

06.2

PERIODIC AND ELECTIVE REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMMES

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

PERIODIC AND ELECTIVE REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMMES

Introduction

1. This section aims to set out the purpose of and procedure for the periodic review and elective review of programmes. It covers:
 - An Outline of Periodic and Elective Review;
 - Purpose of Periodic and Elective Review;
 - Review Panel;
 - School Quality Assurance;
 - Documentation to be Submitted for a Review Event;
 - The Review Event and Programme;
 - Formulation of Review Decisions;
 - Conditions/Recommendations for Approval;
 - Review Report;
 - Review Checklist;
 - Guidance on Preparing a Self-Evaluation Document (Appendix 1).
2. Guidance Notes on the Roles of Panel Chair, Panelists and Programme Team; on Student Involvement in Review; and on Reports of Review Events are contained in Volume 2, Section 1 of the Academic Handbook.
3. Guidance Notes and Templates for Programme Specifications and Module Descriptors are also contained in Volume 2, Section 1 of the Academic Handbook.

Periodic and Elective Review in Outline

4. Programmes must undergo periodic review every five years, unless in exceptional circumstances the Academic Quality & Standards Committee (AQSC) grants a one-year postponement.
5. Elective review has replaced the revalidation procedure. Under elective review, Schools may apply to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee to bring forward a programme's scheduled quinquennial review. Such applications should be made as early as possible, but normally not later than the October preceding the intended elective review event. Upon the successful conclusion of an elective review event, the periodic review clock would be re-set to take place five years from the successful event.
6. As both periodic and elective review events gauge a programme's fitness for purpose and include the opportunity for the programme team to propose changes, whether minor or major, the timing of the review event is the only difference between the review types.

7. Periodic and Elective Review may be of an individual programme or, where acceptable to Academic Quality & Standards Committee, of a scheme or group of related programmes (sometimes referred to as a matrix).
8. Wherever possible franchise programmes will be reviewed with, and at the same time as, the equivalent University programme.
9. In order to give full consideration to programmes undergoing review, it may be acceptable for schemes which incorporate several generically related programmes to be reviewed together. Examples of this might be closely related programmes, such as an HND, HNC and foundation degree programmes, or a grouping of cognate programmes with a substantial degree of commonality at sub-degree and degree level.
10. Review events will normally be scheduled to take place no later than the early spring term though at the discretion of the Academic Quality & Standards Committee, for example where considerable change is proposed or to accommodate a PSRB, the event may be approved to take place later in the spring term.
11. If substantial change is envisaged, this should be outlined in good time to the Chair of AQSC who may decide to recommend that the School makes an application to the Portfolio Development Committee should it be necessary to ascertain whether adequate investigation has taken place regarding the marketability of the programme if changed and/or that the programme if changed would remain aligned to the University Mission. Proposed changes to programme titles or awards, mode of study or language of study will need to receive PDC approval before the periodic review takes place.
12. The Quality Enhancement Directorate (QED), in consultation with Schools, will plan in the autumn term a programme for the review of programmes to be implemented in the next academic year. It will try to avoid duplication of review visits by other, especially professional, bodies and seek a closer working relationship with them.
13. The QED and the School Deputy/Associate Dean should provide the necessary guidance to prepare for a review. The documents required (see list below) should mostly already be in existence and the Self-Evaluation Document (SED) (see below) should be succinct and concentrate on a critical review of the programme, changes made and, if incorporating modifications, on developments proposed. They should also include a copy of the current student programme handbook(s), Annual Programme Review (APR) Reports, external examiners' reports and programme team responses thereto and programme committee minutes for the previous 2 years, any previous review reports and reports from external bodies (e.g. professional bodies). Panel members may request further information before or during the event. Additional information and documents, such as

Academic Handbook 2020/21 – Volume 2 – 06.2 – Periodic and Elective Review of Existing Programmes – modified 27.09.11, 25.10.11, 20.08.12, 19.07.13, 10.10.13, 06.01.14, 20.10.15, 22.06.16, 27.02.18; last modified 29.09.19

examples of the work of students, should be available for consultation on the day of the review, and in some cases (particularly where professional/accrediting bodies are involved) in advance of the review event.

14. The modification procedure should not normally be used in quinquennial/elective review year as any proposed changes should be incorporated into the periodic/elective review event.

Purpose of Periodic Review and Elective Review

15. The purpose of a substantial review of an existing programme is critically to appraise its state of health, its continuing validity and relevance and to approve any proposed changes. It will focus both on changes that have taken place since initial validation (or an earlier review), on quality enhancement, on standards achieved, and on developments planned. It will ascertain whether the programme remains aligned to the University's Mission, has attained appropriate levels of quality and standards and continues to take cognisance of external benchmark statements as necessary including relevant QAA subject benchmark statements (for foundation degrees, the QAA Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark, for Apprenticeships, the QAA Characteristics Statement), FHEQ qualification descriptors, the CQFW, and the requirements of employers and relevant PSRBs.
16. Proposed changes may include the introduction of delivery via flexible and distributed learning and the offering of modules as short courses. Such proposals must be clearly identified and rationalised in the SED.

Periodic/Elective Review Panel

17. Periodic and Elective Reviews will be conducted by a Panel the composition of which will normally be:
 - .1 A Chair, who will be a member of the University's academic staff approved by the Quality Enhancement Directorate. The Chair will normally have experience as a panel member of validation/review panels both within and outside the University. The Chair need not be a subject specialist in a field relevant to the programme. Close association with the programme will be a bar to chairing a panel; and
 - 2 Normally two, but at least one, internal panelists who will be members of the University's academic staff not from the School in which the programme is located; and at least one external panelist with relevant subject expertise. The number of internal panelists and external panelists may be increased appropriately for complex events.

- 3 A student panelist who must not be from the School in which the programme is located.
 - 4 In the interest of staff development e.g. for newly trained chairs or panelists, a panel may include an observer. The role of the observer is essentially passive and does not contribute to the actual decision making. However, occasional input from an observer may be invited at the discretion of the Chair.
18. The QED will facilitate and record the review event.

School Quality Assurance

19. The lead-in to submission of the review documentation is a crucial period during which schools should engage with the QED regarding any re-design/development of the programme (the link to the programme design process is <https://tsr.cardiffmet.ac.uk/units/ltdu/Pages/default.aspx>). Schools should also consult employers, students and, if appropriate, PSRBs and any franchise partners during programme re-design/development. The review panel, with the student experience the focus of their scrutiny, has the right to expect that the SMPT has ensured thorough preparation of both the submission documentation and the programme team, including peer review of the draft submission to inform the DD's release of the document to the Panel. The QED can assist with the school quality assurance stage of the review procedure.
20. The Programme Director and Programme Team will produce the programme review documents. These documents will be the basis for critical discussion between the Programme Team/School Management Team and the appointed review panel and its quality will be of crucial importance. The QED must receive the documents for dispatch to the Panel at least 20 working days before the event; failure to do this will normally result in the cancellation of the event.
21. Before submitting programme documentation for periodic or elective review to the QED, measures must be taken within the School (via the Deputy/Associate Dean) to ensure that:
 - .1 the form, content and quality of the documentation complies with requirements, including those on the 'DD Submission Checklist' (Volume 2, Section 1.2 refers);
 - 2 there is ownership of the documentation by the programme team which will defend it at the periodic or elective review event;

- 3 the resources needed to deliver the programme will continue to be available and, in the case of any proposed changes to the programme, will be made available;
 - 4 if appropriate, that any servicing required from other Schools will continue to be available and, in the case of allowed proposed changes to the programme, is properly organised and will be available;
 - 5 the design of the programme complies with the relevant structural framework and has taken account of the programme design process and any consultation with employers, students and franchise partners;
 - 6 the programme incorporates the University's statutory requirements for example in regard to assessment regulations and skills development, etc. including the number of re-assessment attempts (1 or 2) for the programme;
 - 7 the programme incorporates and is aligned to the requirements of any relevant external benchmark statements including QAA subject benchmark statements, (for Foundation Degrees, the QAA Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark), FHEQ qualification descriptors, and the requirements of relevant PSRBs;
 - 8 the programme incorporates the desired policy direction as outlined in the current University Student Engagement Strategy;
 - 9 the School has fully considered the pedagogic and resource implications of adopting e-learning;
 - .10 the programme endorses and demonstrates means for adopting employability skills through its learning and teaching strategies;
 - .11 the programme enables students to understand, learn and benefit from research based enquiry, particularly that which is relevant to their discipline; where appropriate, undertake such research; and acquire and apply research skills appropriate to their level and discipline;
 - .12 if applicable to the programme, that its Key Information Set has been scrutinised.
22. On submitting the draft programme documentation to the QED normally eight weeks prior to the date of the review event, the QED on behalf of the Panel Chair will undertake an initial scrutiny of the submission to ascertain that the documentation is compliant with regulations (structural, regulatory) and, where necessary, will inform the Deputy Dean and the Programme Director of issues arising.

Academic Handbook 2020/21 – Volume 2 – 06.2 – Periodic and Elective Review of Existing Programmes – modified 27.09.11, 25.10.11, 20.08.12, 19.07.13, 10.10.13, 06.01.14, 20.10.15, 22.06.16, 27.02.18; last modified 29.09.19

23. In instances where the documentation is deemed to be unsatisfactory, the Chair of the Academic Quality & Standards Committee will require the event to be postponed or cancelled.

Documentation to be Submitted for Periodic and Elective Review Events

24. The documentation should be submitted to QED and should be organised in such a way as to make for ease of access, referencing and reading. An indication of what is to be found in each document package is useful, particularly where trailing of issues is concerned.
25. Most of the documentation required should normally be already available. Programme Directors/School Deputy/Associate Deans are encouraged to use existing documents as widely as possible and to collect and present them to best advantage. In essence, the review should be a substantial, extended version of the annual evaluation/monitoring of programmes.

26. The following will be included in the submission for review:

- .1 a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) from the Programme Director using the corporate template and comprehensively addressing each point (see guidance and template in Appendix 1) including the rationale and detail of any proposed modifications together with evidence of their approval-in-principle by the external examiner(s);
- 2 the programme document up-dated with any proposed modification(s) and incorporating the up-dated programme specification and appendices*, and module descriptors (a standard proforma is available in the Academic Handbook); core modules for which failure by students cannot be compensated must be identified; templates and guidance for programme specifications and module descriptors are in the Academic Handbook;

* such appendices include mappings referred to in the programme specification, for example:

- a) programme learning outcomes and modules;
- b) assessment methods and modules;
- c) EDGE and modules;
- d) Programme and module learning outcomes to relevant benchmark statements (QAA subject benchmark statements,

FHEQ qualification descriptors, Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark, relevant PSRB requirements);

- 3 the curriculum vitae of all staff who teach on the programme (corporate CVs are available from the Human Resources Unit) and a map or diagram relating module tutors to module titles;
- 4 for HE programmes, a copy of the relevant QAA subject benchmark statement where appropriate;
- 5 current student programme handbook(s) (all programmes must have a student programme handbook)
- 6 the validation report or the last periodic review report (whichever is the most recent);
- 7 appropriate evidence that past changes to the programme have taken place through the correct mechanism;
- 8 Annual Programme Review (APR) Reports for the last 2 years including those for any franchise and the most recent NSS action plan (if applicable);
- 9 all external examiner/verifier reports for the last 2 years and the programme team's responses thereto including those for any franchise;
- .10 records of all Programme Committee meetings for last 2 years;
- .11 copies of any external (PSRB) reports on the programme which refer to the period in question;
- .12 a copy of the placement learning handbook and learning contract where relevant;
- .13 if applicable to the programme, its Key Information Set.
- .14 For collaborative provision only:
Moderators'/Link Tutors' reports for last 2 years; authorised memoranda of programme agreement.

N.B. The School should ensure that if the submission is in whole or in part in Welsh, that English translations are included.

27. In addition to the above, a selection of students' work; examination examples, assignments, etc. should also be made available during the event.

Definitive Programme Document

28. Once a programme periodic or elective review has been approved through the University academic committee structure, Programme Directors are required to send to the QED an electronic PDF version of the definitive programme document, which will be held as a source of information about the reviewed programme.
29. Amendments to the programme document as a result of a review or significant changes to the programme must be sent to the QED immediately after such amendments have been approved.

The Periodic/Elective Review Event and its Programme

Scope

30. The nature of the periodic or elective review event will reflect the nature of the programmes under review. For large schemes and joint accreditation visits there may be a meeting of the Panel on the evening preceding the day of the event. For all events there will be an opportunity for the Panel to see the facilities that are available to the programme. It is the responsibility of the School Deputy/Associate Dean providing the programme to organise a tour of facilities.
31. The Panel will review the programme(s) taking cognisance of any proposed incorporated modifications that the School proposes to make, to ensure that:
 - .1 the standards set at the introduction of the programme(s) or since the last periodic review have been maintained, that quality enhancement by virtue of taking action on issues raised has taken place, that appropriate programme up-dates have occurred and via the correct mechanisms;
 - .2 changes proposed by the School would keep the programme(s) aligned with the University's mission, would continue to attain appropriate levels of quality and standards and would continue to take cognisance of external benchmarks as necessary;
 - .3 the programme documentation is acceptable.
32. The review event should explore issues arising from the documentation to include:
 - .1 the academic coherence of the programme;
 - .2 the level of the programme *vis a vis* its intended outcome level;

- .3 arrangements for marketing and recruitment and the appropriateness of entry and admissions criteria/processes;
- .4 the appropriateness of the programme aims, learning outcomes and outcomes in relation to the nature of the programme;
- .5 the rationale linking learning outcomes, content, learning and teaching methodologies, assessment strategies (including feedback to students); the balance of assessment methods;
- .6 links between teaching and research;
- .7 the commitment to and appropriateness of pedagogic measures to incorporate the desired policy direction as outlined in the current Student Engagement Strategy (e.g. EDGE, employability, sustainability, internationalisation, research-informed teaching;
- .8 the relationship/comparability of the programme to any national benchmark standards available (e.g. QAA subject benchmark statement, FHEQ qualification descriptor, Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark, PSRB requirements);
- .9 for HND/C and degree programmes, the approach to Key Skills development and assessment;
- .10 for instances where open/flexible/student centered learning is employed, the approach used, support available and (as necessary) learning materials;
- .11 where professional practice, work placement, etc. are incorporated, the management, support and assessment principles involved and that there is general compliance with the University's policy and guidelines for work-based and placement learning;
- .12 the resources available for the programme (including staffing and staff development) and for students on the programme;
- .13 the arrangements for maintaining the relevance of the programme;
- .14 in the case of major projects or dissertations or similar, the arrangements for their selection, supervision and assessment;
- .15 where student exchange and/or other forms of study away from the University which might involve third party assessment, the management and supervision of such elements, and the methods

by which both academic credit and marking/assessment levels will be assured with regards to those required by the University;

- .16 the approach to assessment and examination marking – e.g. double marking, “blind” marking, etc.;
- .17 issues raised by the external examiner and, if franchised, the moderator/link tutor;
- .18 ancillary, programme specific assessment regulations;
- .19 the validity of the programme/programme specification;
- .20 arrangements for PDP and personal tutoring.

The above list is not intended to be restrictive or exhaustive.

Programme

32. The programme for the event will normally include:

- .1 an initial private meeting of the Panel to review the documentation provided and discuss issues to be explored; the Panel will identify issues it wishes to raise with the team in regard to, for example, changes, procedures, quality enhancement and standards, and issues arising from collaborative delivery, if the programme is franchised, or short course delivery if appropriate;
- .2 a meeting of the Panel with the Dean of School, School Deputy/Associate Dean and Programme Director to explore context and management issues;
- .3 a meeting, or meetings, of the Panel with the Programme Team so that the Panel can explore the rationale for the programme and any proposed changes; programme content and delivery; learning, teaching and assessment; entry to the programme, etc.; it is expected that all the programme team members, including external lecturers where there is substantial input, will attend this meeting; the Dean of School and/or School Deputy/Associate Dean may also be present as appropriate;
- .4 a meeting with students and former students from the programme;
- .5 where appropriate, a meeting with employers or employer liaison committee;
- .6 where appropriate, a meeting with placement providers and service users;

- .7 a tour of facilities, both general (for example, library and information technology) and those specific to the programme;
- .8 a further private meeting of the Panel to summarise findings and, as necessary, to formulate conditions and recommendations;
- .9 feedback by the Chair of the Panel to the Programme Team, to include a formal summary of the Panel's conclusions including any conditions of approval and the timescale for their fulfilment, recommendations and commendations.

Formulation of Review Decisions

- 33. Recommendations to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee for the continuation of approval should not normally be made if the Panel retains major reservations about the way the programme has operated since validation or the previous review, about the standards achieved or about the staffing and resources associated with the programme.
- 34. Approval to continue may be recommended to Academic Quality & Standards Committee subject to the fulfilment of conditions to be met within a stated timescale and/or of recommendations.
- 35. A programme which is observed to be, and had been, operating satisfactorily – as determined from Annual Programme Review (APR) Reports, examiners' reports etc. – but for which the documentation is unsatisfactory/unacceptable and/or for which the Programme Team gave a poor defense, should be approved subject to appropriate conditions (and recommendations).
- 36. Periodic and Elective Review Panels may make the following recommendations to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee:
 - .1 that the programme be approved to continue (with or without proposed modifications and short courses);
 - .2 that the programme be approved to continue (with or without proposed modifications and short courses) subject to the fulfilment of conditions in the stated timescale, and/or the full and evidenced (through subsequent Programme Committee records) consideration of recommendations. Resource issues, including staffing, may result in the requirement for an action plan, to be monitored through the Academic Quality & Standards Committee;
 - .3 that approval of the programme be cancelled.
- 37. Decisions should be made by the Panel on the basis of the review event

alone and other factors should not influence the academic decision.

38. The situation which causes most difficulty arises where the programme document is deficient but where the reservations of the Panel have been satisfied in discussion. In such cases the Panel must be satisfied that the issues have been or can be resolved and that the documentation will be amended accordingly (though imposing conditions).

Conditions/Recommendations for Approval

39. Conditions of approval should be used for requirements that **MUST** be fulfilled in order to ensure that the programme meets or will continue to meet appropriate quality and standards requirements. Conditions must be expressed precisely, be agreed by the Panel and must be accompanied by a timescale for completion – normally before students are re-admitted to the programme. Documentation, usually in the form of a revised (definitive) programme document, must be submitted to the QED for consideration by the Panel Chair.

Note: When pathways and/or programmes are proposed for discontinuation at review events, the submission of a discontinuation application to the Portfolio Enabling Group will be a condition.

40. Changes which are desirable in order to enhance the quality of the programme and/or the student experience, but which do not affect the threshold standard, should be expressed as recommendations. Recommendations are advisory as opposed to compulsory, but the University quality monitoring system would wish to see reference to where such issues have been considered and implemented or rejected. This might include an action plan of issues to be addressed. Responses to the recommendations should be recorded in the Annual Programme Review report. Recommendations cannot be used as a means of quality or standards enhancement where the Panel judges one or both of these to be below an acceptable threshold level.
41. Conditions and recommendations may refer to any aspect of the programme including content, resources, staffing, assessment, etc., but should be phrased in such a way as to allow the perceived problem to be solved by the programme team rather than prescribing a solution.

Periodic and Elective Review Reports

42. The report of the event shall conform to the normal format and standard applied to all the University's periodic and elective review reports.
43. The draft written report shall be produced normally within 20 working days after the review event and the confirmed report produced normally

within 10 working days thereafter. The final report confirmed by the Panel Chair will be circulated by the QED to the School concerned and to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee, which will subsequently make appropriate recommendations for the approval of Academic Board. The QED will report as necessary to any external awarding body.

44. The School/Programme Team response to any conditions of approval should be submitted to the QED for consideration by the Panel Chair and/or nominated panelists for approval. The responses must be submitted electronically in Word and identified in the documentation using track changes. It is the responsibility of the Panel Chair to approve any resulting changes to the programme documentation - which then becomes the definitive programme document - and, through the QED and School Deputy/Associate Dean, to follow-up any further action required by the conditions imposed.
45. The Panel Chair will be responsible through the QED and the School Deputy/Associate Dean for ensuring that all the conclusions of the Panel are addressed.

Periodic Review of Programmes Undergoing Discontinuation

46. In circumstances where review falls during the period following formal discontinuation of the programme by Academic Board, then review will consist of the scrutiny of the APR report for the programme by the QED and a short report to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee.

Programme Review Check-List

Lead-Up to Event

Procedure	Action	Time
Plan timetable of reviews for the following academic year	QED	First AQSC meeting of session
Apply for Elective Review	School DD/AD	Second AQSC meeting of session
Outline substantial change for possible referral to PDC	School DD/AD	Second AQSC meeting of session
Constitute Panel	QED	2 months before event
E-mail draft programme documentation to QED for preliminary compliance check	School DD/AD	40 working days before event
Send submission document to QED	DD/programme director	20 working days before event (minimum)
Send submission documents, Programme for event, relevant regulations, expenses form to Panel members and request for written comments	QED	15 working days before event
Send programme and arrangements for event to School and programme team	QED	15 working days before event
Inform School of Panel's comments and request response, arrange pre-meeting	QED	5 working days before event

Identify issues likely to be raised at event and agree structuring of questions with the Panel	Panel Chair	At event
<u>After the Event</u>		
Produce summary of Event outcomes	QED	Within one working day of Event
Submit (track changed) response to any conditions set	Programme Director	By conditions deadline
Complete draft report and send to Chair for confirmation and to Programme Director and Panellists for factual accuracy	QED	Normally 20 working days after event
Send confirmed report to Dean of School, Deputy/Associate Dean, Programme Director, External Awarding Body (if appropriate) and Panel	QED	Normally 30 working days after event
Submit confirmed report to AQSC	QED	First available meeting
Present recommendation of AQSC to Academic Board (if approved by AQSC)	QED	As appropriate

Guidance for Completing the Self-Evaluation Template Document for Periodic/Elective Review

Introduction

The Academic Handbook Entry 'Periodic and Elective Review of Existing programmes' requires that in submitting documentation for review events, the documentation submitted must incorporate a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) from the School, normally from the Programme Director.

The purpose of this guidance is to provide the template for the construction of the SED, bearing in mind: -

- a) the need to ensure that the procedures will help programme teams, Schools and the institution to satisfy the requirements of external stakeholders whilst retaining flexibility and cost-effectiveness;
- b) that Schools may submit generic groups of programmes for review as opposed to individual programmes.

Template for the Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

The SED must comprehensively address the following headings as well as providing a summary of the modifications during the approval period and a summary of any proposed modifications and likely future developments. The Panel will expect the SED to be analytical and evaluative, providing a critical review of the programme including reflections on past changes and developments. The SED must clearly identify and rationalise any proposals for change to be approved by the Panel.

Introduction

1. A summary of the submission and what it is trying to achieve.

Background to the Programme

2. A brief outline of the programme, its background, development history and its current context, including: identification, if appropriate, of any delivery via flexible and distributed learning; and identification, if appropriate, of any modules delivered or intended to be delivered as short courses.
3. A summary of any modifications during the approval period indicating those which were in response to internal and external feedback including the outcome of APR reports, external examiner reports and reports of

relevant professional bodies. The following table must be completed to supplement this summary.

Summary Table of Modifications Approved During the Review Period				
Year	Modification (summary of change and modules affected)	In response to (e.g. external examiner)	Evaluation of Effectiveness	Enhancement of Student Learning

Rows may be added to accommodate all modification activity

- The effectiveness of these changes and the extent to which they have enhanced student learning.

Proposed Changes to the Programme

- A rationale for and a summary of any modifications proposed, which must be cross-referenced clearly to where such changes can be located in the programme document. To supplement the rationale and summary, the following chart and table must be completed:

5a. A table or chart contrasting the existing programme structure with the proposed new structure must be included here. Modules shared with other programmes must be identified.

5b. The following table summarising proposed changes to modules must be completed:

Summary Table of Proposed Modifications		
Purpose of Proposed modification (identify any module[s] affected)	Rationale for modification (identify any module[s] affected)	Evidence of modification in programme documentation e.g. identifying where in the programme specification or which module descriptor

Rows may be added to accommodate modification proposals.

- 5c. It must be made clear whether the proposed changes will apply to the existing cohort.
- 5d. Complete the Modifications Summary of Changes form in Appendix 2 as part of the submission.
6. Evidence of approval-in-principle by the external examiner(s) must be provided in the submission documentation and referenced here.
7. If franchised, evidence of consultation with the collaborating partner must be provided in the submission documentation and referenced here; together with the proposed implementation date should this vary from the University's (see also paragraph 28).

Aims and Learning Outcomes/Performance Criteria

8. How the aims and learning outcomes/performance criteria relate to internal drivers such as the University Corporate Strategy and Student Engagement Strategy.
9. How the stipulated aims relate to the learning outcomes/performance criteria.

Curricula

10. The effectiveness and appropriateness of the curriculum in fulfilling the stipulated aims and learning outcomes/performance criteria.
11. The appropriateness and continued relevance of the curriculum as demonstrated by student and employer and practitioner feedback (citing evidence in the submission document) and recognised good practice within the discipline including teaching and learning developments and/or learner guidance and research.
12. A summary of any amendments that have been introduced to reflect developments within the discipline or as a consequence of the outcome of internal debate or student, employer or external feedback.

Assessment

13. The effectiveness of the chosen assessment strategies and methods in promoting student learning and ensuring that students fulfil the learning outcomes/performance criteria and in enabling discrimination between categories of performance.
14. The effectiveness of assessment strategies in relation to both formative and summative assessment.

15. The effectiveness in the approach to feedback to students and marking verification (such as double marking).
16. The extent to which student achievement demonstrates the requirements for the award in relation to subject benchmarks, learning outcomes and qualification frameworks.

Teaching and Learning Opportunities

17. The range and appropriateness of the teaching and learning strategies and/or learner guidance and how they have developed during the approval period.
18. Issues relating to student workload.
19. Any factors which may impede or limit the quality of the learning and teaching environment.
20. The effectiveness of academic tutorial, counselling and mentor support.
21. The development of EDGE attributes, and where appropriate skills derived from subject benchmark statements.
22. The effectiveness of arrangements for any Work-Based Learning.
23. The effectiveness of arrangements for PDP.

Maintenance and enhancement of Standards and Quality

24. The overall standards achieved and the measures/comparators against which judgements are made.
25. Consideration of progression and completion rates.
26. Employment destinations of graduates/award holders.
27. Action taken in response to External Examiners' or Verifiers' Reports and those of any relevant professional bodies, etc.

Collaborative Provision (if relevant)

28. Where the programme is also offered collaboratively in a partner institution or partner institutions, the critical appraisal should incorporate the operation of collaborative programmes with reference to all of the above, and in relation to the partnership should also comment upon: -
 - a) the effectiveness of the work of the moderator(s)/link tutor(s) in assisting collaborating institution programme delivery;

Academic Handbook 2020/21 – Volume 2 – 06.2 – Periodic and Elective Review of Existing Programmes – modified 27.09.11, 25.10.11, 20.08.12, 19.07.13, 10.10.13, 06.01.14, 20.10.15, 22.06.16, 27.02.18; last modified

- b) the effectiveness of inter-institutional communication;
- c) the effectiveness of arrangements for joint assessment and joint examination boards;
- d) initiatives relating to joint or exchange teaching, student exchanges and/or visits;
- e) the effectiveness of student progression arrangements;
- f) evidence of consultation on any proposed modifications, stating the proposed date of implementation at the partner if that differs from the University.

APPENDIX 2

Cardiff Metropolitan University Academic Quality & Standards Committee

MODIFICATION(S) Summary Form *(to be used in conjunction with Section 4.1 [04.1 Modifications to Programmes](#))*

Guidance on when to complete this form:

To maintain compliance with Competition and Marketing Authority (CMA) guidelines the University is required to inform applicants of changes to the curriculum that could influence their decision to enrol on their chosen programme of study. Consequently, this form must be completed when any element of the proposed modification results in a change in the content of published material and/or other information provided to applicants.

Examples of modifications that require completion of this form include:

- Programme level changes that result in a change to the published definitive programme specification.*
- Module level changes that result in a change to the published definitive programme specification.*
- Programme and / or module level changes that contradict information provided in marketing material (e.g. prospectus, course leaflets, web pages).*
- Programme and / or module level changes that contradict information provided in Open Day recruitment activities.*

Please direct all enquiries related to the completion of this form to Lisa Bowen in Admissions (lbowen@cardiffmet.ac.uk).

Note:

The School Minor Modification Committee or Major Modifications Committee will not consider proposed minor/major modifications that potentially impact on applicants when not supported by a completed 'Modifications Summary Form'.

FOR SCHOOL USE

Name of Programme(s):

School Modification Number:

Name of Programme Director(s):

Area of Study (AOS) Number:

Modification Implementation Date:

Summary of Proposed Modification (Please write a concise and student facing summary of the proposed curriculum modification. Do not use language that will be unfamiliar to an applicant with little or no experience of higher education):

Please forward the completed form to Lisa Bowen in Admissions (lbowen@cardiffmet.ac.uk).