

Programme Approval and Periodic Review Policy

Purpose

This document sets out the College's policy for the approval of new programmes and the periodic review of existing programmes, including responsibilities and documentation requirements.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Reference Points	2
3. Consumer law requirements	2
4. Identifying new programme proposals: Programme Proposers and Programme Development Teams..	3
Market research.....	3
5. Initial Consideration and Approval	3
For new programmes.....	3
For existing programmes	4
6. Development/Review process and required documentation	4
7. Initial Review of documentation.....	6
8. Evaluation Panel (Academic Scrutiny)	6
Evaluation Panel membership	6
Submission of documentation	7
The Panel meeting	7
9. Evaluation panel outcomes and reporting process	8
10. Definitive documentation	9
11. Consultation with existing students about changes relating to the programme approval/review	9
12. Changes to approved site of delivery as part of a programme review	10
13. Evaluation	10
14. Associated forms and documentation.....	10
Appendix 1: List of key contacts within AECC	11

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Programme approval is the process by which AECC ensures that its named awards are relevant to the College's strategic plan, are of an appropriate academic standard and will provide a quality learning experience for the student. Programmes are approved for a defined period only (normally a maximum of six years).
- 1.2 Thereafter Periodic Programme Review provides the opportunity to consider and assure the continued strategic relevance, academic standards and currency of existing awards and the quality of the student learning experience. The process takes into account developments in research, professional practice and pedagogy, changes in the College's strategic mission and the external environment, including the requirements of relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs). It provides an opportunity to evaluate whether students are attaining the intended learning outcomes. The process highlights where enhancements are possible in order to enhance student learning opportunities. Periodic review takes place normally at least every six years.
- 1.3 All academic programmes leading to an award of the College must undergo formal procedures that include approval, annual monitoring and periodic review. Programmes may also be subject to modification following processes set out in the College's Programme and Unit Modifications Policy. Where a programme is to be reviewed for closure, the Policy for programme closure applies.
- 1.4 Academic Development and Quality Committee (ADQC) is responsible for the process of programme approval and review, including initial approval for development of new programme proposals, and the appointment of Evaluation Panel members. Evaluation Panels give approval of new programmes and

approve programmes under periodic review. The decision of Evaluation Panels is submitted to ADQC, which will monitor responses to any conditions/recommendations.

- 1.5 This process should be used in circumstances when it is proposed that a programme be closed and replaced with another cognate programme; or where a framework review is leading to proposals to close one or more programmes within the framework. Proposals to close a stand-alone programme or a whole framework, without a replacement, should follow the separate Programme Closure process.
- 1.6 Advice regarding the operation of this policy and procedure may be sought from the Quality and Enhancement Manager or the Vice-Principal (Quality).
- 1.7 References in this policy to any College role or officeholder include his or her properly appointed nominee. References to job titles include equivalences.

2. Reference Points

- 2.1 All new and existing programmes must be considered and if appropriate approved with reference to:
 - [Quality Assurance Agency \(QAA\) Quality Code Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards](#)
In particular:
 - [The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies \(Nov 2014\)](#)
 - relevant [subject benchmark statements](#)
 - [The Higher education credit framework for England: guidance on academic credit arrangements in higher education in England](#) (2008)
 - [QAA Characteristics Statement: Masters Degree September 2015](#)
 - The requirements of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (where relevant)
 - [QAA UK Quality Code, Part B](#)
In particular
 - Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development and Approval
 - Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching
 - Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning
 - Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review
 - [Competition Marketing Authority : UK higher education providers - advice on consumer protection law Helping you comply with your obligations 12 March 2015 CMA33](#)
 - AECC Programme Structure and Curriculum Design Characteristics Policy
 - the procedures set out in this document
 - relevant College regulations and policies

3. Consumer law requirements

- 3.1 Programme reviews are considered to be a significant change according to consumer legislation. Care needs to be exercised to ensure that consultation evidencing current student consent takes place when appropriate. In addition, Programme Leaders, working with the relevant Programmes Office and Registry need to ensure that communication of the changes to students, applicants and potential applicants takes place. Any change that affects course information that has been provided to students, applicants or potential applicants is likely to be a significant change if it:
 - is a change to one of the items of material or pre-contractual information specified by the Competition Marketing Authority (CMA);
 - potentially has a negative impact on a group of students; or
 - could influence (or could have already influenced) decisions that a potential applicant, applicant, offer holder or student would make.
- 3.2 The Programme team also need to consider whether the change is fair, and whether mitigation should be offered if it may have an adverse effect on students in general or a particular group of students. If the

changes will affect those who have already applied but not yet enrolled at the College Registry will be required to communicate significant changes made to the programme to current applicants as soon as the review is complete. At enrolment applicants agree to the current version of the programme and will be provided with a student handbook and material via the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) that is based on the programme specification.

- 3.3 Guidance notes are available to help the Programme Team decide whether a change is significant and further advice can be sought from the Quality and Enhancement Manager.

4. Identifying new programme proposals: Programme Proposers and Programme Development Teams

- 4.1 Members of staff with suggestions for new programmes should raise these with the relevant Head of School or Vice-Principal in the first instance. The Head of School/Vice-Principal may consult other members of staff, including professional support staff, at this stage, if necessary. If the Head of School/Vice-Principal considers that the suggested programme is likely to fit with the College's strategic aims, and has the potential to be financially viable he/she will propose to the Executive that suggested programme be taken forward for consideration.
- 4.2 If the Executive agrees that the suggested programme should be developed into a formal proposal, the Executive will identify a Programme Proposer to lead the development of the new programme. If there is no suitable internal staff member to take forward the development the opportunity may be advertised externally. The Programme Proposer would normally be outside of the Executive, in order to keep the stages/roles/tasks separate. At this stage the Executive will agree the budget for initial market research, in discussion with Marketing (see below).
- 4.3 The Programme Proposer should then bring together a team of relevant colleagues to work up the proposal. New and revised programmes should be developed by teams of academics and professional support staff with knowledge of the relevant subject area(s), curriculum design, pedagogic practice, professional requirements (where applicable), learning services and technologies, academic administration and the marketing of programmes. A list of AECC staff who should normally be consulted during the process is attached as appendix 1.

Market research

- 4.4 It is important to establish objectively at the outset whether there is a viable market for a new programme. Therefore appropriate market research is essential. Market research should be conducted in collaboration with the Marketing team and where appropriate, may involve the use of external advisors and agencies within this area. An exploration of the proposed market for the programme is required in the New Programme Proposal Form - Strategic Approval, submitted to the Executive and to ADQC (see below).
- 4.5 In considering the rationale for a new programme it is important to consider the need for the programme, what makes it unique, who are the target audience and what the specific needs of the target group are likely to be.

5. Initial Consideration and Approval

For new programmes

- 5.1 Initial consideration and approval is based on a review of the New Programme Proposal Form - Strategic Approval. Initial consideration and approval has two purposes – through the Executive the strategic fit and financial viability of a proposed new programme is assessed; consideration by ADQC reviews and if appropriate approves the academic proposition.

- 5.2 The Programme Proposer, in consultation with colleagues as outlined above, should complete the New Programme Proposal Form - Strategic Approval. The form requires an outline of the academic rationale for the programme, including the likely market, an indication of anticipated student numbers and resource requirements.
- 5.3 This form should be submitted to the Executive in the first instance for consideration of the business case and strategic fit. The Programme Proposer should be involved in the discussions with the Executive as appropriate.
- 5.4 The Executive may accept the proposal, require modifications to the proposal, or further consideration, which should be taken forward by the Programme Proposer in consultation with colleagues, or may reject the proposal. When the programme is accepted the Principal will sign Section 6 of the final version of the form to signify that the Executive agree that the proposed programme fits with the College's strategic direction, and that there is an objective business case for the new programme, including appropriate resourcing for effective delivery and student experience. The completed form will be returned to the Programme Proposer.
- 5.5 The Programme Proposer will then submit the New Programme Proposal Form - Strategic Approval to ADQC. The programme Proposer will be invited to attend the relevant ADQC meeting to present the proposal and answer questions. ADQC will consider the academic proposition in relation to the College's overall strategic objectives, in the light of the information provided. ADQC may:
- approve the proposal,
 - approve the proposal subject to modifications
 - require revisions/further consideration and resubmission
 - reject the proposal.
- Where modification, revisions or further consideration is required, or where the proposal is rejected, feedback will be provided to the Programme Proposer.
- 5.6 If timing required, and where ADQC members agree, modified proposals may be considered in circulation/approved on Chair's action and ratified at the next meeting.
- 5.7 ADQC initial approval signals the formal commencement of the development process and the point at which marketing can begin 'subject to approval' (and to PSRB validation where applicable).
- 5.8 Initial approval for a new programme proposal is granted for eighteen months; proposals which have not proceeded to Evaluation within this period must normally be reconsidered by the Executive and ADQC.

For existing programmes

- 5.9 As the initial stage of the periodic review programme the Programme Leader, in consultation with other colleagues (academic and professional support colleagues, including Finance and Marketing) as appropriate, should complete the Programme Strategy Review form, for consideration by the Executive to confirm that the programme still has a place within the strategy and business needs of the College. The Principal will sign the form to confirm the Executive's satisfaction with the financial and business case for continuing the programme. This form need not be submitted to ADQC but will form part of the documentation for the Evaluation Panel for the Periodic Review.

6. Development/Review process and required documentation

- 6.1 For new programmes the Programme Proposer should work with relevant colleagues (including learning services and colleagues in academic administration) to design and develop the programme, in accordance with the Programme Structure and Curriculum Design Characteristics Policy and prepare and/or gather together the programme documentation for the Evaluation Panel. It is important that there is involvement of/consultation with, all members of staff who will deliver the proposed programme so they gain ownership of the new provision.

- 6.2 For reviews of existing programmes all staff teaching on the programme(s) and associated professional support staff should have the opportunity to contribute to the review.
- 6.3 In both cases development/review should include input from other stakeholders including employer representatives, current students and, where appropriate, graduates and representatives from PSRBs. Where applicable feedback from current external examiners should be sought and considered as part of the process.

- 6.4 The documentation will consist of:

New Programme

- Briefing and Resources document with initial approval form and staff profiles for the programme team
- Programme specification
- Unit profiles
- Notes from the Scrutiny Group (see section 6)
- CMA significant change and impact form, where required.

Existing Programmes for review

- Briefing and Resources document with programme strategy review form and staff profiles for the programme team
- Updated programme specification(s) with previous version for reference and comparison
- Unit profiles for all existing and all new modules
- CMA significant change and impact form (where applicable)
- Latest Professional Body accreditation report and programme response (where applicable)
- Statistics showing longitudinal trends and historical data to demonstrate evolution of the framework/programme
- Evidence from any impact equality assessments
- Framework/programme leaders reports since the last approval
- Notes from the Scrutiny Group (see section 6)
- CMA significant change and impact form, where required.

- 6.5 At this stage, the Programme Proposer/Leader, in consultation with relevant colleagues should nominate two External Advisors (one academic subject expert and one professional practitioner, or two academic subject experts) to participate in the approval of the programme(s), in line with the External Advisor Policy.
- 6.6 The timeline for the remainder of the process, including dates for the Evaluation Panel should be agreed at this stage, in discussion between the Programme Proposer/Leader, Programmes Office and the Quality and Enhancement Manager.
- 6.7 Common units should be reviewed as part of the Periodic Review of the Programme to which the unit belongs (i.e. the programme that initially devised and validated it). If, as part of the approval/review process, changes are proposed to common units this would necessitate a modification to the programme(s) not currently under review. If the change is not appropriate for all programmes concerned, the modified unit should be approved as a separate unit with a distinct unit title/code and the programmes in which it will be used must be clearly specified. Programme teams other than the lead programme team must ensure that the same consultations occur in relation to the proposed changes, e.g.

external examiners, students, applicants. In such cases the Framework/Programme and Unit Modifications Policy and Procedures should be followed.

7. Initial Review of documentation

- 7.1 The Quality and Enhancement Manager will convene a Scrutiny Group, consisting of two members of Faculty who have not been directly involved in the preparation of the documentation, and the Quality and Enhancement Manager. Involvement in the Scrutiny Group does not preclude a faculty member from serving subsequently on the Evaluation Panel.
- 7.2 The Programme Leader/Proposer should submit the completed documentation (see para 6.4) electronically to the Quality and Enhancement Manager for transmission to the Scrutiny Group.
- 7.3 The Scrutiny Group will meet to review the documentation, with attention to both structure and content, to assess its readiness for submission to the Evaluation Panel. The Scrutiny Group may request that the Programme Proposer/Leader attend the meeting to provide clarification and additional Information.
- 7.4 The Quality and Enhancement Manager will provide notes as feedback for the Programme Proposer/Leader to identify recommended amendments. It is the responsibility of the Programme Proposer/Leader to ensure that feedback from the Scrutiny Group is addressed in preparing the final documentation. The notes from the Scrutiny Group will form part of the documentation for the Evaluation Panel.
- 7.5 The Scrutiny Group process, including the provision of feedback should normally take no more than three weeks from the date of submission.

8. Evaluation Panel (Academic Scrutiny)

- 8.1 The purpose of the Evaluation Panel is to provide in-depth academic scrutiny of the proposed Programme or Framework/Programme under review to determine whether this meets, or continues to meet, appropriate academic standards, aligns, or continues to align with key external frames of reference, is professionally relevant, appropriately resourced and provides a high-quality educational experience for students. For existing Frameworks/Programmes undergoing periodic review, the Panel will also consider the experience of delivering the Framework/Programme to date and the views of students. In both cases the Panel should take into account relevant qualitative and quantitative data, and consider whether the Framework/Programme is promoting inclusive approaches to learning, teaching and assessment and addressing the entitlements of students with protected characteristics.

Evaluation Panel membership

- 8.2 The Quality and Enhancement Manager will, in discussion with relevant colleagues, convene an Evaluation Panel to meet and undertake detailed academic scrutiny of the proposal.
- 8.3 The membership of the Panel should include as a minimum:
 - Two members of faculty not involved in the teaching of the programme, one of whom shall act as Chair. The person appointed as Chair will have a good working knowledge of the Institution's quality assurance policies and of external quality frameworks
 - A student representative, normally from outside the programme concerned
 - Two External Advisors (one academic subject expert and one professional practitioner, or two academic subject experts)
 - The Quality and Enhancement Manager who will also act as secretary to the Panel.

Other members of staff with relevant expertise may be invited to join the Panel as appropriate.

Where appropriate a patient or layperson representative may also be invited to join the Panel, either as a member or as an observer.

Additional staff may be invited to participate in the Panel as observers, for staff development purposes.

- 8.4 The student representative should be identified through the Student Union, in liaison with the Quality and Enhancement Manager. Student representatives should normally be from outside the programme. If, exceptionally, it is not possible to identify a student member to attend the Panel meeting, student input must be sought by alternative means.
- 8.5 The Quality and Enhancement Manager shall submit the names of the proposed Panel members to ADQC for consideration and, if appropriate, approval (this may be done in circulation).
- 8.6 Guidance notes for Panel chairs and Panel members are available. Any members requiring further advice or information, or additional training, are invited to consult the Quality and Enhancement Manager.
- 8.7 Where appropriate, and agreeable to both parties, PSRB and College approval/accreditation may take place simultaneously. Panel membership may be adjusted accordingly, but must meet the requirements of both parties. There may be requirements for additional documentation and/or engagement with the programme team to ensure that the requirements of both processes are met.

Submission of documentation

- 8.8 The Framework/Programme Proposer/Leader, supported by the relevant Programmes Office, should submit the final Evaluation Panel documentation to the Quality and Enhancement Manager by an agreed date. This will be at least three weeks before the Evaluation Panel meeting. All documentation should be submitted electronically and will be made available to Panel members by the Quality and Enhancement Manager in the same way.

The Panel meeting

- 8.9 A formal meeting of the Evaluation Panel is normally required. The exact arrangements for the scrutiny will depend on the scope and scale of each individual proposal and the perceived or actual risk associated with the provision. The Quality and Enhancement Manager in consultation with the Chair will agree with the Programme Leader/Proposer the nature of the engagement with the Evaluation Panel and the length of meeting required.
- 8.10 The meeting will normally take place over one day (occasionally more). Longer meetings may be required when College approval and review processes are taking place alongside those of a professional body.
- 8.11 A standard Evaluation Panel event schedule and agenda is used. The event schedule may be varied as required to facilitate attendance by relevant staff and students; the Programme Proposer/Leader should agree this with the Quality and Enhancement Manager, who will liaise with the Panel Chair.
- 8.12 The relevant Programmes Office should make the logistical arrangements for the Panel meeting (room bookings, catering, parking etc).
- 8.13 The relevant Programmes Office, working with the Framework/Programme Proposer should make arrangements for staff and students to attend the meetings with the panel as required, and arrangements for any tours of facilities requested by the panel.
- 8.14 The Evaluation Panel will meet with members of the Programme Team, including learning services and administrative support staff as appropriate. The composition of the team to meet with the Panel should be such as ensures there is suitable representation from subjects included in the programme and across all units, and that those present are able to respond fully to the areas for exploration set out in the indicative agenda for the meeting (see paragraph 8.11 above).

- 8.15 For periodic reviews or proposals for new programmes in closely related cognate areas the Evaluation Panel will also meet with students. This should include students representing all programmes (and levels) under review, student representatives and ideally graduates. Guidance for students invited to meet with the Panel is provided.
- 8.16 The Panel meeting will normally include a tour of facilities and resources available to support the provision. Evaluation of Frameworks/Programmes with a substantial e-learning or distance/blended learning element will normally include a demonstration of the online resources.
- 8.17 Immediately before the meeting with the programme team the Evaluation Panel will meet to identify key issues/priority areas for discussion. The Framework/Programme Proposer/Leader is invited to observe this agenda meeting, but the Panel may request a private meeting if it wishes.

9. Evaluation panel outcomes and reporting process

- 9.1 Following the series of meetings, the Panel will agree its conclusions and formulate a set of outcomes. During the final part of the evaluation meeting the Panel will report the outcomes to the Framework/Programme Team. The outcomes should include aspects of good practice and strengths of the provision as well as a judgment on approval as outlined below.
- 9.2 The outcome from the Evaluation Panel will take any one of the following forms:
- i to recommend unconditional approval, subject to normal periodic review;
 - ii to recommend approval subject to conditions and/or recommendations and subject to normal periodic review;
 - iii to recommend approval for a limited period only with or without conditions and/or recommendations, after which a review will be held;
 - iv to recommend that approval be withheld.
- 9.3 The maximum, and normal, period of approval is six years. If the Panel has concerns about the quality and standards of the proposed provision and these cannot be met through conditions, a more limited approval period or no approval may be proposed.
- 9.4 Where conditions of approval and/or recommendations are set, the Panel will state the timescale for the team to respond.
- 9.5 The written report of the Evaluation Panel meeting, which will record the process, debate and outcomes will be compiled by the Quality and Enhancement Manager and circulated to the Panel and the Framework/Programme Proposer/Leader for comment on matters of fact and accuracy. Once agreed, the final version will be circulated to the Panel and the Programme proposer/Leader.
- 9.6 The Framework/Programme Proposer/Leader should coordinate and provide a full response to the conditions and an initial response to the recommendations, together with revised versions of the programme and unit specifications (if required), normally within three weeks. All conditions must be satisfactorily met before the framework/programme can be delivered. Recommendations can be addressed before the start of the framework/programme or considered over a longer time period. An updated response to recommendations should be formally incorporated into the framework/programme monitoring process through the Continuous Action Plan. Responses to the conditions/recommendations should be sent to the Quality and Enhancement Manager by the specified deadline. Where necessary, extensions may be sought through the Quality and Enhancement Manager in consultation with the Panel Chair.
- 9.7 The Quality and Enhancement Manager will send the response to the Panel. The Panel will normally be asked to respond within a working week. Once all Panel members have confirmed that they are satisfied that the conditions have been satisfactorily met, approval is confirmed by the Chair and the Quality and

Enhancement Manager (or nominee). The Quality and Enhancement Manager will make clear whether an approved programme remains subject to accreditation by a professional body.

- 9.8 Once formal approval is given the Quality and Enhancement Manager will notify the Programme Developer/Leader, relevant Programmes Office, Registry, Finance and Marketing, and ensure that the final evaluation panel report is presented to ADQC for note. As part of this reporting process the Quality and Enhancement Manager will also highlight to ADQC any issues of common interest or good practice which may be applicable College-wide.
- 9.9 PSRB approval or accreditation may be granted through a joint process or it may be completed separately from the College's academic award.

10. Definitive documentation

- 10.1 The approved Programme Specification becomes the definitive document for the Programme, and changes to it are subject to consideration through formal processes reporting to ADQC.
- 10.2 The relevant Programmes Office holds the definitive Word version of the programme and unit specifications. The relevant Programmes Office in consultation with the relevant Framework/Programme Proposer/Leader is responsible for ensuring that the definitive document is appropriately maintained. On receipt of notification of formal approval final versions of the Programme Specification(s) and Unit Specifications should be submitted to the Quality and Enhancement Manager within two weeks, for publication through the VLE, the SIP and the College website.
- 10.3 Together with the above documentation the Programmes Office (working with the Programme/ Framework Leader) should also submit a definitive statement of additional costs the student will be required/recommended to meet to complete the programme. This will be used to update any information already made available via the Prospectus and College website.

11. Consultation with existing students about changes relating to the programme approval/review

- 11.1 A new version of a framework/programme will normally come into effect for the next new intake of students. However, in some instances the team may wish to implement the revised version for existing students. In such instances, the Framework/Programme Leader, with the support of the relevant Programmes Office should obtain consent from affected students as set out below, before this can occur. In considering whether to implement the revised version in this way Programme Teams should consider the arrangements from the point of view of affected students, as well as from an academic perspective.
- 11.2 If it is planned that significant changes (see section 3) will apply to current students the Programme Leader must inform all affected students of the proposed change and the written agreement of at least 75% of all affected students must be obtained (75% of affected students per level, per programme). All reasonable efforts must be made to obtain student support for the proposed changes. This includes making repeated attempts to contact students. When outlining the changes to students it is suggested that the following text is included: *"Please confirm that you are happy with these changes. If you do have concerns or are not willing to consent to them, please let us know as soon as possible so that we can consider your concerns."* Students must be informed that the changes remain subject to formal approval.
- 11.3 This consent must normally be obtained before the Evaluation Panel meeting. The Programme Leader must ensure that an audit trail of the correspondence with the students is kept, including any potential issues that are raised. The outcome of the consent process must be reported to the External Panel to consider when reviewing the change.
- 11.4 Where 75% (or more) sign up is achieved during the consultation process, and where the proposed change may be categorised as a significant change the Programme Leader should discuss with the

relevant Vice-Principal appropriate mitigation in respect of those students who have not accepted the change. The Programme Leader should then complete the CMA significant change form. The Programme Proposer/Leader should submit the completed template with the documentation for consideration by the Evaluation Panel. Matters relating to fairness; both the impact of any changes and the fairness of the process followed in considering and communicating the change, must be considered as part of these discussions.

- 11.5 On occasions the Evaluation Panel may consider that changes not previously regarded as such by the Programme Team would fall into the category of a significant change. Should this occur the Evaluation Panel may require the completion of the CMA significant change form as a condition of approval.
- 11.6 If the change is confirmed at the completion of the review process, the relevant Programmes Office must inform existing students of the change, including any differences between the change that they were consulted about and the one that is finally made, and the response to any important issues raised by students during the consultation.

12. Changes to approved site of delivery as part of a programme review

- 12.1 If a change to an existing site of delivery is proposed as part of a programme review the programme leader should consult the Quality and Enhancement Manager and the Chair of ADQC in the first instance, to determine what information will be required and whether a visit to the site to review the physical resources should take place before a formal proposal is submitted.

13. Evaluation

- 13.1 The Quality and Enhancement Manager will seek feedback from participants as an aid to evaluation and process improvement.

14. Associated forms and documentation

- Programme Structure and Curriculum Design Characteristics Policy
- New programme proposal form- Strategic Approval (for new programmes)
- Programme strategy review form (for periodic review of existing programmes)
- Briefing and Resources Document template
- Guidance and template for Programme Specifications
- Guidance and template for unit specification
- Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) significant change form (for programme reviews and/or modifications)
- Framework/Programme and Unit Modifications Policy and Procedures

Version:	1.1
Ratified by:	Academic Audit Committee/Academic Board
Originator/Author	Quality and Enhancement Manager
Owner	Quality and Enhancement Manager
Reference source	Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Quality Code Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards Quality Assurance Agency (QAA)'s UK Quality Code, Part B, Chapter B1: Programme Design, Development and Approval and Chapter B8: Programme Monitoring and Review Competition Marketing Authority : UK higher education providers - advice on consumer protection law Helping you comply with your obligations 12 March 2015 CMA33 Examples from other institutions used as source material (in particular Bournemouth University and University of Southampton)
Date approved	18 June 2017
Effective from	29 June 2017
Review date	Spring 2019
Target	Framework/Programme Leaders, Programmes Offices, Registry, members of Academic Development and Quality Committee, members of Evaluation Panels
Policy location	SIP
Equality analysis	The policy itself has no direct impact; however the policy has been framed to ensure that equality issues are considered and explored as part of the process of developing or reviewing, and approving a programme, through the use of relevant prompts in templates and agendas for meetings

Appendix 1: List of key contacts within AECC

- Head of Marketing: - for marketing and business intelligence advice
- Head of Finance – for advice on programme costings
- Admissions Manager - for enquires regarding suitable admissions criteria
- Head of Learning Services and E-developments –for library and other resources required, including opportunities for usage of electronic study skills resources and the teaching of Digital Capabilities etc. to be built into the programme
- E-learning Developer – for consideration of how the use of technology enhanced learning/assessment could be built into the programme
- Head of IT – for computing provision, licenses etc
- Head of (relevant) Programmes Administration – for timetabling/scheduling issues
- Student Records Manager – for systems implications (for example in terms of SRS set-up for progression/award), unit and programme coding
- Academic Registrar – for implications where non-standard programme start dates are under consideration and for advice on target groups for widening participation
- Executive Director of Administration – for space requirements and other specialist equipment