

ACADEMIC APPROVAL OF TAUGHT AWARD OR CREDIT-BEARING PROVISION

CONTENTS

Outline of the procedure.....	2
Academic approval of taught credit-bearing modules.....	3
Academic approval of Credit-bearing Short Courses.....	4
Academic approval of taught credit-bearing programmes: School Scrutiny	4
Information to be made available for School scrutiny	5
Points to be considered as part of School scrutiny	6
Recording the outcome of the school scrutiny process.....	6
The Programme Approvals Board	6
Meetings of the Programme Approvals Board.....	6
Selecting the Programme Approvals Board.....	7
The Programme Approvals Board agenda	8
Information to be made available to the Programme Approvals Board.....	9
Scrutiny undertaken by the Programme Approvals Board.....	10
Recording the outcome of the Programme Approvals Board	10
Systematic re-approval of a taught module.....	12
Appendix 1: School Scrutiny guide for taught award or credit-bearing programmes	14
Appendix 2: Programme Approvals Board: Key dates and activities	16
Appendix 3: Indicative Programme Approvals Board agenda.....	17
Appendix 4: The Programme Approvals Board Guide.....	18

Outline of the procedure

1. The procedures set out below have been designed to meet the expectations of the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#) and to meet the common and core practices for standards and quality and takes account of a number of guiding principles set out within the accompanying Advice and Guidance sections.
2. The academic approval of taught credit-bearing modules is devolved to School-level, with the exception of new modules created as part of a new programme. The approval process for new modules must involve sufficient internal and external peer review. See also [Section 1a of the Quality Framework](#).
3. The academic approval of all taught award or credit-bearing programmes is a University-level activity undertaken on behalf of Academic Board by a panel, known as the Programme Approvals Board, appointed to scrutinise each proposed taught award or credit-bearing programme at a formal event. This section of the Quality Framework refers to provision delivered fully by Edinburgh Napier University. Provision developed or delivered in partnership should adhere to the procedures set out in [Section 4 of the Quality Framework](#).
4. All proposals to approve a taught award or credit-bearing programme must be subjected to School-level scrutiny and formally released by the School Academic Lead for Quality on behalf of the School Learning Teaching & Assessment Committee before being submitted for consideration for approval by the Programme Approvals Board.
5. Approved module descriptors within a proposed programme structure will be made available to Board members to enable them to form a view on the overall coherence of the learning experience provided by the programme. New modules within the programme structure can be considered during the School scrutiny stage of programme approval, and formally approved during the Programme Approvals Board, though time to consider these must be factored into the schedule for the event. Modules which are already approved, and may be in use within other programmes, will not be subject to individual scrutiny and re-approval by the Programme Approvals Board.
6. The time taken to prepare for and complete the academic approval of taught award or credit-bearing provision is controlled by the proposing subject group and dependent on the programme leader keeping the School Academic Lead for Quality and appropriate school support officers informed fully of progress in the development of a proposal. When planning the development and lead-in time for taught credit-bearing provision, it is important for consideration to be given to the timescales for promoting the provision (including UCAS and prospectus information deadlines) and for ensuring that consideration is given to planning and administrative timeframes, for example deadlines relating to timetable planning for on-campus provision (further information on this is



available in Appendix 1 of [Quality Framework Section 1b: Designing and Developing Taught Award or Credit-bearing Provision](#)).

Academic approval of taught credit-bearing modules

7. The approval process for taught credit-bearing modules is devolved to Schools. The School Learning Teaching & Assessment Committee (LTAC) is a formal governance and decision-making body, a sub-committee of and directly responsible to Learning Teaching & Assessment Committee and has delegated authority for approving taught credit-bearing modules.
8. In accordance with the responsibilities set out in [Quality Framework Section 0a: School-level Responsibilities for Quality and Standards](#), the School Learning Teaching & Assessment Committee is a formal governance and decision-making body with delegated authority for approving taught credit-bearing modules, however Schools may opt to establish a Quality-focused sub-group to oversee this on behalf of the School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee. This group should include as a minimum:
 - a convenor (usually the Head of Learning & Teaching or School Academic Lead for Quality)
 - an academic peer from another School (typically a member of an Academic Board sub-committee, or fellow of the HEA)
 - an academic peer from within the School (but independent of the provision under consideration)
 - a member of the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement (nominated by the Head of Quality & Enhancement)
 - it should also be supported by a Quality Officer from the School Support Service.

This group should bring a breadth of experience and different expertise to the consideration of the modules presented. Limiting scrutiny to too few individuals risks errors, or opportunities for enhancement being missed.

9. The collective group judges, using their academic and professional experience, whether each proposed module as described in a module descriptor, meets the academic standard for the volume and level of credit as defined in the academic regulations, that the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches (incorporating formative assessment opportunities) enable students to achieve the learning outcomes and that the proposed module will provide students with access to a high-quality learning experience.

[Back to Contents](#)



Academic approval of Credit-bearing Short Courses

10. A short course is defined as credit-bearing provision which does not meet the credit-requirements for an award of the University in accordance with Regulation A4 of the Academic Regulations. The outcome of successful completion of a credit-bearing short course is a Certificate of Credit.
11. Short courses developed for commercial purposes, may require liaison with the University Research, Innovation and Enterprise team.
12. While short courses may comprise a single module, there may be additional factors to be considered as part of approval, which are not considered in relation to the approval of a module (such as learner access to a Personal Development Tutor; student support etc.) and it is advised that the Head of Quality & Enhancement is consulted to agree a proportionate approach to approval, on a case-by-case basis.
13. The process for the approval of non-credit bearing short courses can be found in Quality Framework: Section 6

Academic approval of taught credit-bearing programmes: School Scrutiny

14. Prior to documentation being released to the Programme Approvals Board, it should be subject to a School-level scrutiny. This is intended to offer internal peer review to assist the programme team in ensuring that the final documentation to be presented to the Programme Approvals Board is of a high quality standard, and provides the Board with sufficient information to enable the Board to judge and approve the proposal while avoiding the need for conditions being applied. It also provides the opportunity for new modules being proposed as part of the programme to be considered in detail prior to being presented to the Programme Approvals Board for formal approval.
15. As a means of embracing the University's enhancement-led approach to academic quality it is suggested that scrutiny involves engagement with the programme leader and at least one other member of the proposed teaching team to explore the proposal in an open and collegiate manner. Scrutiny will usually occur in the form of a standalone event (though it may be incorporated into School Learning Teaching & Assessment Committee (or sub-committee) business where appropriate). The School Academic Lead for Quality is responsible for ensuring that sufficient peer review has been undertaken, and as a minimum, must include the composition of colleagues identified in paragraph 8 above. The School Academic Lead is responsible for agreeing and working with colleagues from the School Support Service to record the subsequent actions to be taken prior to the documentation being released to the Programme Approvals Board.



16. The outcome of School scrutiny should be to confirm that the quality and standard of the proposed taught award or credit-bearing programme meets academic regulation and Quality Framework expectations prior to being presented to the Programme Approvals Board.
17. To enable a proposal to be finalised after the scrutiny and to give Programme Approvals Board members sufficient time to prepare for the meeting of the Board it is recommended that the scrutiny for approval is scheduled a minimum of 30 working days before the date of the Programme Approvals Board (refer to [Appendix 2, Key dates and activities](#)).

[Back to Contents](#)

Information to be made available for School scrutiny

- a) a programme specification which meets University expectations
- b) a brief and concise academic rationale to support the introduction of the proposed award or credit-bearing programme which clearly describes the following topics, which are not explicitly included in the programme specification:
 - i) the market intelligence report produced by Planning & Business Intelligence to underpin the viability of the proposal, and written confirmation of an approved business case, to contextualise the proposal
 - ii) the ways in which the proposal contributes to meeting University Strategic objectives, the University's Learning & Teaching Strategy and the School strategic or operational plans (programme teams may find it helpful to refer to the list of indicative topics presented in the Programme Approvals Board guide at [Appendix 4](#)).
 - iii) the management and administrative arrangements and resources available to ensure the quality of the learning opportunities as detailed in the programme specification
 - iv) the outcome of the assessment of any potential risk that could affect adversely the University's reputation and standing as a result of delivering the proposal
 - v) the account given to the feedback and comment received from the external academic peer during the design and development phase
- c) electronic access to all module descriptors for each module within the proposed programme structure
- d) the School scrutiny guide, [Appendix 1](#)

[Back to Contents](#)



Points to be considered as part of School scrutiny

The scrutiny process should seek to ensure that the proposal:

- a) adheres to the [University's Academic Regulations](#)
- b) adheres to Quality Framework and other relevant University policies
- c) has clear relevance within the context of the University Strategy, the Learning & Teaching Strategy and School strategic or operational plans, and is professionally and concisely presented

The process should engage the programme team to support them in finalising the proposal and supporting paperwork in advance of submission to the Programme Approvals Board.

Recording the outcome of the school scrutiny process

18. The Quality Officer from the School Support Service will produce a short outcome report on the points explored during the scrutiny for approval by the School Head of Learning & Teaching/School Academic Lead for Quality (as appropriate) which includes:
 - a) the names of staff who participated in the scrutiny of the provision
 - b) the main themes which arose relating to the quality and standard of the proposal
 - c) a clear indication of any amendments required to the information set before it can be signed-off by the School along with clear deadlines so that the proposal can proceed in accordance with University expectations
19. The School Head of Learning & Teaching/School Academic Lead for Quality is responsible for ensuring that the necessary requirements are satisfactorily completed prior to the paperwork being released to the Programme Approvals Board.

The Programme Approvals Board

Meetings of the Programme Approvals Board

20. Schools are responsible for the organisation of Programme Approvals Boards. It is important to consider programme lead-in time when scheduling the approval event (in accordance with guidance set out in [Quality Framework Section 1b: Designing and Developing Taught Award or Credit-bearing Provision](#)). Each Programme Approvals Board is required to have a student member and it is therefore also important that consideration is given to the timing of the event to facilitate their participation, i.e. within term time and taking account of the exam timetable.



21. The Convenor of the Programme Approvals Board, in liaison with the Convenor of Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee, the Convenor of the relevant School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee and the Head of Quality & Enhancement, reserves the right to cancel an approval event should inadequate or incomplete documentation be available 20 working days before the agreed date for the event.
22. A planning template of key dates and activities associated with the approval process for taught award or credit-bearing provision is attached as [Appendix 2](#).

Selecting the Programme Approvals Board

23. The School Academic Lead for Quality, in consultation with the Head of Quality & Enhancement, will appoint, on behalf of Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee, a Programme Approvals Board to consider each proposal and arrange for them to be briefed on their role. An [online course, 'Quality Panel Essentials', intended for all Board members is also available for self-enrolment](#).
24. A standard Programme Approvals Board will consist of:
 - a) a convenor (typically a member of an Academic Board sub-committee, but not from the proposing school, who has completed approvals board training provided by the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement)
 - b) at least one external academic peer, appointed in accordance with guidance set out in [Quality Framework Section 0b: Appointing External Peers](#)
 - c) a student from a different subject area to the programme/s under consideration
 - d) an academic peer from another School (typically a member of an Academic Board sub-committee or a colleague who has achieved fellowship of the HEA – ideally this should also be an individual from a different School to the Convenor)
 - e) a professional service colleague (typically a member of an Academic Board sub-committee or a colleague who has achieved or is seeking fellowship of the HEA, including Associate Fellowship)
 - f) a member of the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement, nominated by the Head of Quality & Enhancement
 - g) a clerk from the sponsoring School Support team.



If a programme team would find it beneficial to have additional members of the Programme Approvals Board, for example representatives from industry or the professional, statutory or regulatory body this should be discussed during the preparation for the event.

In the spirit of transparency and to support opportunities for training and development. Each Programme Approvals Board event will also permit one observer to sit alongside the Approvals Board members – however this observer is not a member of the Approvals Board and is not involved in its decision-making processes. Requests to participate as an observer should be directed to the Head of Quality & Enhancement.

25. Given the purpose of the Programme Approvals Board the event will always be arranged as a synchronous meeting. Comments will be invited from Board members in advance and the clerk will ensure that comments received are shared with all Board members before the event as part of the collective decision-making process. Comments should not be shared with the programme team.

[Back to Contents](#)

The Programme Approvals Board agenda

26. A typical Programme Approvals Board agenda will, as a minimum, include:
 - a) A meeting of the Board to confirm detailed agenda and areas of focus
 - b) a meeting with programme and School representatives as appropriate to clarify any points arising from Board members' initial scrutiny. Programme representatives may wish to deliver a short introductory presentation (5-10 minutes), or a presentation may be recorded to be provided to the Board in advance, however this is not an essential element of the meeting with the programme representatives.
 - c) A physical or virtual tour of specialist learning and teaching facilities relevant to the proposal (where appropriate)
 - d) a meeting of the Board to discuss and agree the outcome of the approval event
 - e) a meeting with programme and School representatives to provide initial feedback on the outcome of the Programme Approvals Board.
27. The agenda for each Programme Approvals Board will be agreed by the Programme Approvals Board convenor in liaison with the DLTE Quality & Standards Manager associated with the School and will be based on the indicative schedule attached at [Appendix 3](#).

[Back to Contents](#)



Information to be made available to the Programme Approvals Board

28. The clerk to the Programme Approvals Board will circulate the following information set to Board members a minimum of 20 working days before the agreed date for the event:
- a) a schedule for the meeting of the Programme Approvals Board
 - b) the names, appointment and home institution of Board members
 - c) the following documents which have been approved for circulation by the School Academic Lead for Quality on behalf of the School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee:
 - i) a programme specification which meets University expectations
 - ii) a brief and concise academic rationale to support the introduction of the proposed award or credit-bearing programme which clearly describes the following topics which are not included in the programme specification
 - the market intelligence report produced by Planning & Business Intelligence to underpin the viability of the proposal, and written confirmation of an approved business case, to contextualise the proposal
 - the ways in which the proposal contributes to meeting University and School strategic objectives and/or operational plans
 - the management and administrative arrangements and resources available to ensure the quality of the learning opportunities
 - the outcome of the assessment of any potential risk that could affect adversely the University's reputation and standing as a result of delivering the proposal
 - the account given to the feedback and comment received from the external subject specialist peer on the appropriateness of the proposal with particular reference to subject area expectations regarding the content, academic challenge and learning, teaching and assessment practices
 - any other areas of interest that the programme team wish to bring to the attention of the Board.
 - d) electronic access to a module descriptor for each module within the proposed taught award or credit-bearing programme structure
 - d) the report of the School scrutiny of the proposal and an indication that any conditions have been met



- e) the programme approval board guide which provides Board members with a list of indicative topics to be considered during the Programme Approvals Board.
29. A minimum of 10 working days before the event, Board members will provide the clerk with a brief written commentary of points they wish to explore with programme team and School representatives during the meeting. This commentary should be informed by the programme approval board guide, which is attached as [Appendix 4](#). These comments should be shared with the convenor.
30. Board members' individual written comments should not be shared with the programme team, but may be shared with other panel members in advance of the review event at the convenor's discretion to inform the detailed agenda.

Scrutiny undertaken by the Programme Approvals Board

31. The Programme Approvals Board will assess, using the collective academic and professional experience and judgement, whether University expectations for the academic standard and quality of the student learning experience for a taught award or credit-bearing programmes are met. The Board will also provide comment and feedback on the overall appropriateness, quality and standard of the proposal.

[Back to Contents](#)

Recording the outcome of the Programme Approvals Board

32. Having scrutinised and discussed the proposal with the programme team the Programme Approvals Board will record a decision as follows:
- a) **Approved without amendment** to the programme specification or supporting documentation.
 - b) **Approved with recommendations** which the programme team will be encouraged to reflect on in implementing the proposal. Unlike conditions, recommendations do not need to be taken into account before the programme is offered to students. However, the annual programme monitoring process described in [Quality Framework Section 2: Internal Monitoring and Review](#) provides an opportunity for the programme team to reflect and comment on the action taken to address approval recommendations.
 - c) **Approved with conditions** which must be addressed and the amended programme specification must be signed-off by the Programme Approvals Board convenor before the proposal can be deemed to be approved. In such cases the Programme Approvals Board will provide the programme



team with precise feedback on the matters to be addressed. In discussion with the programme team the Board will agree a date by which the proposal can be amended to take account of each condition which will enable the convenor to sign-off the proposal as being approved.

- d) **Not approved** In the unlikely event that the Programme Approvals Board does not believe that a proposal can be approved the Board will provide the programme team with precise feedback on the matters to be addressed before the decision can be reconsidered. In such cases the Board convenor will provide the Dean of School, School Academic Lead for Quality and the relevant Head of School Support Service with the reason for this decision being made and precise feedback on the matters to be addressed before the decision can be reconsidered.

33. Students must not be offered a place on a taught award or credit-bearing programme until academic approval has been granted. Prior to approval being granted a taught award or credit-bearing programme may be advertised but must clearly state that it is subject to formal approval.

34. The clerk to the Programme Approvals Board will provide a report utilising the guidance provided by DLTE ([see Section 1 forms](#)). As a minimum the report will include:

- a) the names, appointment and home institution of Board members
- b) a summary of the discussions undertaken during the event
- c) the outcome reached
- d) the period of approval granted by the Board which must not exceed six years
- e) any conditions set by the Board
- f) any recommendations made for consideration by the programme team
- g) areas of good or innovative practice, strengths and achievements or areas for further development identified by Board members, including areas of strength pertaining to the Gold Standard Curriculum Framework¹
- h) a brief reflection by Board members on the design and development of each proposal and the effectiveness of the programme approval process more generally.

¹ During 2021/22 academic session – the responsibility of awarding programmes with Gold Standard Curriculum accolades will remain with the Project Team, but will be informed in part by evidence provided through approval.



35. The draft report will be produced within 10 working days of the event and following approval by the convenor, will be sent to Board members and the programme team for comment on matters of factual accuracy. Following this, and confirmation by the convenor, the final report should be circulated within 20 days of the event to the programme team, the School Academic Lead for Quality, School Head of Learning & Teaching, copied to the convenor, the clerk to the University Quality & Standards Committee and Quality & Standards Manager associated with the School.
36. The School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee will receive the report on the outcome of each school-sponsored Programme Approvals Board with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of the programme design, development and approval process within the school. The reports will also be presented to the University Quality & Standards Committee by the School representative with a view to disseminating relevant information on good or innovative practice, strengths and achievements or areas for further development University-wide. In addition, it is the responsibility of the School to incorporate the new programme into the schedule of Institution-led Review to ensure that it is reviewed no more than six years following approval, and in accordance with [Quality Framework Section 2b: Institution-led Review](#). The updated review schedule must be approved by University Quality & Standards Committee.
37. The report on the outcome of each Programme Approvals Board must be retained by the sponsoring School Support office as a means of informing the report on approval activity University-wide produced annually by the Head of Quality & Enhancement, and as a means of informing future internal or external audit, monitoring or review activities. The report should be retained until the programme is either formally re-approved or withdrawn, whichever is sooner.

[Back to Contents](#)

Amending, withdrawing or closing taught award or credit-bearing provision

38. The process for amending an approved taught award or credit-bearing provision is set out in [Quality Framework Section 0c: Amending approved taught award or credit-bearing provision](#) while [Quality Framework Section 3: The withdrawal of taught award or credit-bearing provision](#) sets out the process to withdraw or close taught award or credit-bearing provision.

Systematic re-approval of a taught module

39. In accordance with Scottish Funding Council requirements, all approved provision must be reviewed and reapproved within a six year cycle. Our process for Institution-led Review is described in [Quality Framework Section 2:](#)



[Internal monitoring and review](#) and provides an opportunity for programme teams to systematically review and re-approve all taught award or credit-bearing provision.

[Back to Contents](#)





Appendix 1: School Scrutiny guide for taught award or credit-bearing programmes

This guide provides staff undertaking School-level scrutiny with a list of potential topics to be considered when assessing, using their academic and professional experience and judgement, the overall appropriateness, quality and standard of a proposal for a new taught award or credit-bearing programme.

-
- 1 **University Academic Regulations.** Does the proposal take account of [University's Academic Regulations](#) with regard to:
 - a) the level and volume of credit to be granted to successful students
 - b) the title of the final award and any exit awards
 - 2 **The Quality Framework.** Does the proposal take account of Quality Framework and other relevant University policies with regard to:
 - a) the proposed admission requirements
 - b) the process for considering and approving recognised prior learning as part of the admission process and subsequently against specific learning outcomes taking account of recognition of prior learning guidance expectations
 - c) the intended learning outcomes required to achieve the volume and level of credit, the final award and any exit awards available to students who do not complete a taught award or credit-bearing programme
 - d) the account given to subject area expectations regarding the content, academic challenge and learning, teaching and assessment practices
 - e) ensuring that the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches enable students to achieve the programme and exit award learning outcomes
 - f) ensuring that the proposed modules which make up the programme provide a coherent and focussed learning journey and demonstrates that consideration has been given to the developing [Gold Standard Curriculum Framework](#)
 - g) a programme assessment matrix which sets out, by stage of study, the volume, nature and timing of assessment and clear indication of the timing of the provision of formative feedback to enable students to understand



the strengths and limitations of their past performance with a view to improving future performance

- h) the overall quality of the proposed student learning experience including academic and pastoral support and students' wider educational needs
- i) the mechanisms to enable students to provide the programme team with systematic feedback on their learning experience
- j) the provision of appropriate learning resources
- k) the quality and accuracy of information relating to the proposal.

3 Alignment to University Strategies and the School strategic or operational plans.

- a) Does the proposal make clear links to the University Strategy and the programme's context within the School's own strategy or operational plans?
- b) Is it clear that there is a robust business case and sufficient resources available within the School and University to enable high quality delivery of the proposed programme and foster an excellent student experience?

4 Communication

- a) Is the proposal well-presented, coherent and concise?
- b) Is the evidence of stakeholder engagement in the programme development clear?

[Back to Points to be considered during School scrutiny](#)

[Back to Contents](#)



Appendix 2: Programme Approvals Board: Key dates and activities

This table has been produced to provide a quick reference point of the key dates and associated activities leading up to a meeting of the Programme Approvals Board.

DATE	ACTIVITY
A minimum of 30 working days before the date of the Programme Approvals Board.	The programme information set is subjected to a process of internal scrutiny normally overseen by the School Academic Lead for Quality.
A minimum of 20 working days before the date of the Programme Approvals Board.	The School Academic Lead for Quality authorises the release of the programme information set by the clerk to the Programme Approvals Board. The clerk to the Programme Approvals Board forwards the programme information set to Board members.
A minimum of 5 working days before the date of the Programme Approvals Board.	Programme Approvals Board members send their comments on the proposal to the clerk, who shares comments with all Board members.
Day 0	Programme Approvals Board meeting.
A maximum of 10 working days after the date of the Programme Approvals Board.	Clerk to the Programme Approvals Board ensures that the report is completed, approved by the convenor and then sent to Board members and the programme team for comment on matters of factual accuracy.
A maximum of 15 working days after the date of the Programme Approvals Board.	Clerk to the Programme Approvals Board ensures that a final report is agreed by all Board members.
A maximum of 20 working days after the date of the Programme Approvals Board.	Clerk to the Programme Approvals Board circulates the final Programme Approvals Board report to the programme team, School Academic Lead for Quality, the Head of Learning & Teaching, copied to the convenor, the clerk to University Quality & Standards Committee and the Quality & Standards Manager associated with the School.

[Back to Meetings of the Programme Approvals Board](#)

[Back to Contents](#)



Appendix 3: Indicative Programme Approvals Board agenda

0900	The Board convenes.
0900-1030	The Board meets to confirm the topics to be covered during the meeting with programme team and School representatives.
1030-1200	The Board meets with programme team and School representatives to discuss matters arising from their reading of the proposal. Specific topics to be discussed will be shared with the school as early as is practicable before the meeting (5-10 minutes can be allocated to a short introductory presentation by programme representatives if requested)
1200-1245	The Board meets to reflect on the outcome of the meeting with programme team and School representatives. This will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• recording a decision with regard to the proposal• agreeing any conditions or recommendations• identifying achievements, strengths and areas of innovative or good practice to be included in the Board's report.
1245-1300	The Board meets with programme team and School representatives to provide initial feedback on the outcome of the Programme Approvals Board.

Please note, this agenda is indicative and will require adaptation if additional business is being considered as part of the approval event (for example, multiple programmes or new module proposals).

[Back to Programme Approvals Board agenda](#)

[Back to Contents](#)



Appendix 4: The Programme Approvals Board Guide

This guide is intended to provide Programme Approvals Board members with a list of potential topics to be considered when assessing, using their academic and professional experience and judgement, the overall appropriateness, quality and standard of a proposal for a new taught award or credit-bearing programme. It also provides Board members with indicative headings for setting out the points they wish to discuss with the programme team and School representatives during their meeting. Board members' comments may be shared with other Approvals Board members before the meeting takes place, but will not be shared with the School or programme team.

Please note, the prompts are intended to support Board members as they read through the documentation, and Board members should not feel obliged to comment on all of the topics, nor should members feel restricted in limiting comments to the themes listed below. Experience and expertise will determine the themes Board members would wish to explore further with the programme team.

Panel members may find it helpful to enrol on the University Moodle Course which has been developed to support panel members:

<https://moodlecommunity.napier.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=265#section-1>

As external panel members may be unable to access the Moodle course, we have produced supplementary guidance specifically for external panel members and this is available to access from the [Quality Framework's related resources page](#)

The Quality & Standards team will continue to review and update this guide to ensure that it best supports the delivery of the University Strategy and feedback is welcome from colleagues via quality@napier.ac.uk

1. General comments and feedback on the proposal

- a) first overall impression of the proposal, for example, anything that you think is missing or anything that has pleased, surprised or disappointed you
- b) any perceived areas of good or innovative practice, strengths and achievements
- c) any areas where you consider further development or improvement would be of benefit
- d) any additional information that you would wish to have made available either before the Board meeting or on arrival at the meeting.

2. Specific Themes for Consideration:

a) Contributing to the implementation of [University Strategy](#)

- i. How effective is the proposal in providing a clear focus on the programme with local ownership and a holistic view of the student journey from enquiry to completion?
- ii. How effective is the proposal in indicating how the programme will contribute towards addressing the following specific key strategic deliverables aligned to the Gold Standard Curriculum, for example:
 - How has the programme team articulated that curriculum design has been student-focussed?
 - How is citizenship and community integrated into the programme?
 - How has digital and information literacy been integrated into the programme?
 - How is inclusion integrated into the programme?
 - How is research/practice integrated into the programme?
 - How is sustainability integrated into the programme?
 - How is global outlook demonstrated within the programme?
 - How is employability integrated into the programme?
- **Academic standards** (information for commenting on this section will primarily be drawn from the programme specification)
 - i) How effective is the proposal in taking appropriate account of external reference points in setting the academic standard of the proposed provision?
 - [The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies](#)
 - relevant qualification and/or subject [benchmark statements](#)
 - professional, statutory or regulatory body requirements where appropriate.
 - ii) Comment on the appropriateness of the intended learning outcomes required to achieve the final award and any exit awards available to students who do not complete the programme.
 - iii) Comment on the extent to which the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches enable students to achieve the programme and exit award learning outcomes.



- iv) Comment on the extent to which graduate attributes internationalisation, research and enterprise are embedded within the programme.
- v) Comment on the extent of the mechanism and responsibilities in place for:
 - the management of academic standards
 - the assessment, moderation and external examining of the proposed provision
 - monitoring and reviewing the proposed provision and reporting on the outcome of such activity.

b) Quality of learning opportunities

- i) Comment on the overall quality and coherence of the proposed student learning experience including academic and pastoral support and students' wider educational needs.
- ii) Comment on the mechanisms to enable students to provide the programme team with systematic feedback on their learning experience.
- iii) Comment on the extent of the mechanism and responsibilities in place for:
 - the management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities
 - assuring that the quality of teaching and learning is being maintained and enhanced
 - assuring that students are supported effectively
 - providing staff with access to personal development to facilitate the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities
 - ensuring that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes.
- iv) Comment on the mechanisms to ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes.
- v) How effective is the proposal in supporting the strategic objective of providing students with a personalised learning experience through individual support?

c) Published information



- i) Comment on the appropriateness of the mechanism and responsibilities for communicating information on the proposed provision to potential students and other stakeholders.
- ii) Comment on the appropriateness of the mechanism and responsibilities for assuring the accuracy and completeness of published information that is managed by the school.

[Back to Information to be made available to the Programme Approvals Board](#)

