

07.05

**PROCEDURE
FOR
REVIEW OF A TAUGHT
DOCTORATE**

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY REVIEW OF TAUGHT DOCTORATES

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This section sets out the procedure for the review of a Taught 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 Taught 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/AH_1_14_02.pdf

3 Structure for Taught Doctorate

- 3.1 The following rules apply regarding the conduct of the Taught Doctorate:
 - .1 The School associated with a taught doctorate 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 an Associate Dean (Research) who will 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 sub-committee with terms of reference and membership as set out in Volume 3 of the Academic Handbook.

4 Purpose of Review and Regulatory Framework

- 4.1 The review, taking cognisance of any proposed incorporated modifications, will seek to ensure that:
 1. the standards set at the introduction of the Taught 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;
 2. changes proposed would keep the Taught 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;
 3. the programme documentation is acceptable.
- 4.2 The regulatory framework shall be Cardiff Metropolitan University's Taught Doctorate Regulations with due regard also to be paid to the Cardiff Metropolitan University Code of Practice Research Degrees.
- 4.3 The Review Panel evaluating a Taught Doctorate will also take account of external benchmarks, which will include:
 - Advice and Guidance relating to Research Degrees in the UK Quality Code
 - the FHEQ qualification descriptor for a Doctoral degree
 - QAA Doctoral degree characteristics

5 Evaluating the Taught Doctorate

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

- 5.1 That there are in place effective arrangements to maintain appropriate academic standards and enhance the quality of the Taught Doctorate including monitoring the programme against internal and external indicators that reflect the context in which it is being offered;
- 5.2 That the associated School has provided and will continue to provide an environment that supports research students doing and learning

about research, in which excellent research recognised by the relevant subject community is occurring;

5.3 That the associated School has evidenced effective and adequate management and administration, adequate and well deployed human and physical resources and appropriate systems for quality assurance;

5.4 That associated School can evidence that its research activity has been of an appropriate quality and standard to support research at Taught Doctorate level. 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 and selection procedures that are clear, consistently applied and demonstrate equality of opportunity; and that ensure that only appropriately qualified and prepared applicants are admitted after a decision-making process involving at least two members of staff trained in the selection and admission of research degree students;

b) induction programme and student handbook that provide students with sufficient information to enable them to commence study with an understanding of the environment in which they will be working;

c) defined arrangements for supervision, rights and responsibilities of supervisor and student and that these are clearly communicated;

d) systematic and clear supervision arrangements including the appointment of supervisors with appropriate skills and subject knowledge, a supervisory team for each student including a main supervisor as the contact point, and that supervisors are afforded sufficient time to effectively discharge their responsibilities;

e) progression from the taught part of the Doctorate;

f) assessment criteria and procedures (in accordance with the relevant University regulations)

- i) that assessment criteria define academic standards and the achievements of graduates and are clear and readily available to research students, staff and examiners;
 - ii) that assessment procedures are clear, rigorous, fair and consistent, include input from an external examiner, are carried out to a reasonable timescale and are communicated clearly to students, supervisors and examiners;
- .3 that the systems in place or proposed to monitor, support and review student progress (including formal and explicit progress reviews at different stages) and to obtain student feedback are clearly defined and appropriate, and that such systems are made known to students and supervisors, including the need to maintain appropriate records of the outcomes of meetings and related activities;
- .4 that independent and formal procedures for dealing with complaints and appeals are in place and are promoted, which are fair, clear, robust and consistently applied, and that acceptable grounds for complaints and appeals are clearly defined;
- .5 that appropriate student welfare/support services are in place;
- .6 that there are appropriate opportunities for research students to develop their research, personal and professional skills, such development needs identified at the start of the degree and regularly reviewed thereafter;
- .7 that the academic staff who will supervise and manage the taught doctorate 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 current and 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.
- .8 that the resources available or proposed are adequate in extent and quality. Attention will focus on library, information technology and research facilities;
- .9 that a mechanism is in place to collect, review and respond appropriately to evaluations from those concerned with the taught doctorate, including individual research students and groups of research students and their representatives, such evaluations considered openly and constructively, and the results appropriately communicated;
- .10 that the associated School's Research Degrees Sub- Committee is operating in accordance with its terms of reference as set out in the Academic Handbook.

6 Review Panel Membership

- 6.1 The membership of the Review Panel will include a Chair (not from research area of the Taught Doctorate), two representatives from Cardiff Metropolitan University's Research Degrees Committee, one external who is a subject specialist and one representative of the University's 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 Taught 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 associated School Management and Planning Team to explore the location of the Taught Doctorate degree programme within the School's portfolio

and other 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 Taught Doctorate degree programme;

- c) a meeting of the Review Panel with the Taught Doctorate Programme Team and supervisors 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 Taught Doctorate 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 appropriate staff 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 of the associated School to deliver the Taught 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 the University's students qualifying for equivalent awards.

8 Documentation for Taught 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 Taught Doctorate and its progress and identify relevant issues. It is the responsibility of the associated School to ensure that the submission documentation is compliant with the

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 associated School and the 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.
- 4 The associated School 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.
- 5 Before submitting the programme documentation for review to the ASQU, measures must be taken by the associated School to ensure that:
 - a) the form, content and quality of the documentation complies with requirements, including those of the Submission Checklist' jointly signed-off by the Associate Dean Research and the Associate/Deputy Dean;
 - 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) if appropriate, 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 for the lifespan of the programme;
 - 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 and strategies associated with learning, teaching, assessment and research;
- i) the School has fully considered the pedagogic and resource implications of e-learning;
- j) the programme endorses and demonstrates means for developing employability skills through its learning and teaching strategies;
- k) 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 Quality Enhancement Directorate 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 associated School 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 Taught 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 programme;
- 2) the history of the School's research activity, evidence of its 'research culture' and proposals for future development;
- 3) reference to any external and internal reports on the quality of existing provision, and a self-appraisal with regard to these;
- 4) academic and management structure;
- 5) technician and administrative support services;
- 6) intake, admission requirements and selection procedure;
- 7) induction programme
- 8) arrangements for supervision, rights and responsibilities of supervisor and student;
- 9) progression from taught part of the Taught Doctorate;
- 10) assessment criteria and procedures (in accordance with University Taught Doctorate regulations);
- 11) arrangements in place for a Research Degrees sub-committee;
- 12) procedures for dealing with complaints and appeals;
- 13) services for student welfare and support;
- 14) 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;
- 15) opportunities for students to develop research, personal and professional skills;
- 16) 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;
- 17) Mechanism for collecting, reviewing and responding to evaluation.
3. The curriculum vitae of and detailed information on all academic staff who will teach, supervise and manage the Taught 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
5. Module Descriptors
6. current student 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. if collaborative provision, 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 Taught Doctorate be approved to continue (with or without proposed modifications);
- (ii) that the Taught 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 Taught Doctorate be cancelled.

10 Approval to Continue

- 10.1 Approval of the Taught 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 associated School has been 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 Taught Doctorate is and has been operating satisfactorily – as determined from annual graduate studies reports, external examiners' reports, etc. – but for which the documentation is unsatisfactory/unacceptable and/or for which the associated School gave a poor defence, 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 Taught 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 Review Panel Chair.

11.2 Changes which are desirable in order to enhance the quality of the Taught 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 Taught Doctorate Committee and the annual report on research activity submitted to the 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 Taught 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 solution.

11.4 The associated School's 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 Quality Enhancement Directorate and the associated School, to follow-up any further action required by the conditions imposed. The Panel Chair will be responsible through the Quality Enhancement Directorate and the associated School 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 associated School is required to send to the Quality Enhancement Directorate 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 Quality Enhancement Directorate to the Taught 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.

APPENDIX 1

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:

- 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.

- 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 University Learning, Teaching & Assessment Strategy, Widening Access Strategy, Technology-Enhanced Learning policy.
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) 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.

APPENDIX 2

GUIDANCE NOTES ON REVIEW OF A TAUGHT 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 ASQU 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 ASQU 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 ASQU. 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 Manager of the ASQU 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 Chair of Academic Quality & Standards Committee. 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 ASQU.

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 ensuring 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 ASQU 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 ASQU 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.