

07.2

**PROCEDURE
FOR
REVIEW OF A PROFESSIONAL
DOCTORATE**

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATES

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This section sets out the procedure for the review of a Doctoral Degree by Examination and Thesis, hereinafter referred to as a Professional Doctorate.
- 1.2 A template for a Self-Evaluation Document comprises Appendix 1 and a series of Guidance Notes for Chair, Panellists, Programme Team and Students comprises Appendix 2.

2 Authority

- 2.1 Cardiff Metropolitan University includes the Professional Doctorate within its definition of a research degree programme.
- 2.2 Through its research degree awarding powers, Cardiff Metropolitan University has responsibility for the quality assurance of its research degree programmes.
- 2.3 If the review proposes a new Cardiff Metropolitan University qualification, then approval should be sought prior to the review event using the procedure located within the Academic Handbook at:

http://www.cardiffmet.ac.uk/registry/academichandbook/Documents/AH1_14_02.pdf

3 Structure for Professional Doctorate

- 3.1 The following rules apply regarding the conduct of the Professional Doctorate:
 - .1 The School associated with a professional doctorate pathway must have a minimum of 10 academic members of staff in the discipline area who are qualified to supervise research degrees, at least 5 of whom must be qualified to act as Directors of Study;
 - 2 The associated School must be able to provide research students with the facilities set down in Cardiff Metropolitan University's Code of Practice for Research Degrees (henceforth the Code of Practice);
 - 3 The associated School will adhere to all the administrative processes set down in the Code of Practice;

- .4 The associated School will have a Director of Research who, working with the Professional Doctorate Programme Director (see also paragraph .6 below), is responsible for overseeing the admission, supervision and administration of candidates including administration in relation to examination;
- .5 The associated School will have a Research Degrees Committee sub-committee with terms of reference and membership as set-out in Volume 3 of the Academic Handbook
- .6 Cardiff Metropolitan University has established a cross-School Professional Doctorate Committee, chaired by the Professional Doctorate Programme Director that reports to the University Research Degrees Committee.

4 Purpose of Review and Regulatory Framework

4.1 The review, taking cognisance of any proposed incorporated modifications, will seek to ensure that:

- a) the standards set at the introduction of the Professional Doctorate or since the last 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;
- b) changes proposed would keep the Professional Doctorate aligned with Cardiff Metropolitan University's mission, would continue to attain appropriate levels of quality and standards and would continue to take cognisance of external benchmarks as necessary;
- c) the programme documentation is acceptable.

4.2 The regulatory framework shall be Cardiff Metropolitan University's Professional Doctorate Regulations with due regard also to be paid to the Cardiff Metropolitan University Code of Practice Research Degrees.

4.3 The Cardiff Metropolitan University Review Panel should also take account of:

the QAA Code of Practice: Research Degrees:
<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/research-degrees>

the FHEQ qualification descriptor for a Doctoral degree;

QAA Doctoral degree characteristics.

5 Evaluating the Professional Doctorate

The Review Panel will wish to assure itself of the following in respect of the Professional Doctorate under review:

- 5.1 That there are in place effective arrangements to maintain appropriate academic standards and enhance the quality of postgraduate research degree programmes;
- 5.2 That the Programme Management Team & Programme Team have provided an environment that has provided research students with support for doing and learning about research in which high quality research has occurred;
- 5.3 That the Programme Management Team & Programme Team have evidenced effective and adequate management and administration, adequate and well deployed human and physical resources and appropriate systems for quality assurance;
- 5.4 That the Programme Management Team & Programme Team can evidence that its research activity has been of an appropriate quality and standard to support research at MRes and Professional Doctorate levels. The following are examples of evidence to be presented:
 - .1 That its history of research activity, evidence of research "culture" and proposals for future developments (supported by statistics) is acceptable;
 - .2 That the detailed procedures currently in force for the registration, monitoring, supervision and assessment of students are acceptable. These will include:
 - a) admission requirements and selection procedure
 - b) induction programme and student handbook
 - c) arrangements for supervision, rights and responsibilities of supervisor and student
 - d) probationary period and progression from the Contextualising Professional Change module of the Professional Doctorate
 - e) assessment procedures (in accordance with the relevant Cardiff Metropolitan University regulations)

- .4 That the School(s) has established a Research Degrees sub-Committee in accordance with the Academic Handbook;
- .5 That the systems in place to monitor, support and review student progress and to obtain student feedback are appropriate, and that appropriate student welfare/support services are in place;
- .6 That the academic staff who will supervise and manage the research degree programme are sufficient in number and quality. Detailed information will be required in the following areas:
 - a) List of all staff (academic and administrative);
 - b) CVs of potential supervisors including experience of research supervision;
 - c) research degrees held by staff;
 - d) staff development policy and examples of current activities;
 - e) experience of staff in research supervision;
 - f) students currently registered or completed;
 - g) student withdrawals/failure to complete;
 - h) research degrees staff handbook.
- .7 That the resources available are adequate in extent and quality. Attention will focus on library, information technology and research facilities.

6 Review Panel Membership

- 6.1 The membership of the Review Panel will include a Chair (not from research area), two representatives from Cardiff Metropolitan University's Research Degrees Committee, one external and one representative of the Cardiff Metropolitan University Research & Enterprise Unit. Should there be a last minute resignation of an internal member who is not readily replaceable, it will be the Chair's decision (in consultation with the Quality Operations Manager and Chair of Academic Quality & Standards Committee) as to whether or not to proceed, but the Chair should try to do so if at all possible. However, an event will not normally proceed without the external being present.

- 6.2 The Chair will normally have experience as a panel member of validation/review events panels both within and outside Cardiff Metropolitan University.
- 6.3 Close association with the Professional Doctorate programme will be a bar to membership of the Review Panel.

7 Programme for the Review Event

7.1 The programme for the event will normally include:

- a) an initial private meeting of the Review 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 changes, procedures, quality enhancement, standards etc.;
- b) a meeting of the Review Panel with the Professional Doctorate Management Team (normally the Programme Director, the Director of Research and the Pathway Leaders from each of the participating Schools) to explore context and management issues such as strategic plans, arrangements for managing the academic quality and standards of research degrees; current and proposed development of research culture, environment and facilities; and issues relating to resourcing and any initiatives of provision which might affect the Professional Doctorate degree programme;
- c) a meeting of the Review Panel with the Professional Doctorate Programme Team (normally the Programme Director, Pathway Leaders and representatives drawn from the supervisory teams (Directors of Studies and Second Supervisors) and representatives of any franchise partners so that the Panel can explore issues arising from the submission document including rationale, aims, structure, content, and delivery; the registration, monitoring, supervision, assessment and support of students; staffing and research facilities;
- d) an inspection of relevant facilities, both general (e.g. library and IT) and those specific to the programme;
- e) a meeting with current and former students of the programme;
- f) a further private meeting of the Review Panel to summarise findings and, as necessary, to formulate commendations, conditions and recommendations;
- g) feedback by the Chair of the Panel to the Professional Doctorate Management Team and 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.

7.2 In considering its recommendations to the Cardiff Metropolitan University Academic Quality & Standards Committee and the conditions and recommendations of approval, as appropriate, the Review Panel shall take full cognisance of the perceived ability to deliver the Professional Doctorate degree programme to at least threshold levels of quality - as adjudged from the staffing expertise and adequacy, the learning resource levels and the student support available – and to sustain academic standards equivalent to those achieved by Cardiff Metropolitan University students qualifying for equivalent awards.

8 Documentation for Professional Doctorate Review Events

8.1 Overview

- .1 The submission document should demonstrate what has been achieved and, if appropriate, what is proposed to be achieved. Concise, explicit documentation should enable the reader readily to understand the Professional Doctorate and its progress and identify relevant issues. It is the responsibility of the Professional Doctorate Management Team and Programme Team to ensure that the submission documentation is compliant with Cardiff Metropolitan University's requirements and is appropriate in quality.
- 2 The quality of the documentation is an important element in a successful review as these documents will be the basis for critical discussion between the Professional Doctorate Management and Programme Teams with the appointed Review Panel. To that end, the nature of the language used, and the presentation adopted are important. The writing should be clear and precise, the language simple and jargon-free and excessive verbosity should be avoided. Diagrams and charts may be used with benefit.
- .3 The submission document should be organised in such a way as to make for ease of access, referencing and reading. The various areas encompassed should be differentiated either as subsections of a larger document or as separate documents. The overall product should be manageable and usable.

The Professional Doctorate Programme Director and Programme Team will produce the programme review documents. The Quality Enhancement Directorate (QED) must receive the documents at least 20 working days before the review event; failure to do this will normally result in the cancellation of the review event.

- 4 Before submitting the programme documentation for review to the QED, measures must be taken by the Programme Director to ensure that:
- a) the form, content and quality of the documentation complies with requirements;
 - b) there is ownership of the documentation by the Management Team and the Programme Team which will defend it at the review event;
 - c) the resources needed to deliver the programme will continue to be available and, in the case of any proposed changes, will be made available;
 - d) that any servicing required from all participating schools will continue to be available and, in the case of allowed proposed changes to the programme, is properly organised and will be available;
 - e) the design of the programme complies with the relevant structural framework;
 - f) the programme incorporates Cardiff Metropolitan University statutory requirements in regard to assessment regulations, etc.;
 - g) the programme incorporates and is aligned with the requirements of any relevant external benchmark statements including the FHEQ Level-8 qualification descriptors and QAA Doctoral degree characteristics and the benchmarks of relevant PSRBs;
 - h) the programme incorporates the University's desired policy direction as outlined in current Cardiff Metropolitan University Strategic Plan;
 - i) the programme enables students to understand, learn and benefit from research-based enquiry, particularly that which is relevant to their discipline; undertake such research; and acquire and apply research skills appropriate to their level and discipline.

On receiving the programme documentation, the QED and the Panel Chair will undertake an initial scrutiny of the submission to ascertain that the documentation is compliant with regulations (structural, regulatory, etc.) and where necessary will inform the Programme Director of issues arising. 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.

8.2 Information to be included in the Submission Documentation

The following information should be included in the submission document for Professional Doctorate review:

1. a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) (see template in Appendix) including the rationale and detail of any proposed modifications and their approval-in-principle by the external examiner;
2. the Programme Document incorporating the programme specification and module descriptors (updated with any proposed modifications). Core modules for which failure by students cannot be compensated must be identified. Programme specification and module descriptor templates are available in the Academic Handbook; the Programme Document should include:

- 1) a brief historical background with particular reference to recent developments and the context for the proposal;
- 2) reference to any external and internal reports on the quality of existing provision, and a self-appraisal with regard to these;
- 3) academic and management structure;
- 4) technician and administrative support services;
- 5) intake, admission requirements and selection procedure;
- 6) arrangements for supervision, rights and responsibilities of supervisor and student;
- 7) probationary period and progression from taught part of the Professional Doctorate;
- 8) assessment procedures (in accordance with Cardiff

Metropolitan University
Professional Doctorate regulations);

- 9) arrangements in place for a Research Degrees sub-committee; systems in place or proposed to monitor, support and review student progress and to obtain student feedback are appropriate, and for student welfare and support;

10) The resources available, or proposed, in particular:

(i) Library

Details of the current stock, including journals and electronic access, opening hours, annual budget, acquisition policy, lending rights at local and other Universities and Institutions;

(ii) Information Technology

Information technology provision, budget and access;

(iii) Research Facilities & Environment

Listing of accommodation available for research and study, tutorial and seminar facilities.

3. the curriculum vitae of all staff on the Programme Team including detailed information on the academic staff who will supervise and manage the proposed Professional Doctorate including:

1) list of all staff (academic and administrative);

2) CVs of supervisors;

3) research degrees held by staff;

4) staff development policy and examples of current activities;

5) experience of staff in research supervision;

6) students currently registered or completed;

7) student withdrawals/failure to complete;

8) research degrees staff handbook.

9) induction programme and the Student Handbook;

4. Programme Specifications:

1) Professional Doctorate

2) Master of Professional Practice

5. Module Descriptors

6. current programme handbooks;

7. the validation report or the last review report (whichever is the most recent);
8. appropriate evidence that past changes to the programme have taken place through the correct mechanism;
9. annual graduate studies report for the last two years;
10. external examiner/verifier reports for the last two years;
11. copies of any external reports on the programme which refer to the period in question, if applicable;
12. moderators' reports for the last two years, where available, and authorised memoranda of programme and financial agreement, if applicable.

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

9 Formulation of Review Panel Decisions

9.1 Review Panels may make the following decisions: -

- (i) that the Professional Doctorate be approved to continue (with or without proposed modifications);
- (ii) that the Professional Doctorate be approved to continue (with or without proposed modifications) subject to the fulfilment of conditions in the stated timescale, and/or the full and evidenced (through subsequent School RDC records) consideration of recommendations. Resource issues, including staffing, may result in a requirement for an action plan, to be monitored through the University Academic Quality & Standards Committee;
- (iii) that the approval of the Professional Doctorate be cancelled

10 Approval to Continue

10.1 Approval of the Professional Doctorate to continue should not be recommended to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee if the Review Panel retains major reservations about the aims, academic standard, structure, content, assessment regulations, resources etc., after the dialogue with the Management Team and Programme Team is completed.

10.2 Decisions of the Review Panel should be made on the basis of the event and other factors such as pressures resulting from the

timing of an event should not influence the academic decision.

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

11 Conditions/Recommendations for Approval to Continue

Approval to continue may be recommended to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee subject to the fulfilment of conditions to be met within a stated timescale and/or recommendations.

If it is observed that the Professional Doctorate is and has been operating satisfactorily – as determined from annual graduate studies reports, examiners' reports, etc.- but for which the documentation is unsatisfactory/unacceptable and/or for which the Programme Team gave a poor defense, it should be approved subject to appropriate conditions (and recommendations).

- 11.1 Conditions of approval should be used for requirements which **MUST** be fulfilled in order to ensure that the Professional Doctorate degree programme meets the required quality and standard threshold. Conditions must be expressed precisely, be agreed by the Review Panel and must be accompanied by a timescale for completion – normally before students are admitted to the programme. Documentation, usually in the form of a revised (definitive) programme document, must be submitted to the Quality Enhancement Directorate for consideration by the Validation Panel Chair.
- 11.2 Changes which are desirable in order to enhance the quality of the Professional Doctorate degree programme and/or 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 recommendations should be recorded in the minutes of the Professional Doctorate Committee and the annual report on research activity submitted to Cardiff Metropolitan University's Research Degrees Committee. Recommendations cannot be used as a means of quality or standards enhancement where the Review Panel judges one or both of these to be below the acceptable threshold level.
- 11.3 Conditions and recommendations may refer to any aspect of the Professional Doctorate 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 problem.

- 11.4 The Professional Doctorate Management Team and Programme Team response to any conditions of approval should be submitted to the Quality Enhancement Directorate for consideration by the Panel Chair and/or nominated panellists for approval. 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 the Professional Doctorate Programme Director, to follow-up any further action required by the conditions imposed. The Panel Chair will be responsible through the QED and the Professional Doctorate Programme Director for ensuring that all the conclusions of the Review Panel are addressed.
- 11.5 Once the review report (see below) has been approved through the University committee structure, the Professional Doctorate Programme Director is required to send to the QED an electronic version of the definitive programme document, which will be held as the source of information about the reviewed programme.

12 Review Report

- 12.1 The report of the review event shall conform to the normal format and standard applied to all Cardiff Metropolitan University review reports.
- 12.2 The draft written report shall be produced normally within 20 working days after the review event and the confirmed report produced normally 10 working days thereafter. The final report confirmed by the Panel Chair will be circulated by the QED to the Professional Doctorate Management Team and Programme Team and to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee, which will subsequently make appropriate recommendations for the approval of Academic Board.

Guidance for Completing the Self-Evaluation Template Document for Review

Introduction

It is a requirement that in submitting documentation for the review event, the documentation submitted must incorporate a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) from the Programme Director.

The purpose of this guidance is to provide the template for the construction of the SED, bearing in mind the need to ensure that the procedures will help the programme team, schools and Cardiff Metropolitan University to satisfy the requirements of external stakeholders whilst retaining flexibility and cost-effectiveness.

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.
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 annual programme review 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. Please contact QED should you need any information or advice.

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.

- Evidence of approval-in-principle by the external examiner(s) must be provided in the submission documentation and referenced here.
- 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 Cardiff Metropolitan University (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 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 Key Skills, 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 in assisting collaborating institution programme delivery;
 - 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 Cardiff Metropolitan University.

GUIDANCE NOTES ON REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATE

This series of guidance notes covers:

Role of Panel Chair (pre-, mid- and post-event);
Role of Panel Member (pre-, mid- and post-event);
Role of Programme Team (pre-, mid- and post-event);
Student Involvement in Review;

Guidance Note: Chairing the Review Panel

Introduction

The Chair is the key person in the review event. It is the Chair's responsibility to create an atmosphere in which critical professional discussion can take place, where opinions can be freely and courteously exchanged and in which justice and fair play prevail. The Chair will have been approved by the Academic Quality & Standards Committee.

As the custodian of professionalism and justice, the Chair's attitude, preparation and control are critical. The Chair will need to:

1. read thoroughly and demonstrate an understanding of the documentation;
2. demonstrate a familiarity with the policies and guidelines of relevant external awarding bodies and professional organisations and with those of Cardiff Metropolitan University;
3. concentrate on main issues;
4. establish the essential purpose of the occasion and its possible outcomes;
5. control and guide investigation and discussion to ensure that the conclusions are clearly articulated and understood.

Before the Event

1. The Chair should have early consultation with the QED regarding the background to the review, the composition of the panel, the programme of the day and ensure that the Programme Director is familiar with the agenda and purpose of the meeting.
2. The Chair will need to:
 - a) establish the essential purpose and possible outcome of the event;

- b) clarify the detailed programme for the occasion;
 - c) be familiar with initial responses from panel members and communicate issues thus raised to all panel members and to the Programme Director;
 - d) hold a private meeting of the panel to explain and explore the documentation, to identify problem areas and to develop an agenda for the meeting with the programme team;
 - e) identify panel members who will lead discussions with the programme team on specific issues;
 - f) distinguish between management and organisational and teaching and learning issues.
3. The Chair will therefore have planned programmes for the private panel meeting and for subsequent discussions with the programme team in which major issues are the focus of concern. The Chair will ensure that the issues to be covered are appropriate and the time apportioned for discussion is effective.

During the Event

1. The Chair will set the scene by introducing members of the panel and establishing clearly the purpose and possible outcomes of the occasion. The location of the event in the wider framework of Cardiff Metropolitan University's internal validation/review machinery will be explained as will its relation to the external awarding body, where necessary. The final outcome will be a written report with recommendations to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee and, where applicable, for the relevant external awarding body.
2. The Chair will confirm an agenda for discussion and indicate that different members of the panel will give a lead on issues. Internal and external panel members need to be given equal prominence.
3. It is the Chair's responsibility to guide discussion and ensure that the panel's questioning is clearly understood and responded to and that with each major issue there is a clearly understood conclusion, which may incorporate a condition or recommendation.
4. The Chair should intervene if the discussion is being diverted, is trivialising or sticking on what is a difference of opinion or is taking up too much time at the expense of the rest of the agenda.
5. The Chair should ensure that the panel members are confident of the continued quality, quality enhancement, and standards of the programme through exploration of areas such as: changes to the programme and resulting updated documentation; programme contention, enrolment,

progression and completion/success rates; comparability of standards; external examiner and other reports and action taken; the Programme Committee records; student comment; the effectiveness of the external examiner arrangements; staffing and staff development; resources.

6. The Chair should ensure that the discussion is thoroughly professional and positively critical, that there is a genuine exchange of viewpoints, and that adequate attention is given to the teaching, learning and research experiences of students. It is the Chair's duty to establish an atmosphere of lively, open, critical, yet helpful discussion, so that the occasion is seen to be a professionally helpful experience rather than a confrontational burden.
7. At the end of the event, the Chair, following private discussion with the panel, will report verbally to Programme Management /Programme Team the Panel's conclusions and the time required for responding to any action necessary. The programme management/programme team should be in no doubt as to where they stand in consequence.

After the Event

1. The Panel Secretary will submit a draft report to the Chair and panel members for scrutiny. The draft report will be circulated to the Directors of Research of participating Schools and the Programme Director.
2. After receiving observations, the report will be adjusted as necessary before being circulated as the confirmed report by the QED to the Chair of the Academic Quality & Standards Committee.
3. The confirmed report should capture, in a precise and structured form, the essential discussion that had taken place, and clearly record any conditions or recommendations made and the time required for their implementation. The Chair of the Panel must approve changes required to programme documents as a result of review.
4. The response to conditions and revised documentation must be submitted to the QED for consideration by the Chair. On receipt of the revised documentation, it is the Chair's responsibility to satisfy him/herself that the required modifications (etc.) have been completed adequately and to confirm this in writing to the QED. It is helpful for a full report to be provided by the Chair, which indicates what, and where, changes have been made in relation to each condition, and to confirm (or otherwise) that the particular condition has been met.
5. Exceptionally, the Programme Team might, for good reason, request an extension to the deadline for submission or may not in the view of the Panel Chair have met one or more conditions satisfactorily. In such instances the Panel Chair should discuss the situation with the Quality Operations Manager and the Chair of Academic Quality & Standards Committee with a view to finding a way forward.

Guidance Note: Panel Members

1. Panel members are selected from a list approved by the Quality Enhancement Directorate. They will provide the crucial expertise and experience to enable the programme to be scrutinised effectively. Between them they will provide experience of subject expertise, validating procedures and practices, and the employment market relevant to the occasion.
2. Panel members are selected for their independence and the relevance of their backgrounds. No member can have a close association with the programme, for example, as current external examiner, programme adviser or management role, or former member of academic staff of the School in which the programme is located. External panel members due to commence an external examining role would however be eligible to be involved in the review of the said programme. It is not acceptable for former members of Cardiff Metropolitan University staff or former students of Cardiff Metropolitan University to be invited to become external panellists before a lapse of at least three years following the end of their employment with, or programme at, Cardiff Metropolitan University.
- 4 The essential purpose of the panel is to ensure that the programme continues to meet the standards set at its introduction and that quality enhancement has taken place. As individual members of a chosen group, panel members need to make collective judgements on quality and standards. To do so they will need to be conversant with all the documentation and enter into critical dialogue with the programme leaders and its members on key issues, and to meet with students and sample their work wherever possible and relevant. It is important that the dialogue is critical, balanced and constructive.

Before the Event

1. Panel members need to prepare themselves thoroughly and acquire a detailed understanding of the documentation provided.
2. Panel members should identify:
 - a) any apparent weaknesses and strengths;
 - b) any irregularities regarding procedural matters;
 - c) any issues raised through external or internal reports and how they have, or have not, been addressed;
 - d) any indications in regard to the standards achieved by the students;

- e) the effectiveness of the external examiner arrangements.
- 3. Panel members who are subject specialists should, particularly, examine in detail syllabi, their content, how they are taught and the capacity of the staff to do so. Non subject specialists can usefully concentrate on quality enhancement issues, documentation, etc.
- 4. Panel members should submit a summary of key issues, which they have identified for consideration, as requested by the QED.

During the Event

- 1. The individual panel member is a crucial contributor in creating an atmosphere for dialogue in which praise is as necessary as challenge, in which development is as important as criticism. Panel members should be critical, but courteous, persistent in questioning when necessary but should avoid excessive personal bias. Above all, panel members have to be seen to be consistent and fair. As a team member, it is essential to stick to the agreed agenda and not digress unnecessarily.
- 2. In particular, panel members will need to:
 - a) explore discrepancies between what is written and what is said;
 - b) seek clarification and confirmation when required;
 - c) listen as well as ask;
 - d) offer suggestions if, and when, appropriate;
 - e) concentrate on major, rather than minor, issues;
 - f) participate in a collaborative manner.
- 3. Panel members are part of a scrutinising team and at the end of the event will need to help the Chair to arrive at an agreed conclusion.

After the Event

- 1. Panel members will need to:
 - a) check and agree the report of the review (if required);
 - b) be available, where possible and if required, to programme team members for further discussion;
 - c) complete evaluations of the event.

Guidance Note: Programme Team Members

Before the Event

1. The review documentation is crucial to the panel being able to understand the programme, changes that have been made since the last validation or review, changes proposed, how the programme team operates and what external peers think about the programme. The programme team should ensure that all required documents are available in their most up-to-date and complete form.

Note that past changes to the programme, whether minor or substantial (through approved mechanisms) must be incorporated into the programme document; the review panel has the right to expect this.

2. It is recommended that document updating is a frequent process rather than being prompted by a review event.
3. The Programme Management Team/Programme Team also should ensure that the quality and scope of what is being submitted is acceptable. In particular, the Programme Director and associated Directors of Research will ensure that the documentation satisfies the guidelines of the Academic Handbook. The Programme Director will need to have preliminary meetings with the designated Chair of the panel to clarify issues and practices and with the QED to agree the programme for the event and appropriate arrangements.

During the Event

1. The quality of the staff and the impression it conveys to the panel is important to a successful review event. Staff need to act as a genuine team in which its members are confident, open rather than defensive, articulate and able to respond to questions simply, yet developing an answer fully where required. Programme team members need to clarify, exemplify and illuminate their programme fully so that the documentation comes to life and the teaching and learning capacity is of obvious quality. Opportunities to illustrate teaching and learning should be readily taken and demonstrated.
2. The programme team will need to be able to demonstrate, rather than assert, in response to questioning, using the reports, etc., which form part of the documentation.
3. The Programme Director will have particular responsibility for orchestrating the responses of the programme team to questions raised in the formal meeting. The Programme Director needs to be substantially involved in the discussion, but a continuous dialogue between her/him and the panel Chair should be avoided. It is essential that the opportunity be provided for a wide range of staff teaching on the programme to participate in discussion.

4. Students and former students are essential members of any programme review and the Programme Director should encourage and organise their involvement. This may take on a variety of forms and imaginative approaches to their fuller involvement should be considered and introduced.

After the Event

1. The Programme Director will ensure that the programme team fully understand the conclusions of the review and that any changes required to the programme and/or its documentation take place in the time specified. The School Director of Research will need to report developments to the School, the QED and the Academic Registry.

Guidance Note: Student Involvement

1. It is helpful for Review Panels to be able to meet with existing students on the programme, and where possible past students. The Programme Director should ensure that a representative selection of students is available and that they are briefed in regard to what the event is about so that they can contribute to the review in an informed manner.
2. Students should be encouraged to discuss the programme frankly and honestly in the spirit of a genuine attempt to identify strengths and weaknesses so that the programme can be improved.

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