the programme in its totality.

4.6.2 The purpose of the Programme Modification Review Exercise will be to confirm that the approved programme award, programme aims and programme learning outcomes remain intact, valid and achievable.

4.6.3 The Programme Modification Review Exercise does not require the direct participation of the programme team. It is undertaken at the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Programme Planning Executive.
Modification Panel. A Faculty Director of Quality or Faculty Director of Learning and Teaching from outside of the Faculty will be requested to join the meeting for the purposes of the Programme Modification Review Exercise to provide a further element of externality.

4.6.4 The outcome of the Programme Modification Review Exercise will be reported to the Faculty Quality Committee as a recommendation. The Faculty Quality Committee will:

EITHER

- Confirm that all modifications completed since the previous approval / review event have followed due process and that the programme aims and learning outcomes remain consistent with the approved award;

OR

- Refers the programme for major modification.

4.6.5 Where the outcome is the former of the above, the programme may proceed with the proposed modification as a minor modification as set out in Section 4.5 above.

4.7 Reporting of Modifications

4.7.1 The minutes of Faculty Quality Committee will record each proposal submitted. They should include a list of the proposals with sufficient information to identify each one.

4.7.2 The Programme Director will be formally responsible for ensuring all student-facing documentation and materials are updated following approval of the modification. They will also be responsible for liaising with Admissions/Marketing with respect to any amendments required to marketing material and for ensuring that any necessary correspondence with applicants is undertaken as set out in the Change Policy at the earliest opportunity http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-modification.aspx.

4.7.3 The Faculty Quality Committee must report all minor modifications through submission of the Modification Proposal Form and the revised Programme Specification and amended / additional appendices to the following:

- Quality and Standards Office;
- Data Management Office in Planning and Academic Administration (data.management@canterbury.ac.uk); and
- Planning Office (planningoffice@canterbury.ac.uk); and
- Faculty Marketing Manager (via marcomms@canterbury.ac.uk).

4.7.4 The Data Management Office will be responsible for modifying the module or programme details as recorded in the Student Records System. Such changes must be entered before students are registered for new or modified modules.

4.7.5 The Quality and Standards Office will be responsible for reporting the minor modifications to the Quality Monitoring & Review Sub-Committee.

4.7.6 On an annual basis, the Quality Monitoring & Review Sub-Committee will receive a Summary Report from each Faculty on the operation of its delegated authority, which will reference its role in the approval of modifications.

4.8 Modification to Programme / Pathway Title

4.8.1 Where a modification relates solely to the modification of a Programme / Pathway Title, the Programme / Pathway Title Modification Form must be completed. This must indicate a rationale for the title change and be accompanied by comments from an External Examiner to confirm the validity of the proposed change.
4.8.2 Modifications to Programme / Pathway Titles will apply to the next recruiting cohort only and cannot be applied to existing students.

4.8.3 The completed form should be signed by the relevant Head(s) of School and submitted to the relevant Faculty Director(s) of Quality along with an updated programme specification. The Faculty Director of Quality will ensure that the form is considered by the following Faculty committees:

- Faculty Programme Planning Executive, or equivalent body for consideration of any portfolio implications;
- Faculty Quality Committee – for consideration of any quality assurance implications.

The Faculty Committee may determine that changes are required before the proposals can be approved.

4.8.4 Following Faculty-level approval, the form will be signed by the Dean and submitted to the Academic Strategy Committee for institutional-level approval.

4.8.5 The Secretary to the Academic Strategy Committee will notify the Heads of all relevant Professional Service areas of Programme / Pathway Title changes approved by the Academic Strategy Committee including:

- Admissions
- Finance
- Marketing
- Planning
- Quality and Standards
- Planning & Academic Administration
- Student Support and Guidance
- UK Partnerships or International Partnerships (where relevant)

4.8.6 The Faculty Director of Quality is responsible for ensuring that the Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body is notified (where relevant).

4.8.7 For the avoidance of doubt, a change of programme / pathway title will not constitute a re-validation of the programme. A Periodic Programme (and Partnership) Review will need to be undertaken in the sixth year of operation of the programme as set out in Section 10 of the Quality Manual.

4.9 Overview of the Programme Modifications Process

4.9.1 The following flowchart provides an overview of the Programme Modifications Process
CHANGES TO PROGRAMMES

Programme Director completes Programme Modification form (Section A) in discussion with FDQ and FDLT and submitted for consideration

Faculty Programme Modification Panel (FPMP) meet to consider modification proposal

Faculty Panel should be FDQ (chair), FDLT, at least one senior academic, at least one student representative

Programme Modification Review Exercise (PMRE)

Major Modification

Minor Modification

FPMP consider modification proposal incl. student consultation process as provided by Programme Director

Modification proposal approved to proceed by FPMP

Modification proposal not approved by proceed by FPMP

FPMP rejects modification proposal providing rationale to PD

PD amends modification proposal in light of feedback and resubmits to FPMP

Major Modification Event

FPMP undertakes PMRE and makes a recommendation to the FQC

FQC approves recommendation and programme can continue to undertake minor modifications

FQC refers to major modification

PD updates associated student documentation and ensures applicants are notified where applicable

Chair of FPMP reviews and confirms modification proposal can be submitted for consideration by FQC

Approved modifications reported to QSO, DMO, P&AA, planning office & marketing managers
5 COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS

5.1 The development and approval of a partnership

5.1.1 The majority of partnerships will be approved through the University’s central structures. These procedures are overseen by the strategic leads for International or UK partnerships, depending on location, and operated by the relevant Professional Service Department. These procedures usually culminate in the agreement of a Memorandum of Understanding, or in the case of a collaborative partner in an Agreement, which are usually signed by the Vice-Chancellor, or his nominee, on the advice of the relevant strategic lead.

5.1.2 Where the University wishes to form a significant strategic partnership that falls under B10 of the UK Quality Code and is designed at the outset to make a considerable contribution to the University’s strategic goals, there will be a Memorandum of Agreement, approved through the collaborative provision route.

5.1.3 Partnerships that deliver placement learning, work-based learning and distributed learning are developed and approved directly by Faculties and are approved in line with the University regulations for these aspects of delivery.

5.1.4 Partnerships entering into progression agreements are approved by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) on the advice of the Director of Admissions.

5.1.5 Some knowledge exchange and consultancy partnerships are developed and approved through the procedures of the Research and Enterprise Development Centre.

5.2 The approval of partnerships

5.2.1 The University has tailored processes for the approval of non-collaborative partnerships and collaborative partnerships to reflect the level of risk.

5.2.2 The relevant International or UK Partnerships Office must be consulted at an early stage regarding any proposed new partnerships. The relevant Dean(s) of Faculty will also need to consider and approve any proposal, prior to submission to the relevant decision-making body.

5.2.3 Proposers will be required to identify whether a proposal is intended to be collaborative or not and complete a Partner Proposal Form for New Non-Collaborative or Collaborative Partnerships accordingly.

5.3 The approval of new non-collaborative partnerships

5.3.1 Non-collaborative partnerships are normally lower risk than collaborative partnerships. It therefore follows that a lower degree of scrutiny is required in their approval.

5.3.2 Lead proposers should in the first instance liaise with their relevant Head of School, Dean of Faculty and the relevant Partnerships Office (UK Partnerships or International Partnerships).

5.3.3 The Partnerships Office will provide the lead proposer with a New Partner Proposal Form for Non-Collaborative Partnerships for completion and submission to the relevant SMT Lead for Partnerships.

5.3.4 The relevant SMT lead will conduct a risk assessment of the proposed partnership, and decide what further vetting is necessary, including whether further due diligence enquiries need to be completed. Once any further stages specified by the SMT lead have been completed, the SMT lead will recommend that the partnership be approved, and the Memorandum of Understanding or contract will be signed by the Vice-Chancellor.

5.3.5 The relevant Partnerships Office will keep a record of all relevant non-collaborative partnerships.
5.4 The approval of new collaborative partnerships

5.5 The Planning Process

5.5.1 The collaborative partnership planning process will be overseen by the Academic Strategy Committee, which will give in-principle approval for new collaborative partnerships, taking into account the collaborative portfolio of the faculty and the University as it does so. The Academic Strategy Committee will decide whether developments should be referred to the Senior Management Team for approval.

5.5.2 The Head of School should appoint a lead proposer to take forward the proposal, for all programmes within the proposal.

5.5.3 Lead proposers should in the first instance liaise with their relevant Head of School, Dean of Faculty and the relevant Partnerships Office (UK Partnerships or International Partnerships).

5.5.4 The Partnerships Office will provide the lead proposer with a New Partner Proposal Form for Collaborative Partnerships (PPFNC) for completion and submission to the Faculty Programme Planning Executive (or equivalent body) and the Academic Strategy Committee.

5.5.5 The PPFNC form will be completed to include details of the programmes which it is proposed that the new partner should run, indicators of the proposed partner’s experience in running HE programmes and other ‘indicators of esteem’ to help the Academic Strategy Committee have confidence in the proposal.

5.5.6 Once completed the PPFNC will need to be considered by the relevant Partnerships Office and approved by the Head of School. It will also need the approval of the Dean of Faculty prior to submission to the Academic Strategy Committee. This will normally include consideration of the proposal by the Faculty Programme Planning Executive.

5.5.7 The proposal will be presented to the Academic Strategy Committee by the relevant Dean of Faculty. Where a proposal relates to multiple faculty work and/or relates to a strategic partnership, the partnership proposal will be presented to the Academic Strategy Committee by the relevant Partnerships Office.

5.5.8 Where a (new or existing) programme is proposed for delivery by an existing partner, a PPFNC will not be required and in-principle approval will be sought through the In-Principle form / Faculty Programme Planning Portfolio process. A strategic overview of the partnership may be required by the Academic Strategy Committee from time to time to provide context for such discussions, especially where large numbers of programmes are to be approved for delivery by strategic partners.

5.5.9 In considering a proposal for in-principle approval, the Academic Strategy Committee will refer any proposals that it considers to be especially high risk to the Senior Management Team (SMT) for further consideration. Periodically the Academic Strategy Committee will make a report to SMT on new partnerships approved.

5.5.10 The Academic Strategy Committee (or SMT) will authorise the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding, for ceremonial purposes, where this is a precursor to a Collaborative Agreement.

5.5.11 Once the Academic Strategy Committee (or SMT) have granted in-principle approval full due diligence enquiries should commence.

5.6 Due Diligence Enquiries

5.6.1 As part of the process of considering the suitability of another institution as a collaborative partner, the University will carry out a ‘Due Diligence’ check to assure itself of the partner’s standing. Such Due Diligence is the norm in similar situations in the commercial world and, in relation to higher education, one of the focuses of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education.
5.6.2 It is important to note that there may be variation to the due diligence enquiries required, based upon the perceived level of risk within the proposed partnership and the nature of the information discovered within the enquiry.

5.6.3 The due diligence process will be co-ordinated and overseen by the Quality Manager but will require data / information collation and completion of sections of the due diligence enquiries form by the lead proposer and the proposed partner.

5.7 Actions Prior to Approval

5.7.1 In addition to the due diligence enquiries, the following are normally conducted before an approval/validation event is held.

- Arrangements will have to be made for a Venue Check and the Venue Check carried out.
- An Agreement will need to be negotiated and agreed.
- Partner staff CVs will need to be received and sent to the QSO for consideration.
- It will need to be established that Partner staff will need to undertake the Associate Tutor Programme
- Marketing and promotion material will need to be discussed and put in place.

5.7.2 The Venue Check (pro-forma available at http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/collaborative-provision.aspx) is an assessment of the suitability of the partner institution’s venue/venues for the delivery of a University programme. The check, assessed through a visit, will ensure that the facilities and learning resources of partner institutions are suitable, particularly in regard to accommodation, library, computing and other specialist provision.

5.7.3 When planning and negotiating Collaborative Provision, it is important for quality assurance purposes that venues are suitable for sessions being taught. It is the responsibility of the Assistant Director of Quality and Standards or nominee to verify the quality of accommodation.

5.7.4 A separate Venue Check must be completed for each venue at which the collaborative programme is delivered. This may or may not be completed at the partner approval event.

5.7.5 If a partner wishes to deliver the programme at a further venue during the course of the partnership agreement with the University, this venue must also undergo a check before it may be used for programme delivery.

5.7.6 Partner and University staff should ensure that any issues that arise concerning approved venues whilst the programme is running are reported to the Assistant Director of Quality and Standards.

5.7.7 Where the venue poses a possible risk to staff welfare due to the nature of the business and/or environment (e.g. a prison), a full risk assessment will be undertaken by the University as a part of the Venue Check.

5.7.8 Venue Checks are stored in a Shared Folder on the QSO computer drive.

5.7.9 Simultaneously with the Due Diligence procedure, a range of contract documents are prepared.

5.8 The Agreement

5.8.1 The Agreement is the written agreement between the University and a partner. The Assistant Director of Quality and Standards will initiate the writing of this document.

5.8.2 The Agreement (template available on the Quality and Standards Office website) underpins a single collaborative activity with a partner organisation. It is signed for up to a six year period by the Chief Executive of each organisation. It sets out a common commitment to
the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, and commits the partner and the University to following the appropriate processes and practices.

5.8.3 Central to the Agreement is the notion that students on all programmes of which the University is the awarding body are students of the University. While it is important that those students who study on partnership campuses consider themselves full members of that institution, they should also see themselves as students of the University, and will be subject to the rules and academic structure of the University.

5.8.4 Each Agreement is underpinned by an Annual Letter which details the student numbers available to the partner, the percentage of the programme to be delivered by the partner, the fee, the arrangement for fees collection, the deduction to meet the University’s quality assurance, validation and management costs, and the apportionment of the tuition fee income between the Parties. The letter is sent by the University’s Director of Finance to Partner organisations in advance of the start of the new academic year.

5.8.5 Most international partnerships will follow the normal University approval processes. At times it is necessary for the University to produce customised agreements for international partnerships. The Assistant Director of Quality and Standards liaises with the International Office and the University Solicitor regarding these agreements.

5.9 Establishment of Staffing Resource

5.9.1 The establishment of Staffing Resource for collaborative programmes is a matter for the due diligence process overseen by the University’s QSO, which will:
- request the partner’s procedures for appointing staff;
- determine that staff are appropriately qualified;
- determine that the partner has effective mechanism to ensure the proficiency of such staff;
- retain all relevant staff CVs.

5.9.2 Staff CVs are also considered at the relevant Approval event.

5.10 Associate Tutor Programme

5.10.1 Partner staff teaching on collaborative programmes are required to engage with the appropriate part of the University’s Associate Tutor Programme.

5.11 Resources

5.11.1 The programme must be supported by the appropriate specialist resources. To ensure this occurs, during the drafting of the Agreement, the HE Manager from the partner institution will be asked to supply the contact details for the partner institution’s Computing Services and Library Services representatives to allow the necessary communication to ensure smooth running of the programme.

5.11.2 An evaluation of available resources is also a key part of the Approval Event.

5.12 The promotion of collaborative programmes

5.12.1 The programme must be supported by the appropriate marketing. Collaborative programmes may not be advertised ‘subject to approval’ until they have received approval from the Faculty Programme Planning Executive to proceed to an approval event. To ensure this occurs, during the drafting of the Agreement, the HE Manager from the partner institution will be asked to supply the contact details for their Marketing Department, to enable the University and partner to liaise to best effect.
5.12.2 All promotional material for collaborative programmes should be referred to the University before dissemination. It is the responsibility of the partner institutions to forward all draft promotional materials to the named contact in the Marketing Department at the University in either electronic or hard copy form. The University will communicate any necessary changes to the partner institution for action.

5.12.3 All promotional materials devised and used by the partner institution must be:

- approved by the University prior to their publication or release
- designed in keeping with the guidelines for the correct use of the University's logo and corporate colours. See [https://cccu.canterbury.ac.uk/mar­keting-and-communications/services/corporate-identity.aspx](https://cccu.canterbury.ac.uk/marketing-and-communications/services/corporate-identity.aspx)

These include advertisements, prospectuses, brochures, leaflets, folders, posters, CD-ROMS, web pages and any other form of printed or electronic communication which refer to the partner institution’s connection with the University, and are used to recruit students or staff or to attract funding or other support from public or private sector sources.

5.13 The Approval of Collaborative Provision

5.13.1 The approval of each new instance of Collaborative Provision will comprise two elements:

- The partnership arrangement that delivers a specific University programme, including its resource base.
- The validation of the programme to be run by the partner.

5.13.2 In the case of a franchise arrangement, there will be a prior Programme Approval Event at the University to validate the proposed programme, if it is not already in validation. This will be conducted by a University Panel, following its established programme validation processes.

5.13.3 In the case of a validated arrangement, both the programme approval and partnership approval will normally be conducted by the same approval event, which will normally take place at the partner’s premises.

5.13.4 All matters pertaining to the formation of partnerships, the termination of partnerships and the allocation of student numbers both to partner organisations and to collaborative programmes are ultimately the decision of the Vice Chancellor of the University, or person so delegated, following consultation with the Chief Executive of the partner organisation, or person so delegated.

5.13.5 Within the University, the person so delegated is the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) regarding quality matters and regarding student number/strategic matters. Any proposal to enter into a collaborative programme with either a new or existing partner, to terminate an existing collaborative programme, or to re-distribute existing student numbers between programmes falls within her remit and proposals should be communicated to her at an early stage, via the Assistant Director of Quality and Standards.

5.14 Approval

5.14.1 The Partner Approval Event will mirror the University’s validation processes, with appropriate additions to enable it to approve the partner to operate the proposed programme of study.

5.14.2 The panel for the Partner Approval Event will be constructed by QSO and will be scaled to the nature of the provision, but will normally feature:

- A Chair (senior academic);
- An External Assessor (appointed in line with the University’s approved criteria);
• An internal panel member;
• A nominee of the Director of Quality and Standards Office (or senior member of the Quality and Standards Office);

5.14.3 Panels may also include the following:
• A nominee of the Director of Learning and Teaching (or senior member of Learning, Teaching and Enhancement);
• A student panel member.

5.15 Approval of partners to operate validation arrangements

5.15.1 This arrangement operates where the programme (or cluster of cognate programmes) is being developed with or by a partner.

5.15.2 There will be a Validation Partner Approval Event, which will approve the Partner (to run the programme or cluster of cognate programmes) and validate the programme (or cluster of cognate programmes). The Panel will make a single judgement, but formed in two parts: it will approve that the partnership has the current and on-going capacity to deliver the programme as specified; and only if this condition is met, may it approve the validation of the programme.

5.15.3 The Event will:
• enable the University to determine that it can run the programme (or cluster of cognate programmes) with the specified partner;
• assess the programme-specific resource-base for delivery;
• be chaired by a Senior Member of University staff (normally Head of School level or above);
• always involve externality and an External Assessor will normally be present at the event;
• view all the partnership documentation, including the proposed contractual agreement;
• recommend to ESEC that an Agreement with the partner to allow the programme(s) to run can be signed.

5.15.4 The Validation Partner Approval Event will normally be at the Partner organisation. If the University wishes to validate a programme with more than one partner, QSO will make appropriate adjustments. This might include a Validation Event, attended by representative(s) of the partners, at the University with Partner Approval Event to approve the Partners (to run the programme or cluster of cognate programmes). Where this is not possible, report on the institutional issues raised by the partnership will be completed by a senior member of University staff, following a visit to the Partner, and submitted to the Panel for consideration.

5.15.5 A partner approved in this way will be subject to a new Partner Approval Event, for the validation or franchising of any additional awards.

5.15.6 An existing programme or cluster of cognate programmes may be franchised to an additional partner.

5.16 Approval of partners to operate franchise programmes

5.16.1 This arrangement operates where the programme (or cluster of cognate programmes) has already approved a programme to run at the University or to run with one or more partners.

5.16.2 There will be a Franchise Partner Approval Event at the partner organisation, which will approve the partner to run the programme or cluster of cognate programmes. The Franchise Partner Approval Event will be of an appropriate scale to manage the risk.
5.16.3 The Franchise Partner Approval Event will:
- be structured to reflect the risk involved, with the decision taken by the Director of Quality and Standards, unless a previous determination had been made by the Academic Strategy Committee;
- enable to University to determine that it can run the programme (or cluster of cognate programmes) with the specified partner;
- assess the programme-specific resource-base for delivery;
- view all the partnership documentation, including the proposed contractual agreement;
- recommend to ESEC that an Agreement with the partner to allow the programme(s) to run can be signed.

5.16.4 The Franchise Partner Approval Event will normally be at the Partner organisation.

5.16.5 Indicative Agenda for a Collaborative Approval Meeting
- Tour of Resources
- Initial Panel meeting - The Event will begin with a preliminary meeting of the Panel to share their views on the documentation and plan the subsequent meetings.
- Meeting with students
- The Panel may meet with partner HE students, where this is appropriate and where such students exist.
- Meeting with Staff - The Panel will meet with the following staff:
  - University Head of School/Centre, or nominee and
  - University Programme Director /Academic Link Tutor
  - Partner Programme Director/ Partnership Manager
  - Relevant Partner Teaching Staff

The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss issues relating to the partnership:
- Detailed consideration of any programme to be validated;
- The rationale for the partnership, congruence of missions and policies, student numbers and achievements;
- Partnership and programme development, including future proposals;
- Venues and resources;
- Analysis of the potential strengths and potential limitations of the partnership: (for example, communication, curriculum development, assessment, staff support and staff development, examination arrangements, student admission, registration and progression, student support, resources);
- The capacity of the partnership to deliver the programme appropriately.
- Final Meeting - The Panel will then consider its findings. In particular, it will focus on:
  - The potential strengths and weaknesses of the quality of the provision, in particular learning, teaching and assessment, the quality of learning opportunities, and the likely maintenance and enhancement of quality and standards.
  - The likely effectiveness of the overarching services provided jointly by the University and the partner for Registration, Admissions, Quality Assurance, Student Support and Resources.
  - Identification of aspects of the partnership which potentially represent good or innovative practice.
  - Conditions or Recommendations for actions to remedy any potential shortcomings, giving an indication of significance and urgency in the latter.
  - An overall recommendation to the University that the partnership in relation to the programme(s) under consideration should be approved and that the Agreement may be signed.
5.17 Actions following the Approval meeting

5.17.1 Following the Panel visit, the Secretary to the Panel will prepare a draft full report and send this to the Chair and other Review Panel members for revision and/or approval not more than two weeks after the completion of the visit. The Secretary to the Review Panel will send copies of the final reports to all members of the Review Panel.

5.17.2 By the agreed date, the programme team shall submit to the Panel Secretary in the Quality and Standards Office, the documentation, revised in the light of the conditions and recommendations, a schedule of amendments (via the written report), and for new programmes an external examiner nomination form.

5.17.3 Once the chair is satisfied that the conditions and recommendations have been addressed in line with the expectations of the panel, she or he will sign the partner approval off. As part of this process the Panel Chair will ensure that there is a final version of the Collaborative Provision Agreement. The partnership (and programme approval where relevant) will then be reported to the next meeting of the Education and Student Experience Committee which will recommend it for approval to the Academic Board.

5.17.4 The Approval Event will recommend the final form of the Collaborative Provision Agreement. Further change to the Agreement will need to be signed-off by the Panel Chair. ESEC will recommend approval to AB only when the Agreement is in its final form. This will form the basis on which the VC is asked to sign the Agreement.

5.17.5 The delivery of the collaborative programme may not commence until the above process is complete and the Agreement has been signed by both parties.

5.18 Summary of Authorised Signatories of Agreements

5.18.1 It is important that the agreements used for collaborative arrangements by the University are signed by appropriate and authorised representatives of the University.

5.18.2 The following table details the authorised signatories for the different types of agreements utilised by the University for collaborative arrangements.

5.18.3 N.B. Although it is not a collaborative arrangement, the Progression Agreement is included for clarity.

Figure 5-1 Summary of authorised signatories of agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Agreement</th>
<th>Approval Route</th>
<th>Authorised Signatory within the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Not contractual or collaborative. Recommended for approval by the appropriate partnership SMT lead.</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor or nominated SMT Member, on the advice of the relevant SMT Strategic Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement/Memorandum of Agreement/Articulation Agreement (B10)</td>
<td>Recommended by the Validation event to the Education and Student Experience Committee, for onward recommendation for approval by the Academic Board.</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor or nominated SMT Member, on the advice of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement or service contract (Non B10)</td>
<td>Not collaborative. Contractual arrangements recommended for approval by the appropriate SMT lead.</td>
<td>Person authorised by Vice-Chancellor or SMT lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Agreement Type</th>
<th>Approval Process</th>
<th>Person Authorised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement/Work-based Learning/Distributed Learning Agreement* (Health &amp; Wellbeing and Education)</td>
<td>Person authorised by the Dean of Faculty placement mechanisms.</td>
<td>Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) or nominated SMT Member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement/Work-based Learning/Distributed Learning Agreement* (Programme level)</td>
<td>Recommended by the Validation event to the Education and Student Experience Committee, for onward recommendation for approval by the Academic Board.</td>
<td>Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) or nominated SMT Member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Progression Agreement     | Recommended by Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee to the Education and Student Experience Committee. 
  Considered and recommended for approval to proceed by the Education and Student Experience Committee. | Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) or nominated SMT Member. |

5.19 The Management of Partnership Agreements following Approval

5.19.1 Once a new collaborative partnership has been approved, confirmed details of the partnership will be added to the University’s definitive list of collaborative partnerships, which is regularly reported to the Academic Strategy Committee and the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee. QSO will continue to ensure that all collaborative agreements are monitored, reviewed and refreshed, as necessary.

5.19.2 Any decision to terminate a collaborative partnership will be made by ASC, upon the recommendation of the Strategic Lead for the relevant partnership area. Further information can be found regarding this in Section 7 of this document.

5.20 New Partner Review

5.20.1 For new partners, or partners where significant new development has taken place, a New Partner Review meeting will take place after approximately six months of operation.

5.20.2 The purpose of the meeting will be to ensure that systems are operating effectively and to address any misunderstandings or concerns developing with the partner in the first six months of the programme / collaborative partnership.

5.20.3 The meeting will be organised and led by a senior member of the Quality and Standards Office and involve staff in the relevant schools and the partner.

5.20.4 Following the meeting, the Quality and Standards Office will produce a report and an action plan where relevant. This will be considered by the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee.
6 PROCEDURE FOR APPROVING A SHORT COURSE

6.1 Definition of a short course

6.1.1 The University defines a short course as a programme of study of up to 40 credits or 400 total learning hours, the learning outcomes of which are either at levels 4-7, or are commensurate with work at that level, which leads to

- the award of credit, and/or
- University summative assessment, and/or
- a certificate or transcript of award, issued by the University, and/or
- a formal record kept by the University Registry.

6.2 The approval of short courses

6.2.1 Where a student is required to undertake more than 40 credits or 400 hours of total learning time, the University’s requirements for programme approval must be followed.

6.2.2 In Principle Approval for a short course is required from the Academic Strategy Committee in advance of proceeding to planning and approval.

6.2.3 Where a short course carries with it an award title, that title will be ‘University Certificate' followed by the Academic Strategy Committee approved description, except where the Chair of the Academic Strategy Committee has approved an exception to this rule. This will apply to all new approvals and re-approvals.

6.2.4 A short course award should be made only as a ‘pass’, except where there are regulatory, professional or contractual requirements, in which case special regulations will need to be approved by the Academic Board.

6.2.5 The policies and procedures set out in the Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards and the Assessment Procedures will apply to short courses in all instances where they are capable of application, unless specifically set aside by this document. In particular it should be noted that where credit is awarded an external examiner will need to be appointed.

6.2.6 A short course award cannot be made as an exit award to a student registered full time or part time on a University programme.

6.3 The approval of a non-collaborative short course

6.3.1 The Faculty Quality Committee approves non-collaborative short courses for the faculty, using the University’s agreed processes. In doing so, the Faculty process must ensure that:

- for a short course that is credited at an HE level: the Faculty Quality Committee must ensure that it is fully compliant with all aspects of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, including the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications;
- for a non-credit-rated short course: the Faculty Quality Committee must ensure that the University can assure those aspects of achievements that are reflected in the certification.

6.3.2 Non-collaborative short courses should be approved using the University’s Short Course Approval Form, available on the website of the Quality and Standards Office.

6.3.3 Where the non-collaborative short course is to be delivered by University staff off-site, a venue check must be carried out using the form available on the Quality and Standards Office website. This should form part of the documentation considered by the Faculty Quality Committee.
6.3.4 This form should be submitted to the Faculty Quality Committee where the content of a short course has been approved as a module(s) of a University programme.

6.3.5 A short course will be approved for an unlimited number of intakes for a period of five years, unless determined otherwise by the Faculty Quality Committee. However, the Committee cannot extend the maximum period beyond five years.

6.3.6 The Faculty will each term provide the Academic Strategy Committee with a list of proposed short course titles to enable the University to oversee the approval of proposed award titles.

6.3.7 The Faculty will provide the Registry, on approval, with a copy of each Short Course Approval Form to enable curriculum set up to take place.

6.3.8 The Faculty will each term provide the Quality and Standards Office with a list of approved short courses to enable reporting to the Quality Monitoring and Review Sub Committee.

6.4 The approval of a collaborative short course

6.4.1 All collaborative short courses require consideration by a Partner Approval Event in line with the University’s collaborative procedures. This will also include in-principle approval of new collaborative partnerships by the Academic Strategy Committee, planning approval by the Faculty Programme Planning Executive, due diligence enquiries, venue check, the drawing up of a collaborative Agreement. Where the collaborative partner’s contribution is restricted to recruitment and the provision of a venue for the short course, the Quality and Standards Office will ensure that the procedures are applied in a way which is proportionate to the academic risk.

6.4.2 Where a collaborative short course is approved to run with one collaborative partner and it is proposed to run it with additional collaborative partner(s), Partner Approval Event(s) will be required to approve delivery at each individual collaborative partner.

6.5 The review of short courses

6.5.1 Each short course will be reviewed as part of the Annual Programme Monitoring of the appropriate school/centre, considering

- an evaluation by the participants in each intake that completed during that year,
- an evaluation of the short course by the short course convenor, using the appropriate University template, and, where appropriate,
- the annual review of the collaborative partner.

6.5.2 The University will assure itself that the standards and quality of its short courses are appropriate through the following mechanisms:

- the review process as outlined above, and
- any separate processes that the Faculty may wish to put into place to monitor its short courses, and
- the annual faculty report to the Quality Monitoring and Review Sub Committee on the conduct of delegated powers.

6.6 Other Courses

6.6.1 The Academic Strategy Committee may approve other programmes of undergraduate study, leading to a University award, with the explicit requirement that the award cannot be made as an exit award to a student registered full time or part time on a University programme. The University currently awards a University Diploma for an approved programme of study of 60 credits at levels four to six. Such programmes must be approved by the University Validation Panel.
7 PROCEDURES FOR THE SUSPENSION / WITHDRAWAL / CLOSURE OF A PROGRAMME

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 Recruitment to programmes may be suspended or withdrawn or programmes closed for a number of reasons. These may be for business or academic reasons, or a lack of market interest. Whatever the reason, and at whatever level within the University the issue is identified, the procedures to follow are set out below. The key element is to ensure that any student affected by closure has an opportunity to complete his or her programme of study.

7.1.2 Where the University decides to close a programme, implications of the closure of the programme will have been carefully considered including:

- The strategic consequences of the programme closure for the University.
- The impact of the closure on the staff and the students.
- How the quality and standards of the student experience will be maintained until the completion of the programme.
- The process of consultation with or notification of students where the delivery of the programme will materially change.
- The strategy for on-going delivery and support (including areas such as external examiner arrangements, revalidation requirements, etc.) during the phasing-out period.
- The implications regarding professional body registration (where applicable).

7.1.3 In the case of a programme delivered in collaboration with a partner and terminated as the result of that partnership ending, particular consideration should be given to the need of the student to complete his or her award.

7.2 The decision to suspend/withdraw recruitment to a programme and/or close a programme

7.2.1 Where a decision is made to suspend recruitment to a programme for a fixed period of time, the Programme Withdrawal Form available on the QSO website at http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-modification.aspx must be completed. This should clearly indicate the period of suspension which should not be more than two years. In the event that it is subsequently determined to withdraw / close the previously suspended programme a new Programme Withdrawal Form will be required.

7.2.2 Where a decision is made to withdraw recruitment to a programme that has existing students, the Programme Withdrawal Form available on the QSO website at http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-modification.aspx must be completed.

7.2.3 Where a decision is made to close a programme that is in validation but does not have any existing students, the Programme Withdrawal Form available on the QSO website at http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/programme-modification.aspx must be completed.

7.2.4 The form should be signed by the relevant Head(s) of School and submitted to the relevant Faculty Director(s) of Quality. The Faculty Director of Quality will ensure that the form is considered by the following Faculty committees:

- Faculty Programme Planning Executive, or equivalent body – for consideration of any portfolio implications;
- Faculty Quality Committee – for consideration of any quality assurance / student experience implications.
The Faculty Committees may request changes to the forms.

7.2.5 Following Faculty-level approval, the form will be signed by the Dean and submitted to the Academic Strategy Committee for institutional-level approval.

7.2.6 The Secretary to the Academic Strategy Committee will notify the Heads of all relevant Professional Service areas of programme suspension/withdrawal/closure approved by the Academic Strategy Committee including:

- Admissions
- Finance
- Marketing
- Planning
- Quality and Standards
- Registry
- Student Support and Guidance
- UK Partnerships or International Partnerships (where relevant)

7.2.7 The Faculty Director of Quality is responsible for notifying the professional body (where relevant).

7.3 The decision to terminate a collaborative partnership

Decision to Close a Programme and/or terminate a Partnership

7.3.1 The termination process will be regulated by the terms of the formal Agreement between both parties. The period of notification required to close a collaborative partnership or specific collaborative programme will usually be between 6 to 12 months, depending on the specific terms of the formal Agreement. However, closure of a partnership or programme may be undertaken in a shorter timescale in the case of a breach of contract. The specific terms of the Agreement will set out the procedures to be followed in the case of a breach of contract.

7.3.2 In all cases both parties are expected to co-operate to safeguard the interests of current students and applicants and follow the programme/withdrawal/closure procedures as set out in the Quality Manual.

7.3.3 The implications for the University of the termination of a contract must be carefully considered including:

- The strategic consequences of closure for the University and the other party;
- The impact of the closure on staff and students;
- How the quality and standards of the student experience will be maintained following notification of termination and/or closure;
- The process of consultation with or notification of students where the delivery of the programme will materially change;
- The strategy for on-going delivery and support (including areas such as external examiner arrangements, revalidation requirements, etc.) during the phasing-out period;
- The implications regarding professional body registration (where applicable);
- The potential for legal action ensuing from terminating the agreement.

7.3.4 In addition to this, whether the termination is instigated by the University or the partner, the University must ensure a phasing-out period is negotiated and a financial arrangement is agreed to enable any current students registered with the University to complete their programme of study. The University must ensure that the quality and standards of the programme, and the student learning experience are maintained during the phasing-out period. The partner will be expected to commit agreed resources to this process.
Closure of a Programme, and/or termination of the Partnership

7.3.5 Where the University is considering terminating a collaborative partnership or closing a collaborative programme, or the University is formally notified of a partner organisation’s wish to close a partnership or programme, the Assistant Director of Quality and Standards must be informed. The Assistant Director of Quality and Standards will liaise with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience), the Director of UK Partnerships or International Partnerships, and the University Solicitor (as appropriate), regarding the closure.

7.3.6 Following this consultation, and where the University agrees it wishes to instigate the termination of a formal agreement, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) will issue a formal notice of termination to the partner under the relevant terms of the agreement. The PVC (Education and Student Experience) has the discretion to determine whether the formal notice of termination is issued in advance of a Programme Withdrawal Form being completed and approved by the Academic Strategy Committee or whether it is a requirement that this be completed and approved prior to issuing the formal notice of termination. In the event that the formal notice of termination is issued in advance of a Programme Withdrawal Form being completed, the PVC (Education and Student Experience) has the discretion to determine when the decision is reported to the University and may agree with the Partner when it reports the decision.

7.3.7 A Programme Withdrawal Form must be completed at the appropriate stage and considered by the Faculty Programme Planning Executive and the Faculty Quality Committee prior to submission to the Academic Strategy Committee for approval.

7.3.8 Collaborative partnerships entering termination, or programmes facing closure, will be reported to the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee following Academic Strategy Committee approval.

7.4 The closure of a programme following a teach-out period

7.4.1 Academic Strategy Committee must be informed about the conclusion of a programme following a teach-out period.

- The Board of Examiners should be informed that the final cohort of students has completed the programme.
- The Chair of the Board of Examiners should ensure that this is recorded in the minutes of the Board of Examiners and make appropriate arrangements for the University to be notified.
- A copy of the final Board of Examiners minutes should be sent to the Quality and Standards Office with notification that no further awards will be made. This should be copied to the Faculty Director of Quality.
- The Quality and Standards Office will ensure that the Academic Strategy Committee is informed that the programme has closed and that there are no residual quality concerns.
8 ANNUAL PROGRAMME MONITORING [APM]

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 Each undergraduate and taught postgraduate programme and short course will be reviewed on an annual basis through an Annual Programme Monitoring process. The Annual Programme Monitoring process will take place at three levels as follows:
- Programme level
- Faculty level
- Institutional level

8.1.2 A separate process exists for the monitoring of postgraduate research programmes and the work of University Centres.

8.1.3 The purpose of the Annual Programme Monitoring process will be:
- To provide assurances that the programme or short course is meeting its objectives;
- To assess the quality of the student experience and consider mechanisms for enhancement;
- To identify and manage any risks to the programme or short course and ensure appropriate action plans are implemented to address any identified risks;
- To identify good / innovative practice and to share it to facilitate quality enhancement.

8.2 Oversight of Annual Programme Monitoring

8.2.1 The process will be overseen by the Faculty Quality Committee (FQC). The FDQ or nominated member of FQC will engage with schools/centres during the Annual Programme Monitoring process and will advise on the process and content of the review.

8.2.2 At an institutional level, responsibility for monitoring the process rests with the Education and Student Experience Committee. They will be supported in this monitoring role by both the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee and the Quality Monitoring and Review Sub-Committee.

8.3 Programme Level Review

8.3.1 The Programme level review of the previous academic year will take place between September and November. The exact timeline will be established at faculty / school level. The timeline is intended to enable an explicit link to be made between the Annual Programme Monitoring process and the University Business Planning Process. This alignment will enable outcomes of the Annual Programme Monitoring process, such as resourcing requirements, to feed in to the Business Planning process.

8.3.2 An annual review of each undergraduate and taught postgraduate programme / short course will be undertaken by the programme team in conjunction with student representatives and led by the Programme Director. This should include consideration of all modes of delivery and both single honours and combined honours where applicable.

8.3.3 The outcome of the annual review process will be an Annual Programme Monitoring Report (APMR) (including an Action Plan). A standard University report and action plan template will be provided.

8.3.4 For undergraduate programmes, the Annual Programme Monitoring Report will be informed by the data available on the Academic Management Information dashboard (accessed via the SAS Visual Analytics link in StaffNet or at the following website: https://cccu.canterbury.ac.uk/registry/planning-office/reporting.aspx) with a core set of data available for all programmes as follows:
• Student Retention (progression rates and withdrawals, interruptions, transfers, return from interruption rates)
• Student Success (completion rates and 1st, 2(i) rates, Value Added)
• Student Satisfaction – National Student Survey
• Admissions (headcount and average tariff required for entry and average tariff required for Entry compliance rate)
• Employability (Destination of Leavers of Higher Education)
• League tables (Guardian, Times, Complete University Guide)
• Quality (Academic Appeals, Plagiarism, Chair’s Actions, Complaints)
• Equality and Diversity (gender, ethnicity, disability etc.)

The data on the Academic Management Information dashboard will be provided in a format that allows for the easy identification of areas of concern.

8.3.5 For postgraduate programmes, the Annual Programme Monitoring Report will be informed by the Cohort Monitoring Data available in the Students Folder at the following website: http://reportingservices.canterbury.ac.uk/.

8.3.6 There will be a requirement for all programme teams to use the core data sets provided at institutional level. Where programme teams have additional data sets these can be included as part of the Data Pack (where relevant) but must not replace the institutional-level data. For undergraduate programmes, the Academic Management Information dashboard provides the facility for programme teams to generate further reports from the dashboard where it is felt this would be beneficial. Such circumstances may include where the programme team are aware of a particular area of concern, which is not identified as part of the core data set or to identify good / innovative practice.

8.3.7 The programme review will additionally be informed by a range of other sources as follows:
• External Examiner reports and responses
• Student-Staff Liaison Meeting minutes
• Module Evaluation
• National student surveys, e.g. National Student Survey (qualitative comments), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, Postgraduate Research Experience Survey, Newly Qualified Teacher survey and United Kingdom Engagement Survey
• Any other sources of student feedback
• Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) reports
• Placement reports (where applicable)

8.3.8 The Annual Programme Monitoring report template is designed in such a way as to encourage programme teams to focus attention on the issues identified on the Academic Management Information dashboard / through the review of evidence. It is intended to be an exceptions reporting process and descriptive commentary is not required on each piece of evidence reviewed. Opportunities for the sharing of good / innovative practice and enhancement will also be provided.

8.3.9 Review of Annual Programme Monitoring Reports and Action Plans will take place at a School-level Scrutiny Meeting. This will be a panel meeting organised at subject level.

8.3.10 The exact composition of the Panel may be considered at Faculty / School level but as a minimum must comprise the following:
• Head of School (chair)
• Student representative (from the Faculty but outside of the programme under review)
• Designated non-School academic panel member to be determined by the Faculty Quality Committee (for example the Faculty Director of Quality and / or the Faculty Director of Learning and Teaching but not necessarily the same individual for each meeting)
8.3.11 The Senior Representative from the Directorate of the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) will be a member of the Directorate Senior Leadership Group.

8.3.12 Where a School has a large number of subject areas, necessitating a large number of meetings, the Head of School may nominate a senior member of staff to chair some or all of the School-level Scrutiny Meetings. This will be in exceptional circumstances only and permission must be granted by the Dean for this activity to be delegated.

8.3.13 The Subject Lead (or equivalent depending on Faculty nomenclature), relevant Programme Directors and a current student on each of the programmes under consideration will be required to attend the School-level Scrutiny Meeting. It may be appropriate in certain circumstances for a wider group of staff such as Pathway leads to also attend. All will be required to attend for the full duration of the meeting to enable the immediate sharing of good / innovative practice to take place and to enable a wider discussion of issues that may be common to more than one programme to take place.

8.3.14 A data pack will be provided to the panel along with the Annual Programme Monitoring Report. The data pack should be comprised of the sources of evidence that lead to explicit commentary / actions in the Annual Programme Monitoring Report and Action Plan. It does not need to include evidence sources reviewed that the programme team determine do not require commentary in the report. It will be the responsibility of the Subject Lead or other designated person within the School to ensure that the data pack is produced for the Panel. This should be provided electronically.

8.3.15 The purpose of the School-level Scrutiny Meeting will be as follows:

- To highlight good / innovative practice and consider transferability of good / innovative practice at subject/school level;
- To determine whether issues have been appropriately identified and appropriate actions put in place to address them and where this is not the case support programme teams to find appropriate strategies to address issues;
- To give consideration to the appropriate level for issues to be addressed.

8.3.16 An outcome of the School-level Scrutiny Meeting may be that further work is to be undertaken on the Annual Programme Monitoring Report.

8.3.17 A brief summary report will be produced following the meeting (Summary Report – School Level Scrutiny Process) outlining areas of good / innovative practice to be shared, along with actions identified. A University-wide report template will be provided for this purpose.

8.3.18 Responsibility for production of the Summary Report will rest with the Subject Lead (or equivalent depending on Faculty nomenclature). The report will identify actions that can be appropriately addressed at programme / subject area / school level. The remaining actions will be included in the report but it will be the role of the Faculty Quality Committee to determine where these are best addressed.

8.3.19 It is not the intention for there to be a School-level tier of review rather the School is the context for the review of programmes. The Summary Report should therefore be produced at the subject level and there is no requirement for a separate School level report.

8.4 Faculty level review

8.4.1 On completion of the programme level review process a meeting of the Faculty Quality Committee will be convened to consider all of the summary reports of the School-level Scrutiny Meetings. The Faculty level review process will take place in December / early January.
8.4.2 The role of the Faculty Quality Committee in considering the summary reports will be as follows:

- To confirm that due process has been followed;
- To determine how the good / innovative practice identified will be shared at Faculty level and to determine the areas of good / innovative practice that are transferable to other parts of the University to go forward as part of the Faculty level report;
- To take an overview of the issues highlighted but not identified as matters that can be dealt with at programme / subject area / school level and to determine where responsibility for such issues should reside (it may be appropriate to refer them back for programme / subject area / school consideration);
- To agree the process for reviewing programmes against actions identified on a periodic basis.

8.4.3 A senior member of the Quality and Standards Office will be invited to attend the FQC meeting to support the Faculty in identifying the appropriate place for actions to be addressed.

8.4.4 Following the Faculty Quality Committee meeting, the Faculty Director of Quality will produce a Faculty-level Overview Report. A University-wide template will be provided for this purpose (Faculty Overview Report). The Faculty Overview Report must be approved by the Faculty Dean prior to submission to the Quality and Standards Office.

8.4.5 The purpose of the report will be to identify any Faculty-wide or University-wide issues or areas of good / innovative practice and will take appropriate steps to report or action these, with appropriate follow-up arrangements.

8.5 Institutional-level review

8.5.1 An Overview Report of all non-academic issues identified as part of the Annual Programme Monitoring process will be produced by the Quality and Standards Office based on the Summary Reports of the School-level Scrutiny meetings. This will be considered by the Professional Services Quality Committee and will enable the sharing of information between Faculties and Professional Services. Individual programmes, subject areas and faculties should continue to liaise with Professional Services directly about such matters.

8.5.2 All Faculty-level Overview Reports will be considered by the February meeting of the Quality Monitoring and Review Sub-Committee. The meeting will also consider an Overview Report of the Annual Professional Service Monitoring process.

8.5.3 The Quality Monitoring and Review Sub-Committee will identify any institution-wide issues or areas of good / innovative practice and ensure that they are reported to the February meeting of the Education and Student Experience Committee (after the Quality Monitoring and Review Sub-Committee) through a report produced by the Chair of the Quality Monitoring & Review Sub-Committee.

8.6 Note on module evaluations

8.6.1 There is a requirement for module evaluation to take place at the end of delivery of each module. The Academic with responsibility for the module is required to ensure this is conducted.

8.6.2 As part of the Annual Programme Monitoring process all schools/centres should share summaries of programme module evaluation with student representatives. This will normally be through Student-Staff Liaison Meetings.

8.6.3 This does not include short course evaluations, although schools/centres may choose to share module evaluations, if they so wish.
8.6.4 Schools/centres may wish to utilise this process to canvass student views on any proposed action to be taken in light of this evaluation.

8.7 Collaborative Programmes

8.7.1 All collaborative programmes must be included in the Annual Programme Monitoring process conducted at Academic School / Centre level. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Quality Committee to ensure collaborative programmes are included in this process.

8.7.2 Collaborative Partner Staff with Associate Tutor accounts will have access to the Academic Management Information Dashboard and the University data must be used.

8.7.3 Collaborative Partner Staff should utilise the standard University Annual Programme Monitoring Report template.

8.7.4 Where a programme is franchised, each location of delivery must produce a separate Annual Programme Monitoring Report. The University Programme Director must also produce an overall report. All reports should be considered by the School-level Scrutiny Meeting.

8.7.5 Collaborative Partner Staff may be represented at the School-level Scrutiny meeting by the University Programme Director / Academic Link Tutor. Equally, arrangements may be made enabling them to participate in the meeting either through attendance or via electronic means such as skype.

8.7.6 In addition to annual monitoring at a programme level, there is a requirement for a Collaborative Partner Annual Monitoring Report (CPAMR) to be produced by each collaborative partner. For collaborative partners that deliver programmes in one subject area only at only undergraduate or postgraduate level, the CPAMR will be completed as an Appendix to the Annual Programme Monitoring report using the University-wide template for this purpose. For collaborative partners that do not meet the above criteria, a standalone CPAMR will be required. The focus of the CPAMR will be predominantly on the capacity of the partner to deliver Higher Education and specifically the programmes the University have approved the partner to deliver.

8.7.7 Responsibility for ensuring completion of the CPAMR as an Appendix to the Annual Programme Monitoring Report rests with the Faculty in which the collaborative programme sits. Responsibility for ensuring completion of the standalone CPAMR rests with the Quality and Standards Office.

8.7.8 For collaborative partners where the CPAMR is produced as an Appendix to the Annual Programme Monitoring Report, the completed Appendix will be submitted directly to the School in accordance with the deadline specified for submission of the Annual Programme Monitoring Report. The Appendix will be considered alongside the Annual Programme Monitoring Report at the School-level Scrutiny meeting with the School-level Scrutiny Panel responsible for ensuring appropriate sign-off at institutional level by the collaborative partner, all sections of the Appendix are completed and the quality of the report. Once the Annual Programme Monitoring Report and CPAMR Appendix is finalised the full report (with the data pack removed) will be forwarded to the Quality and Standards Office for consideration by the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee.

8.7.9 For collaborative partners where a standalone CPAMR is required, the completed report will be submitted to the Quality and Standards Office. The Quality and Standards Office will ensure appropriate sign-off at institutional level by the collaborative partner institution and the report will be sent to the relevant Faculty Director(s) of Quality for review. Where the Faculty Director(s) of Quality is of the view that the report has not been fully completed the report will be returned to the collaborative partner with an indication of the areas that require further consideration. This will be done via the Quality and Standards Office for partners working across multiple Faculties. Where the Faculty Director(s) of Quality has concerns regarding the quality / accuracy of the report, a meeting will be held with a senior
member of the Quality and Standards Office and appropriate action will be determined. Appropriate action may require the input of the relevant Partnerships Office.

8.7.10 All CPAMRs will be subsequently considered by the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee. Where the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee has concerns regarding a partnership based on the report submitted, it will determine the most appropriate course of action to be taken.

8.8 Overview of the Process

8.8.1 The flowchart overleaf provides an overview of the process.
Figure 8-1  Overview of the Annual Programme Monitoring Process

Programme level – September to November

- Programme team review
  → Informed by institutional data and other sources
  → Production of APMR (programme team)
  → Institutional report template
  → School-level Scrutiny Panel Meeting (subject level)
  → Production of Summary Report (Subject Lead)
  → Institutional report template

Faculty level – Dec / Jan

- FQC meeting to consider Summary Reports
  → Production of Faculty Report (FDQ)
  → Institutional report template

Institutional level – Feb / Mar

- QMRSC meeting to consider Faculty Reports
  → ESEC meeting to consider QMRSC Report (Director of QSO)
9 ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICE MONITORING

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 The purpose of the Annual Professional Service Monitoring is:

- To provide assurances that the professional service is meeting its objectives as set out in its business plan and assess impact and delivery of the business plan;
- To assess the quality of the stakeholder experience through consideration of lessons learnt through delivery of the Service Level Statement / Agreement and consider mechanisms for enhancement;
- To identify and manage any risks and ensure appropriate action plans are implemented to address any identified risks;
- To identify good practice and share it to facilitate quality enhancement.

9.1.2 All professional service departments are required to have Business Plans and a Service Level Statement / Agreement and the following diagram sets out the principles of the Annual Professional Service Monitoring [APSM] process. This more clearly links the process to the Business Plan and Service Level Statement / Agreement.
9.2 Links with other processes

9.2.1 Business Planning – the Business Plan is the main operational planning mechanism for departments. The Annual monitoring process should both reflect on the previous year's Business Plan with regard to any quality concerns relating to the student experience that may not have been resolved and look forward to the next Business Plan in terms of identifying any quality concerns that would feed in to the next Business Plan. A high quality Annual Monitoring report should facilitate the Business Planning process. It should not however duplicate it.

9.2.2 Service Level Statements/Agreements – The Annual Monitoring Process should facilitate an annual review of performance against Service Level Statements / Agreements (SLS/As). It should also afford an opportunity to review the continued appropriateness of the SLS/As.

9.2.3 Stakeholder Feedback – Departments have in place a range of different processes for gaining feedback from their stakeholders. Stakeholders will vary depending on the individual professional service department. For a number of professional service departments, the report should evidence that consideration has been given to outcomes of surveys such as the National Student Survey, University Student Survey, UK Engagement Survey, Destinations of Leavers of Higher Education (DLHE), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey and Postgraduate Research Experience Survey. These may not be relevant for all professional service departments however. Feedback from stakeholders may be sought through bespoke surveys but there is no suggestion that professional service departments need to introduce additional surveys just for the purpose of annual monitoring. Feedback could be received through meetings with stakeholders and informal mechanisms.

9.2.4 With regard to specific feedback from programmes / schools, there is a responsibility for both programme teams / schools and professional service departments to maintain a dialogue throughout the year and identify any issues or good practice, particularly those that may not have been resolved in the annual monitoring process. As the Annual Programme Monitoring process and the Annual Professional Service Monitoring process need to take place simultaneously to both feed in to the Business Planning process it is complex for the two processes to feed in to each other. The two processes will meet at the Quality Monitoring and Review Sub-committee however and this sub-committee will have a key role to play in terms of identifying any issues that may not have been picked up by the appropriate professional service departments / faculties.

9.3 Sharing of Good Practice

9.3.1 The report template includes a specific requirement for good practice to be identified and for the Professional Services Quality Committee to consider approaches for the sharing of good practice.

9.4 Report Format

9.4.1 The report template issued by the Quality and Standards Office is to be used by all professional service departments. This is intended to shift the focus of the process to exception reporting whilst still enabling the sharing of good practice. The design of the report template is intended to more clearly focus attention on the issues raised by the review of evidence. The report does not need to provide commentary on all the evidence reviewed rather just focus on the key issues that have arisen throughout the year under review.

9.4.2 The report is to be produced as a whole department activity, led by the Director/Head of Department. The report should be evaluative and critically self-reflective, not just descriptive.

9.4.3 The report should be produced in reference to a range of sources of evidence. The report should reference documents provided as part of the evidence base rather than repeat content from the sources of evidence. The sources of evidence will need to be compiled in to an
electronic data pack to be submitted along with the completed report for consideration by the SMT Lead and the Quality and Standards Office.

9.4.4 Once finalised the report should remain a live document and the action plan should be reviewed for progress throughout the year via the departmental team meeting. The report should also inform the University’s business planning process.

9.5 Scrutiny of Reports Prior to Submission

9.5.1 The SMT Lead has responsibility for ensuring reports are produced for all professional services within their area. The report must be approved by the SMT Lead prior to submission to the Quality and Standards Office. There may be a requirement for the report to undergo further amendment following consideration by the SMT Lead.

9.6 Timelines for Production and Consideration of Reports

9.6.1 The following indicative schedule and committee responsibilities provides a clear indication of the deadlines for submission of the APSM Report and consequent consideration through the committee structure. Deadlines for submission of reports must be adhered to in order to enable the feed up of appropriate summary reports through the University committee structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August – mid December</td>
<td>Completion of reports and sign off of reports by relevant SMT Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-December</td>
<td>Submission of reports to the Quality and Standards Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-January</td>
<td>Consideration of reports by the Professional Services Quality Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-late January</td>
<td>Production of an Overview Report on the Annual Monitoring process for Professional Service Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Consideration of the Overview Report by the Quality Monitoring &amp; Review Sub-Committee, which produces a further report for the Education and Student Experience Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 PERIODIC PROGRAMME (AND PARTNERSHIP) REVIEW

10.1 Introduction

10.1.1 All programmes and partnerships must undergo Periodic Programme (and Partnership) Review. As part of this process the programme and partnership will be considered for re-approval.

10.1.2 Programmes will be reviewed annually by the programme team through Annual Programme Monitoring and updated as needed through programme modification. The same annual review process should be used to ensure that the programme of study undertaken by students is still capable of enabling students to meet the intended learning outcomes of the programme. If the School/Centre believes that the programme needs radical change for any reason or if there is a threat that successive programme modification threatens the integrity of the programme, there will need to be a major modification event if this is before the due date for a Periodic Programme (and Partnership) Review. When a programme is undergoing major modification to respond to an urgent external requirement, such as a change in the external regulatory framework, the major modification event may be scaled accordingly through consultation with the Director of Quality and Standards.

10.1.3 The Periodic Departmental Review (please note this process is paused for 2017/18) will conduct a review of the relevant school/centre’s academic portfolio, but will not review, revalidate or reapprove programmes of study. All programmes of study will need to be reviewed and reapproved by the University Validation Panel.

10.1.4 In addition to this, each programme must undergo a Periodic Programme Review. The principles for Periodic Programme Review are as follows:

- there must be a visible and rigorous review of each programme of study, conducted to a regular timetable;
- the Review must make use of external reference points, including external participation;
- the Review should contain within it a process for reapproving the updated programme specification;
- the Review of the operation of collaborative partnerships should, whenever possible, be integrated with the Review of the programme.

10.1.5 The following steps form the basis of Periodic Programme Review activity:

- an explicit review of each programme of study is conducted in the sixth year of operation of the programme;
- the Review Event should concern itself with whether threshold academic standards are being maintained, and whether the programme provides a good student experience and is fit for purpose;
- the Review Panel will make a recommendation to ESEC regarding the re-approval of the programme;
- the Review will test whether the programme team has a clear understanding of the challenges faced by the programme, and appropriate plans to tackle them.

10.1.6 The Review will make use of existing evidence of the programme’s effectiveness and the views expressed to the Panel, as well as any updated programme documentation.

10.1.7 Where the programme operates within a collaborative partnership, the Review will normally consider the operation of the partnership in respect of that programme.
10.2 Timing of review

10.2.1 Regularity of review is part of the QAA’s expectation. Most programmes are currently approved for six years. The Review will be conducted in the sixth year of operation of the programme, and will take into account any and all modifications or pathways to the programme approved during the period since its approval or last periodic review.

10.2.2 The timing of the Periodic Review will take into account the requirements of relevant professional, statutory and/or regulatory bodies, for example where these require review and reapproval in the fifth year of operation.

10.2.3 Where a programme requires major changes before the normal date at which a Review is due, perhaps because of legislative changes, the Review element will not be required. Approval of the revised programme specification will be treated as a Major Modification, approved for the lifetime of the programme. The programme will be expected to undergo a Periodic Review within the original timescale.

10.3 Planning

10.3.1 Completion of the Planning process as outlined in the Programme Approval section of the Quality Manual is required in advance of a programme being considered for Periodic Programme (and Partnership) Review.

10.4 Externality

10.4.1 In considering revisions to be made to the programme in advance of the Periodic Programme Review, the programme team will draw on a number of different sources of feedback both internal and external to the University. The University provides some funding to aid programmes in securing additional external advice during the process of programme review. This may be used to pay an External Programme Development Advisor to review revised documentation or discuss ideas. The appointment of such an advisor is delegated to the relevant Faculty Director of Quality. Applications should be made on the External Advisor Appointment Form - http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/periodic-programme-review/periodic-programme-review.aspx

10.4.2 An External Assessor must be appointed to participate in the periodic review process. They will participate both through the submission of some suggested lines of enquiry in advance of the preliminary meeting and through attendance at the Meeting of the University Periodic Programme (and Partnership) Review Panel.

10.4.3 The criteria for the appointment of an External Assessor is as follows:

(i) An External Assessor must have either:
   - a significant academic career in an appropriate field of study which involves experience as a subject or programme manager (e.g. Head of Department, Programme Director, Pathway Director, Professional Lead), a significant research record of national standing, or experience of external examining; or
   - relevant professional experience where the field of study has a professional or vocational context, and where appropriate professional registration.

(ii) An External Assessor should normally have five years’ experience in the relevant academic area and a higher degree.

(iii) An External Assessor cannot be, or have been nominated as, or have been within the previous five years an External Examiner on any University award.
(iv) Former members of University staff should not be nominated to become External Assessors before a lapse of at least five years or sufficient time for students taught by that member of staff to have passed through the system, whichever is the longer.

(v) Former students should not be nominated to become External Assessors before a lapse of at least five years.

10.4.4 Where a ‘professional’ External Assessor is appointed, this will always be in addition to the appointment of an ‘academic’ External Assessor.

10.4.5 Using the form provided on the Quality and Standards Office website, the School will nominate an External Assessor meeting the above criteria for the periodic review. A CV will be required for each nomination. The nominations will be submitted to the Quality Officer managing the periodic review process at the earliest opportunity. Each nomination will be forwarded to the Quality Manager and the Assistant Director of Quality and Standards for approval.

10.5 Documentation Requirements

10.5.1 The Programme Team are required to make the following documentation available for the periodic review:

- a Programme Briefing Paper, identifying issues such as from annual reporting (a template is provided for this on the Quality and Standards Office website).
- annual programme reviews and associated documentation, for all years of operation since the last periodic review, including
  - annual review action plans;
  - external examiner reports and responses;
  - progression and completion summary data;
  - NSS/USS scores;
- the existing programme specification;
- the existing student handbook;
- the proposed programme specification;
- the proposed student handbook;
- staff CVs for those staff teaching on the programme;
- a sample of core module handbooks (where these are available);
- a list of minor modifications approved since the original validation / last review;
- first destination data (for the last two years of operation);
- minutes of Programme Management Committees, where these are available (for the last two years of operation);
- minutes of Boards of Examiners (for the last two years of operation);
- minutes of student-staff liaison meetings (for the last two years of operation);
- programme planning form (as approved by the Faculty);
- the existing collaborative Agreement (for collaborative programmes);
- annual partnership review meeting minutes (for all years of operation since the last review) (for collaborative programmes);

10.5.2 It is the responsibility of the faculty to ensure that the programme briefing paper, proposed programme specification and proposed student handbook that is incomplete or of poor quality is not submitted to review. Each faculty will specify mechanisms for signing off the programme documentation to proceed to the review event. The faculty should also ensure the provision of a full evidence base for the review event.

10.5.3 Programme documentation should be submitted via the office of the Faculty Director of Quality to the Quality Officer managing the review process.

10.5.4 The full set of documentation should normally be submitted six weeks in advance of the scheduled date for the review event. In the event that the documentation is not received in
a timely manner, the event will be postponed, in order to give the panel sufficient time to read the documentation.

### 10.6 The Review process

#### 10.6.1 In conjunction with the Faculty Director of Quality, the Quality and Standards Office will arrange a date for the review event. Programmes must normally have been considered by the Periodic Programme (and Partnership) Review Panel at least 6 months prior to commencement of the revalidated version of the programme unless there are exceptional circumstances.

#### 10.6.2 The Quality and Standards Office will appoint a Panel to scrutinise the programme. The Panel will consist of

- A Chair (senior academic);
- An External Assessor (appointed in line with the University’s approved criteria);
- An internal panel member;
- A nominee of the Director of Quality and Standards (or senior member of the Quality and Standards Office);
- A nominee of the Director of Learning and Teaching (or senior member of Learning and Teaching Enhancement);
- A student panel member.

#### 10.6.3 All members of the panel will be independent of the faculty proposing the programme, and will be expected to attend the event. QSO will keep a list of relevant members who have the approval of their Head of School or Dean to participate and who have completed the necessary training.

#### 10.6.4 All documentation will be provided for the panel electronically via Blackboard or via email to external assessors. Staff CVs will be circulated by e-mail.

#### 10.6.5 It is expected that the event will be attended by

- The Programme Director
- The Head of School or nominee
- Sufficient programme team members so to be able to present the proposal.

#### 10.6.6 Approximately one week prior to the periodic review event the internal panel members will hold a preliminary meeting to determine the lines of enquiry for the review event. A standard agenda is used for this meeting to ensure consistency of approach. The External Assessor is required to submit suggested lines of enquiry in advance of the meeting to inform the discussions at the meeting. The Programme Director and Head of School or nominee will be invited to attend the last half hour of the preliminary meeting. This will enable the Panel to explain the lines of enquiry to be followed during the periodic review, the request additional documentation where required and to confirm the agenda for the review event.

#### 10.6.7 The indicative agenda for the Review Event is as follows:

- 10.00am: Private meeting of the Panel
- 10.30am: Panel Meeting with students
- 11.30am: Panel Meeting with stakeholders
- 12.30pm: Private meeting of the Panel (with working lunch)
- 1.00pm: Panel Meeting with Programme Team
- 3.00pm: Private meeting of the Panel to determine outcomes
- 3.30pm: Feedback meeting
- 4.00pm Close.
10.6.8 The programme may be modified to include a tour of resources where specialist resources are required for the delivery of the programme.

10.6.9 As can be seen from the indicative agenda, it is intended that the Periodic Review panel will meet with students, staff and, where relevant, other stakeholders, to triangulate the picture of the programme given in the Briefing Paper and the documentary evidence. It is the responsibility of the programme team to source the students and stakeholders to meet the panel. It is a compulsory requirement that the review panel meets with students and in the event that none are available the review event will need to be postponed.

10.6.10 The Review Panel will decide what kind of approval activity is required for the new revised programme. The Panel may decide on one of the following outcomes:

- no amendments are required and AB is recommended to grant approval for another six years;
- the programme may be recommended to AB for approval, subject to the fulfilment of conditions and recommendations, which will be checked and signed off in a manner to be determined by the Review Panel;
- if, in exceptional circumstances, the Review Panel cannot approve the revised programme specification, then the programme will be referred to a reconvened meeting of the Panel.

10.6.11 The Review Panel will have the capacity to make recommendations to the University where, for example, there are serious concerns about the quality of a programme.

10.6.12 In addition to these outcomes, the Review Panel will identify good practice (commendations). Conditions and recommendations will address matters of substance, and, other than the revised programme specification or student handbook, will not require the resubmission of the Briefing Paper or the documentary evidence provided for the Periodic Review. Conditions and recommendations may relate either to the existing programme or to the new proposed programme specification. The Panel will also specify mechanisms for determining where conditions and recommendations have been appropriately addressed and a deadline for the resubmission of the documentation.

10.6.13 The Quality and Standards Office will provide a written report within three weeks of the panel meeting.

10.6.14 By the agreed date, the programme team shall submit to the Panel Secretary in the Quality and Standards Office, the documentation, revised in the light of the conditions and recommendations and a schedule of amendments (via the response table).

10.6.15 Once the chair is satisfied that the conditions and recommendations have been addressed in line with the expectations of the panel, they will sign the review off. The review will then be reported to the next meeting of the Education and the Student Experience Committee which will recommend the revised programme for re-approval to the Academic Board.

10.6.16 Programme directors permitting a revised programme to commence prior to Academic Board approval may be subject to disciplinary action.

10.6.17 QSO will retain the definitive copy of the revised validation documentation and place it on the shared drive.

10.6.18 An annual report on the operation of the periodic programme review process will be submitted to the QMRSC in Michaelmas Term for recommendation to the ESEC.

10.7 Partnerships

10.7.1 Where possible, the Periodic Review will encompass a review of the operation of the partnership and will be conducted at the partner organisation. This will be relatively straightforward where a Partner teaches only one University programme.
10.7.2 Where a partner delivers a number of programmes, the Quality and Standards Office will, following discussion with the appropriate SMT Strategic Lead(s), determine how the review of the partner is to be carried out. The following offers indicative arrangements.

- In the case of a University Strategic Partner, the University will normally set up a comprehensive review of the collaborative arrangements with the Partner to take place on a six-yearly basis.
- Two or more programmes may be drawn together for a single Review.
- The Review of one programme may be undertaken in the same way as if it were the sole provision, with any wider outcomes being considered separately.
- One programme/partnership review event may be designated to look for partner-specific issues that cross programme boundaries, and will receive the reports of other programme reviews at the partner to do so.

10.7.3 Where a programme is taught at the University and across multiple partners simultaneously, there will be a single Review of the programme conducted at the University. QSO will agree a mechanism to check that the operation of programme and partnership is appropriate at each of the collaborative partners.

10.7.4 An interim review of the partnership may take place before the full review of programme and partnership where the review dates for the two aspects do not currently align and the Memorandum of Agreement / Agreement is due to expire prior to the due date for the full periodic programme and partnership review. The interim review will take place at the University considering all partnerships due to expire that academic year with a panel composition and using an evidence base determined by the Director of Quality and Standards.
11 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

11.1.1 One of the mechanisms by which programme management takes place is through Programme Management Committees.

Figure 11-1   Remit and Terms of Reference of the Programme Management Committee

The Programme Management Committee meets at least once per term, receives programme reports, carries out appropriate curriculum monitoring, and considers, inter alia:
- programme and curriculum development;
- learning and teaching methods;
- learning outcomes and assessments;
- patterns of assessment;
- student progression;
- attendance;
- student retention;
- student support;
- student destinations;
- resources, such as accommodation;
- professional practice placements;
- programme evaluations;
- other issues as required.

Composition of the Programme Management Committee

Normally this comprises:
- the Head of School/Centre, or nominee (Chair);
- the Programme Director (Deputy Chair);
- course co-ordinators;
- student representative(s);
- others, as appropriate, e.g., pathway co-ordinators, course co-ordinators, practitioners, representatives of partner providers etc.
12 **EXTERNAL EXAMINERS**

12.1 **Responsibility of Academic Board**

12.1.1 The Academic Board is responsible for the oversight of the external examiner system.

12.1.2 The Academic Board will approve all arrangements relating to the external examination of programmes, on the recommendation of the Education and Student Experience Committee.

12.1.3 The Education and Student Experience Committee on behalf of Academic Board will be responsible for the appointment of external examiners on the recommendation of the External Examiners Appointments Panel.

12.1.4 The Academic Board will receive and approve an annual report on the operation of the external examiner system from the Director of Quality and Standards, on the recommendation of the Education and Student Experience Committee. The report will cover any issues for the University raised in Faculty External Examiner annual summative reports. The report will normally be received in the Lent Term.

12.1.5 The Quality Monitoring and Review Sub Committee will receive and approve an annual (summative) report from each Faculty Quality Committee on the operation of the external examiner system in that faculty. The reports will normally be received in the Michaelmas Term.

12.1.6 The Education and Student Experience Committee will consider any issues of significance raised in a report by an external examiner using the appropriate reporting pro forma. The Director of Quality and Standards will consider any issues so raised in his annual report to the Academic Board.

12.1.7 All matters relating to external examiners, including their appointment, are covered by *Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards* and the Assessment Procedures documents.

12.2 **The appointment of external examiners**

12.2.1 Rules for the appointment of external examiners are set out in the Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards and the Assessment Procedures. The procedures ensure that external examiners are appointed in a timely fashion. In support of the appointment of external examiners, the Quality and Standards Office will provide the Faculty Directors of Quality at the start of the Michaelmas term with a list of all external examiners the term of office of which is due to end during or at the end of the current academic year. There will be updates detailing the progress towards replacement on a monthly basis.

12.3 **The nomination of an external examiner for a new programme**

12.3.1 Where an external examiner is being nominated for a new programme, the process of nomination and approval of the external examiner should be completed as far as it is practicable before the programme commences.

12.3.2 To this effect the nomination of the proposed external examiner should normally be received no later than the date on which any revised validation documentation is due to be received by the Quality and Standards Office. It must be noted that if the school/centre wishes to nominate an external assessor from the validation event as the external examiner, that person should not be approached until after they have completed their role as external assessor. This is to ensure that there is no conflict of interest that might undermine the impartiality of the external assessor at validation. If the external examiner is to play a role in the final approval of revised documentation, they must not be approached until after that point.
12.4 The nomination of a replacement external examiner

12.4.1 Where an external examiner is being nominated to replace an existing external examiner, the process of nomination and approval of the external examiner must be completed before the end of the term of office of the existing external examiner. In practice this means that the nomination should normally be submitted to the Quality and Standards Office at least six months prior to the end of the existing external examiners contract. It should be noted that, whereas it will remain practical for the nomination of the replacement examiner to be processed during Semester Two/Trinity Term, if it is submitted to the Quality and Standards Office, such an arrangement leaves no time for a replacement external examiner to be nominated and approved should the first nomination prove unsuccessful.

12.5 Nomination of External Examiners: Procedures

12.5.1 The nomination of an External Examiner is the responsibility of the Head of School/Centre concerned, in consultation with the Programme Director. Before making a nomination, they should contact the prospective nominee informally to ensure that they are willing to serve, while making it clear that the appointment will require approval and final confirmation will follow after some delay.

12.5.2 The Head of School/Centre should complete an application on the University’s nomination form, which can be found at http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/external-examiners/nomination-and-approval.aspx

12.5.3 The completed nomination form should be submitted, together with the curriculum vitae of the nominee, via the Quality and Standards Office to the External Examiner Appointments Panel.

12.5.4 In making recommendations for the appointment of the External Examiner, Heads of School/Centre shall ensure that the proposed External Examiner demonstrates:

- knowledge and understanding of UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality;
- competence and experience in the fields covered by the programme of study, or parts thereof;
- relevant academic and/or professional qualifications to at least the level of the qualification being externally examined, and/or extensive practitioner experience where appropriate;
- competence and experience relating to designing and operating a variety of assessment tasks appropriate to the subject and operating assessment procedures;
- sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the discipline to be able to command the respect of academic peers and, where appropriate, professional peers;
- familiarity with the standard to be expected of students to achieve the award that is to be assessed;
- fluency in English, and where programmes are delivered and assessed in languages other than English, fluency in the relevant language(s) (unless other secure arrangements are in place to ensure that External Examiners are provided with the information to make their judgements);
- that they meet applicable criteria set by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies;
- awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula;
- competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience.

12.5.5 It should also be noted that the UK Quality Code for Higher Education indicates that due to the potential for a conflict of interest to develop, the following categories should not be appointed as an External Examiner:
• a member of a governing body or committee of the appointing institution or one of its collaborative partners, or a current employee of the appointing institution or one of its collaborative partners;
• anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the programme of study;
• anyone required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the programme of study;
• anyone who is, or knows they will be, in a position to influence significantly the future of students on the programme of study;
• anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the programme(s) or modules in question;
• former staff or students of the institution unless a period of five years has elapsed and all students taught by or with the external examiner have completed their programme(s);
• a reciprocal arrangement involving cognate programmes at another institution;
• the succession of an External Examiner from an institution by a colleague from the same School in the same institution.

12.5.6 Academic Board has agreed that external examiners should normally hold no more than two external examiner appointments for taught programmes / modules at any point in time.

12.6 The extension of an the term of office of an existing external examiner

12.6.1 The duration of an external examiner’s appointment will normally be for four years, with an exceptional extension of one year to ensure continuity.

12.6.2 An external examiner will be considered for an extension to his or her term of office, where:
• The reason for an extension of a year are clearly stated on the appropriate form and approved by the Panel and ESEC. The reason for the extension should normally be for reasons of continuity and should not relate to the administrative convenience of the University.

12.6.3 With regard to the proposed extension of an existing external examiner, the same timescale must be applied as that in the nominations process above.

12.7 The nomination of an external examiner to an additional programme within the University

12.7.1 External examiners may be appointed to additional programmes or short courses, provided that in doing so, the external examiner is not being asked to undertake a workload that would not enable him or her to ensure the standards of the programmes being covered. The following must be noted:
• The external examiner cannot examine for a period longer than the original nomination, plus a possible extension.
• In order to ensure that the external examiner is appropriate to cover the subject of the new programme, a formal request to extend their duties should be made, using the appropriate pro forma.

12.8 External examiner induction

12.8.1 In order that external examiners are properly prepared for their roles, and introduced to the University, the Quality and Standards Office organises induction events at various points in
the year. Wherever possible these events are conducted in conjunction with a programme-specific briefing, and programme directors will be invited to the events for this purpose. It is an expectation that where possible all new or recently appointed external examiners will attend one of these events, prior to beginning to look at assessed student work.

12.9 External examiner Right to Work checks

12.9.1 The University has a responsibility to check that external examiners have the right to work in the UK. This will involve seeing the external examiner, in person, with their passport (or other approved documentation), and any relevant visa, and making a signed copy. Wherever possible this check will be conducted by QSO at the external examiners’ induction event.

12.9.2 Where QSO is unable to make this check, academic schools/centres will be responsible for so doing. This should be done at the first available opportunity, and before the external examiner begins to look at student work. Right to work checks should be conducted only by staff members who have been briefed by Human Resources.

12.10 Payment of fees and expenses for external examiners

12.10.1 External examiner’s fees are paid through the Quality and Standards Office. Fees are paid on the submission of the external examiner’s annual report. For external examiners nominated and appointed before September 2012, a repeat payment will be made based on the last submitted work schedule unless annual work schedules have been agreed with the programme team for reasons relating to the nature of the programme.

12.10.2 For external examiners nominated and appointed after September 2012, they will also be paid on a formula related into the number of students on the programme. This will be fixed at the beginning of their term of office, and requires the programme director to submit an external examiner setup form prior to the external examiner’s contract being issued. Claims for any additional days visits must be submitted to the Quality and Standards Office on an annual basis.

12.10.3 Schools/centres are responsible for the payment of external examiners’ legitimate travel and living expenses. All such expenses will need to be approved by the Head of School/Centre, in line with rules published on the QSO website.

12.11 Meeting students

12.11.1 It is best practice to enable external examiners to meet with students. This is for the purposes of induction and it is not related to the assessment of student performance. It normally happens at the beginning of the term of office of the external examiner.

12.12 External examiner reports

12.12.1 The procedures for consideration of and responding to external examiner reports are set out in the Assessment Procedures documents. It should be noted that where an external examiner raises a significant issue, one, for example, that if not rectified threatens the standards of the programme, that issue and how it is addressed must be reported on the appropriate pro forma to the FQC and thereafter to the Quality Monitoring and Review Subcommittee.

12.12.2 Where there is more than one external examiner for the programme, it is expected that all reports for that year will be shared with all external examiners.

12.13 Responses to external examiner reports

12.13.1 It is expected that each programme team will provide a written report in response to each annual report of the external examiner for the programme (Response to the External
Examiners Report). This should be a single document, on the appropriate QSO template, which will highlight any good practice identified, discuss issues raised and draw attention to any actions that will be taken. Guidance on drawing up responses to external examiner reports is set out below in Figure 12-1.

12.13.2 Having been approved by the Head of School/Centre, the Response to the External Examiners Report will be

- sent to all external examiner(s) for the programme
- provided to the Quality and Standards Office for publication
- considered via the Annual Programme Monitoring process.

12.13.3 It is intended that these responses will be published alongside the relevant external examiner report on the Student Portal and StaffNet.

Figure 12-1 Guidance on drawing up responses to External Examiner reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General points:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A single response can be made to a number of reports for the same programme, as long as each external examiner can be reassured that their points are addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For the avoidance of doubt, the response should be addressed directly to the External Examiner. It is not a response to the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Responses can be formulated in a number of ways. Versions using bullet point and other formats may be used. All issues identified in the report requiring action should be responded to using the action plan table, but there may be commentary alongside this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Responses to external examiner reports are public documents that will be made available to all staff and students at the University, and must, therefore, be written in appropriate academic style, and must not contain typographical errors. The academic title of the external examiner must be used, and individual staff and students must not be mentioned by name or be identifiable in any way. Roles should be used to identify those responsible for completing actions within the action plan table.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested structure for a response to an external examiner’s report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welcome the positive points in the report and to highlight areas of good practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify those areas which the external examiner report recognises as best practice and worthy of dissemination across the University, and describe how the matter is being taken forward. [Referral to institutional committees is not the only possible route.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify the actions taken in response to points raised by the external examiner that unless addressed might indicate a failure to meet national expectations or might threaten the standard of the award. An example of this is where assessment methods are not designed well enough to meet the programme learning outcomes. This response should be completed in consultation with the Faculty Director of Quality who will advise on whether the issue is of a significance that requires reporting separately to the university, if this has not already occurred. The specific actions to be taken should be included in the action plan table within the response template.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify the actions taken or to be taken in response to points raised by the external examiner that are matters of academic choice where the programme team or department wishes to take positive action in response to these points to enhance the programme. The specific actions to be taken should be included in the action plan table within the response template.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discuss those issues raised by the external examiner where the programme / school does not wish to take up the external examiner’s suggestions. Please note that this applies only where the external examiner is reflecting on something that is a matter of academic choice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. External examiners’ reports often raise issues where the University has taken a different policy stance. It is likely that the University has taken that decision for good reasons and will not wish to change that policy without substantial evidence that the current position is not the appropriate one. State that the issue raised conflicts with university policy and note the stance that the programme team, school or faculty has decided to take in the light of the comment. This might be that the issue has been passed on for discussion or that the issue is to be taken no farther. The Quality and Standards Office or the Faculty Director of Quality will be happy to advise.