



Queen Margaret University
EDINBURGH

Validation and Review Guidance for Programme Teams

Last updated: 6 December 2017

Contents

Introduction	1
Roles and responsibilities	3
Programme Team	3
Deans of School and Heads of Division	4
Panels	5
Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement	6
Centre for Academic Practice	8
Professional and Regulatory Bodies	10
Preparation and planning	11
Approval of new programmes	11
Validation document	15
New collaborative programmes	19
Review	21
Arrangements	23
Panel membership	23
Submission of documents	25
Checklist	26
On the day	27
After the event	31
Further information and contacts	33
Appendix – sample event agenda	35

Useful Contacts

Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement
Centre for Academic Practice

dmartin1@gmu.ac.uk
vbamber@gmu.ac.uk

Introduction

This booklet has been produced as an aid to programme teams preparing for validation or review at Queen Margaret University. It includes information and guidance on the aims of validation and review, roles and responsibilities, procedures and regulations. It complements and should be read in conjunction with relevant sections of the University's Governance and Regulations published on the QMU website at <https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/committees-regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulations-policies-and-procedures/>. Links to internal and external reference points are provided where appropriate, including links to the Quality website, which is the definitive and up-to-date source of information on University regulations and procedures.

We hope you will find this booklet useful and would welcome any comments or suggestions for improvement. If you would like to provide feedback, please refer to the 'Further information and contacts' section (page 33).

Key Point

Staff of the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement (GQE) and Centre for Academic Practice (CAP) work closely together to support programme teams preparing for validation and review events and to continually enhance the quality of the process at QMU. All staff participating in validation and review should contact staff from GQE and CAP at an early stage of their preparation. Information about the relationship between GQE and CAP and their respective roles is provided on pages 6-9.

Background

The University is responsible to students, the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), Funding Councils, employers and the wider community for the quality, standard and relevance of programmes delivered in its name. To fulfil these responsibilities all programmes leading to an award of the University are subject to validation, periodic review and annual monitoring¹.

Aim of validation

The overall aim of the validation process is to establish that the standards and quality of the programme under consideration are consistent with nationally accepted benchmarks and that the programme fulfils the University's mission:

To enhance the well-being of individuals and the communities we serve through socially and economically relevant education and research. This mission is enhanced by our strong commitment to economic, social and environmental sustainability.

This is achieved through peer group scrutiny and discussion which is intended to:

¹ It is not within the scope of this booklet to provide guidance on the Annual Monitoring process. For further information please refer to the Governance and Regulations, Programme Development, Modification, Monitoring and Review, paragraph seven)

- Challenge and stimulate the programme team by questioning aspects of the proposed programme;
- Ensure that the curriculum is properly aligned with external points of reference including the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework², Quality Assurance Agency's Quality Code for Higher Education and Subject Benchmarks³,
- Identify examples of best practice for commendation and dissemination (this is achieved through circulation of the validation or review report, discussion and follow-up action taken by academic committees);
- Encourage staff in the development of new areas of the curriculum, new teaching methods and in areas of scholarly activity that will help improve the programme;
- Inform and advise staff of good practice elsewhere and of new developments in the curriculum and teaching methods.

Based on the outcome of the above a decision is made on whether the programme can be recommended for approval.

Aim of review

A programme is reviewed after it has been in operation for a period of up to five years (specified at the time of the previous validation or review event). During this time one or more cohorts is likely to have passed through the programme. This means that staff, students and employers will have had experience of its operation. The aim of a programme review is to re-evaluate through peer group scrutiny and discussion the health and viability of the programme, the validity of aims and learning outcomes and to ascertain:

- How the programme has been operated and managed during the most recent period of validation;
- How standards have been attained and how this has been recognised;
- The ways in which the programme has met the needs of the community;
- The extent to which all the previously expressed aspirations and ambitions have been fulfilled;
- The extent to which the institution has been able to provide an environment in which the programme can flourish.

Based on the outcome of the above a decision is made on whether the programme can continue to be approved.

² <http://scqf.org.uk/the-framework/>

³ <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code>

Roles and Responsibilities

The programme team

The role of the programme team is to plan the programme and present it at validation or review event to a group of panellists whose responsibilities are described on page 5 below.

A team approach to validation and review is crucial for a number of reasons:

- To provide an efficient, effective and creative means of completing all tasks;
- To ensure the views of all stakeholders are considered;
- To enhance quality since everyone serves as critical reviewer.

Typically, the team should be composed of:

Programme leader(s)

Normally programmes have only one programme leader. Exceptionally, as with inter-disciplinary programmes, there may be more than one. However, where there is more than one programme leader it is strongly advised that individual roles and responsibilities for developing and managing the programme be agreed and respected from the outset.

All (potential) module co-ordinators

- New programme teams should include individuals who are most likely to be named as module co-ordinators. The team may need to recruit individuals as curriculum development dictates.
- Review teams should include module co-ordinators, who can contribute detailed critical analysis of the programme and suggestions for revision.

Where a number of programmes are being put forward for validation together (for instance in the case of School wide validations) it may be appropriate to divide some aspects of planning between sub-groups.

Additional input should be sought for the process of planning from:

Students

Students should be included on the programme planning team since they offer a different perspective of the programme from that of staff. Where it is not practical to include students, for example in the development of entirely new programmes, one option might be to recruit students from related programmes at QMU. Where possible, review teams should include both current and former students.

Recent graduates

If possible, it may be useful to include one or more recent graduates. Graduates are particularly well placed to comment on the way in which the programme has prepared them for employment and can provide useful insights that current students may not be able to offer.

Employers of graduates or employers within the field

These representatives will bring knowledge of current and future needs of the industry, employability skills of graduates, professional standards and current developments within the profession/industry. Their insight and perspective is crucial to ensure the

programme will not only have currency, but will be future-proofed for the term of validation.

Placement supervisors and/or practitioners

Practitioners may contribute professional knowledge and expertise, but will also bring to the discussion their experience of current practice. Placement supervisors will help consider the needs of the profession and issues associated with placements, such as numbers of places, timetabling, student support and staff development.

Members of QMU advisory boards within the subject

Some subject areas have professional advisory boards whose role is to contribute to the curriculum portfolio. A member of the board might join the programme team or contribute in other ways, such as critiquing a draft document.

Members of professional bodies

Representatives from professional bodies may play an advisory role in curriculum development. It is the responsibility of the programme team to check with the professional body whether this is an expectation in planning for validation or review.

Service users

Teams are encouraged to involve service users (clients or customers who might access a service provided by graduates from the programme). Service users can comment on the likely benefits of the programme for the wider community.

School representatives

For inter-disciplinary programmes there should be representatives from the contributing School, which might include module co-ordinators or proposed teaching staff.

Library representation

Involvement of a library representative at an early stage can be useful. Staff from the Library can advise on resource issues that might affect the delivery of the programme and student experience. This is particularly important given the emphasis in higher education on student-centred learning.

Roles and Responsibilities

Deans of School and Heads of Division

The programme team is responsible for curriculum development, the preparation of documentation, liaison with GQE and CAP and submission of a response to conditions and recommendations.

Deans of School are responsible for the strategic direction of the School. All programmes going forward for validation must be included in the School and School strategic plans.

The Head of Division is responsible for ensuring that a programme planning team is established and that appropriate staff are assigned to take forward the work of preparation for review or validation. Heads of Division may be involved in the detailed planning process, development and/or delivery of the programme under consideration. However this is not a requirement.

Heads of Division are also asked to approve validation and review panels. This is to ensure that there is no conflict of interest.

It is an expectation that the secretaries to the School Academic Boards will maintain a record of programmes due for review in their respective Schools.

Roles and Responsibilities

The validation panel

The role of the validation panel is to evaluate the rationale and coherence of the programme and to make a recommendation on its approval through the Learning and Teaching Panel to the Student Experience Committee, which approves programmes on behalf of Senate.

The panel will consider separately and collectively the following areas of the programme:

- Admission requirements;
- Learning outcomes;
- Curriculum;
- Content;
- Teaching/learning activities;
- Assessment methods and regulations;
- Quality assurance and enhancement;
- Programme management;
- Student support arrangements.

The panel may also comment on:

- The accessibility of the award for all students including those from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds and disabled students;
- Adherence to QMU or professional body policies and regulations;
- Articulation with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework;
- Adherence to Benchmark Statements and other external reference points;
- Employer and student demand;
- Staff and resources including quality and experience of academic staff.

Resource requirements for new programmes are identified and agreed by the Portfolio Development Group as described on pages 11-12. It is essential that estimated resource requirements are approved well in advance of the validation by the Dean of School and relevant heads of service departments. The Portfolio Development Group will also have considered evidence of demand and the business case for the programme.

The panel is expected to adopt a peer group approach to provide a constructive and collegiate setting, while at the same time conducting a sufficiently rigorous evaluation of the merits of the programme.

The review panel

The role of the review panel is similar to that of the validation panel (see above). Additionally the review panel will carry out a critical appraisal of the standing, progress and future of the programme by evaluating:

- The academic health and standard of the programme;
- Progress and changes in the programme since its validation or last review;
- The continuing need for the programme, including the scale of student intake, and its effectiveness and efficiency in staff and resource terms;
- The academic validity of proposed changes in the programme, and an assessment of the associated resource requirements.

Information about panel membership and selection is provided on page 23.

Roles and responsibilities

The Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement (GQE)

KEY POINT

Programme teams are encouraged to contact staff in the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement at an early stage in their preparation for validation or review. Normally an initial meeting between the event secretary, who will be based in the GQE, and programme leader should take place no later than six months prior to the event. Contact details for GQE are provided on page 33.

Staff in the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement are responsible for aspects of the validation and review process as stated below:

Validation and review schedule

Development and approval of the validation and review schedule each year in consultation with Deans of School, Heads of Division and programme leaders. It is expected that validation and review dates will be agreed at least eight months in advance of the event to allow for curriculum development and (where applicable) review of the operation of the programme during the most recent period of validation.

Advice and information

Liaison with programme leaders, panellists and professional bodies as required to advise on all aspects of the process including:

- Timescale
 - Procedures
 - Roles and responsibilities
 - The format of the validation or review event
 - Documentary requirements
- Please note that staff from GQE generally **cannot** advise on the following: curriculum design and development, completion of Programme Specifications and module descriptors. Such queries should be directed to CAP.
- Internal and external reference points including QMU regulations, undergraduate and postgraduate attributes and the QAA Quality Code for Higher Education and SCQF. Please note that staff from GQE generally **cannot** advise on the interpretation of the SCQF and that such queries should be directed to CAP.

Panellists

The nomination of internal panel members (please refer to page 23 for further information)

Arrangements

All arrangements for the validation or review event, including room bookings, hospitality, accommodation and transport for external panel members (please refer to page 23 for further information)

Secretariat support

The provision of professional secretariat support to the panel

This includes: preparation and circulation of the agenda, the consolidated checklist (as described on page 26) and other supporting documentation prior to the event; participation in the event to advise on due process and QMU policies and procedures; preparation and circulation of the validation or review report following the event

Response to conditions

Circulation and tracking of programme teams' response to conditions, in line with the timescale advised in the validation or review report.

Collaborative agreements

The development of written agreements (Memoranda of Agreement) between QMU and collaborative partner organisations.

A formal agreement is required and **must be signed** before the commencement of each collaborative programme.

Further information is available on the Quality website at <https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/partnerships/qmu-collaborations-manual/>

Roles and responsibilities

The Centre for Academic Practice (CAP)

KEY POINT

It is recommended that all programme teams consult CAP in preparing documentation for validation and review. This dialogue should occur as early in the curriculum planning process as possible. Contact details for CAP are provided on page 33.

The Centre for Academic Practice can provide advice and support in the following areas:

Curriculum design and development

This includes theoretical principles of constructive alignment, approaches to learning, teaching and assessment and practical advice about steps/stages in the curriculum design process.

Philosophical perspective

Each programme should be underpinned by a philosophy, consensually agreed by the programme team.

Aims and learning outcomes

These are the most important elements to 'get right' at programme, year and module level because they set learning goals for both students and staff and underpin all other aspects of the programme.

Programme structure

CAP can facilitate discussions about the 'shape' of the programme, such as award(s), routes, longitudinal and horizontal coherence, nature of the modules (size, core, electives), etc.

Articulation with external reference points

CAP staff can assist with the interpretation and response to external reference points, such as the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF), Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), government policy such as widening access, funding council priorities, benchmarks and codes of practice.

Articulation with internal reference points

CAP staff can also help with interpretation and response to internal reference points including overall QMU strategic plans and in particular the Student Experience Strategy for the period 2015-20.

Programme delivery

Major considerations include capacity for face-to-face, blended or distance delivery, incorporation of the virtual learning environment, use of e-portfolios, support for stand-alone software, support for innovation. The 'shape' and delivery of the programme will also impact on access to Library and IT materials, including research resources. Such queries should be directed to staff from the Library and Information Services, not to CAP.

Assessment

CAP can advise on alignment of assessment with learning outcomes, assessment design, innovative modes of assessment, assessment criteria, quality assurance of assessment and staff development.

Module descriptors

CAP staff are happy to assist with writing module descriptors. Instructions and module descriptor templates are provided on the QMU quality website (<https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/forms-and-guidance/forms-for-programme-design/>).

Programme specifications

Universities are required to publish Programme Specifications on their websites. Instructions and templates are provided on the QMU quality website (<https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/forms-and-guidance/forms-for-programme-design/>).
Programmes specifications for awards of the University are available on the Quality website (<https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/programme-specifications/>)

Accessibility

CAP can facilitate discussions about the accessibility of your curriculum, including advice on Teachability (www.teachability.strath.ac.uk/) and accessibility of any online resources. You may also wish to consider QMU's Inclusive Learning and Teaching policy (available from <https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/quality-a-z-index/>)

Roles and responsibilities

Professional and regulatory bodies

The role of individual professional and regulatory bodies in the validation and review process varies and should be determined at an early stage in the planning process. It is the responsibility of the programme leader to notify staff in GQE of the involvement of professional organisations and to provide contact details for representatives with responsibility for liaison with education providers.

Staff in GQE are responsible for formal liaison with professional and regulatory bodies regarding arrangements and procedures and for communicating these to the programme team. Programme teams are expected to familiarise themselves at an early stage in the process with the procedural and documentary requirements of professional bodies.

Preparation and planning

Validation of new programmes

KEY POINT

Planning of new programmes should begin at least 12 months in advance of validation. It is important this is done in good time to allow for approval, consultation, and preparation, including a considerable amount of document preparation.

The validation event normally takes place **no later than four months** prior to the commencement of the programme. This is the minimum time required to address any conditions attached to approval that have to be met before the programme is delivered and to allow for inclusion in the prospectus and other publicity material (clearly advertised as 'subject to validation').

The documentation for the event needs to be submitted to the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement **no later than four weeks** before the event.

The steps to planning are given below, some of which would occur in parallel:

- Initial proposal and preliminary market research / fact finding.
- Discussion with the Dean of School and inclusion of the proposed new programme in the School Operational Plan for the academic session in which the programme will operate.
- Stage 1 Programme Approval form submitted to the Portfolio Development Group (PDG). The PDG is asked to approve the new development in principle, allowing a more detailed examination of the proposal to follow. At this stage the PDG is merely looking to confirm that there is an identified need for the programme, that the University has the capacity to support it and that it does not conflict with the University strategy or the School Operational Plan.
- Identification of programme leader (and Academic Link Person, for collaborative programmes). More detailed work on proposed shape of programme and methods of delivery, which allows a full costing to be completed. Early consultation with support services such as the School Office, CAP, Information Services, Library and technicians regarding likely resource needs. Estates and Facilities should be contacted regarding any specialist teaching space or equipment that might be required.
- Normally the Dean or Head of Division will liaise with staff in Finance to undertake the costing, but this may be delegated to the Programme Leader. Advice is available from the Head of Finance. For collaborative programmes, the Partnership Development Manager will take forward the costing, in consultation with the Head of Division and/or Academic Link Person.
- Research conducted on the market for the programme in order to provide evidence of demand. The Programme Leader should assess the likely demand for the proposed programmes by means such as:

- a. seeking opinion from QMU sources including:
 - colleagues across the University
 - present students
 - Development Office
 - Marketing & Communications Office
 - Recruitment & Admissions Office

- b. seeking opinion from external sources including:
 - alumni
 - prospective students attending open days, campus visits, recruitment fairs etc
 - occupational and professional bodies
 - accrediting bodies
 - statutory and regulatory bodies
 - prospective employers

- c. investigating and considering:
 - existing and planned provision (including tuition fees charged) of similar programmes in HEIs in Scotland, the rest of the UK and international competitor institutions
 - admissions queries from potential students
 - national/local labour market information
 - growth areas in the economy
 - identified shortfalls in certain areas of expertise

Note that it is essential for all programmes that staff in Marketing and Communications and Admissions are informed of the proposed development. This will allow them to make any changes to the prospectus and web listing.

- For collaborative programmes, a site visit and risk assessment will be required. (See Collaborations Manual for details - <https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/partnerships/qmu-collaborations-manual/>)
- Stage 2 Programme Approval form submitted to the Portfolio Development Group, along with costing, evidence of demand and any other relevant information. This is the crucial stage at which senior managers will decide whether the proposed programme is viable from a strategic, academic and business point of view. Stage 2 Approval means that the University agrees to commit the resources required to deliver the programme subject to minimum student numbers.
- After Stage 3 approval the programme may be advertised as 'subject to validation'. Note that care needs to be taken about the level of detail included at this stage as all published information on University programmes must comply with the guidance issued by the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA).
- Provisional date for validation event agreed with GQE.
- Identification of programme planning team and invitation to join (see page 3 for details of planning team membership).

- Schedule for programme development, set out as a project plan with timescales and deadlines. Tasks allocated to different members of the team. Regular, minuted meetings.
- Consultation with all stakeholders, e.g. employers, professional bodies and external examiners.
- Stage 3 Programme Approval form submitted to School Academic Board for discussion. The School Academic Board will be responsible for debating and developing the detail of the academic rationale. This will include consideration of the following:
 - Educational philosophy and aims;
 - Appropriateness of the proposed SCQF level;
 - Outline content;
 - Structure, exit points, delivery pattern, core and elective modules;
 - Balance of new and existing modules;
 - Opportunities for linkages and efficiencies through collaboration with existing School provision.

The School Academic Board will provide feedback to the team that will help to shape the final validation document submitted to the panel. While the SAB does not have authority to veto the development of a new programme, it may raise concerns if it is believed that a programme's design is flawed or the team is not ready to proceed to validation. In such cases, the concerns will be passed to the Dean of the host School and a decision taken whether to postpone the validation.

- GQE confirms that all stages of Programme Approval have been completed and that validation may proceed.
- Identification of external panel members. The programme team is responsible for contacting the proposed external panellists initially to determine availability and willingness and then notifying GQE (see page 23 for further details). GQE will identify internal panellists.
- Document preparation.
- Final documents submitted to GQE four weeks prior to the date of validation. Documents should be submitted electronically.
- Identify and invite students, senior managers and clinical educators as required. Ensure all participants are aware of the time and venue for their part of the agenda.
- Circulate documents to programme team and arrange team meeting to prepare for event. Normally, feedback from the panel will be supplied shortly in advance of the event to given an indication of the likely areas for discussion.

Suggested timescales for the above steps are set out in Diagram 1 overleaf.

Diagram 1 - process for validating a new programme (with recommended timescale)

- 18 months	Programme Leader (PL)/Academic Link Person (ALP) conducts exploratory discussions and market research
- 16 months	Approval in principle by Dean of School, confirmation of institutional fit and inclusion in School Operational Plans. Proposal reported to GQE.
- 14 months	PL/ALP completes Stage 1 Programme Approval Form. Stage 1 Programme Approval Form submitted to Portfolio Development Group for outline approval which enables detailed planning to commence.
- 13 months	Outline programme development. Costing completed. Detailed market research conducted. For collaborative programmes, site visit and risk assessment completed.
- 12 months	PL/ALP completes Stage 2 Programme Approval Form. Stage 2 Programme Approval Form submitted to Portfolio Development Group for approval to proceed to validation.
- 11 months	GQE sets provisional date for validation. PL/ALP completes Stage 3 Programme Approval Form. Stage 3 Programme Approval Form submitted to School Academic Board
- 10 months	GQE confirms validation arrangements following Stage 3 approval. Programme advertised as 'subject to validation'.
- 5 months	Development of validation documentation. Panel established. Documents submitted to GQE 4 weeks prior to event.
- 4 months	Validation event
- 2 months	Recommendations from Panel reported to the Learning and Teaching Panel of the Student Experience Committee, which approves programme on behalf of Senate.
0	Programme starts

Required documentation for validation (to be provided in advance)

The documentation listed below is needed for **every validation** and must be submitted to the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement **no later than four weeks** before the event.

- Validation Document, including all module descriptors;
- Programme Specification;
- Student Handbook;
- Placement Handbook (if appropriate);
- Staff CVs (these are required for members of the teaching team only, and not for other members of the planning committee e.g. employers, student representatives, service users).

Other documentation for validation (to be provided in advance or tabled)

Other documents required depend on the nature and level of the Programme to be validated and in some cases on professional and regulatory body involvement. The documentation listed below, if needed, can either be provided in advance of the event or tabled on the day of the validation. If final versions are not available handbooks may be provided in draft format. Staff in the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement can advise on requirements and deadline for submission.

- Supervisors'/Mentors' Handbook
- Other documents required by professional bodies, for example:
Mapping against Standards of Education and Training (SETS) (HCPC requirement)
Mapping against Standards of Proficiency (SOPS) (HCPC requirement)

It may be useful to provide a copy of the dissertation handbook (if available) at the event.

Validation document

The principal requirements of the validation document are summarised below.

Programme name, rationale, demand and design

- Programme title and SCQF level of award;
- Subsidiary exit points;
- Date programme is due to start;
- Nature and purpose of the programme;
- Intended student numbers;
- Any relationship or overlap with existing programmes delivered by QMU;
- The relationship of the programme with comparable awards delivered by other higher education institutions in the UK;
- A statement on how the programme compares with similar provision in other countries;
- The place of the programme within the University's strategic plan;
- Any professional or statutory body recognition;
- The use of external reference points including QAA Subject Benchmark Statements and professional body standards

- The use of internal reference points including the University's Student Experience Strategy for the period 2015-20 and Graduate Attributes
- Consultation on programme design: External Examiners, students, potential employers, professional associations.
- A list of members of the programme planning team

Consultation and Research

Evidence (in a summarised form) of the consultation engaged in the development of a new programme or in making major changes to an existing programme should be provided. This should include details of who was consulted, by what means, the information those consulted received on which to base an opinion (normally the draft programme proposal or a summary) and a summary of their opinions. It is important to remember to discuss both student and employer demand.

Consultation should take place with the following groups:

- Professional and statutory bodies as appropriate;
- Current External Examiners on related programmes or other assessors;
- Students currently on the programme (reviews only) or related programmes;
- Recent graduates from the programme (reviews only) or related programmes;
- Potential employers;
- Others, as appropriate.

The document should also include information on the programme's target market. Discuss any plans to increase recruitment from previously under-represented groups, e.g. disabled students, direct entrants from FE, or students from previously under-represented genders or cultural backgrounds.

Programme Characteristics

The validation document sets out the essential characteristics of the programme in a narrative format. This section of the document is also covered by the Programme Specification, which is produced separately and submitted with the documentation. Where appropriate, the validation document will cross-refer to the Programme Specification.

- Mode of study and programme length;
- Educational intentions (programme aims);
- Learning outcomes in terms of the attainment of knowledge, understanding, skills, experience and, where appropriate, professional development;
- Learning and teaching strategies, explaining the rationale for the choice of learning and teaching methods to be used;
- Provision for supervised work experience or placement if applicable;
- The curriculum and its component parts (including relationship to educational intentions and learning objectives);
- The distinction between core and optional elements and a statement of any prerequisites;
- Sequence of progression between programmes/levels.

Methods of Assessment

- Methods of assessment with relevant weightings, and appropriateness to the learning outcomes and the level of the programme;
- Arrangements for formative assessment;

- Policy on exemptions (where appropriate);
- Board of Examiners' arrangements including the involvement of External Examiners in the assessment process.

The validation document may also include a draft assessment schedule with approximate submission dates for individual assessment components.

Student Support

In this section you should discuss:

- Support for study skills;
- Arrangements for personal development planning (this may be via any method, but it is expected that all programmes will include some element of PDP);
- Support for students from the full range of diverse backgrounds;
- Personal Academic Tutors;
- Opportunities for student involvement in quality processes e.g. through the Student-Staff Consultative Committee or other regular meetings with tutors;
- Strategies for development of an inclusive learning community;
- Careers advice.

Students on programmes delivered at QMU will have access to on-site Student Services. Programmes delivered by collaborative partners should clarify how they will provide an equivalent level of support.

Arrangements for admission, progress and transfer

- Entrance requirements;
- Recognition of prior learning/experiential learning, where appropriate;
- Arrangements for admission with advanced standing;
- Scope for students to transfer into the programme;
- Scope for students to transfer to other programmes;
- Progress requirements and criteria for success;
- Transitional arrangements for students affected by changes to the programme (reviews only);
- A statement on accessibility of the programme for students from all backgrounds, including disabled and international students. If there are professional or regulatory body restrictions/requirements for admission make this clear.

State any special admissions procedures that are used, such as auditions or interviews. Clarify safeguards in place to ensure equitable treatment of all applicants regardless of gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion, nationality, culture and sexual orientation.

Resource requirements

- Teaching and support staff;
- Teaching and learning accommodation and equipment;
- Learning resources;
- Central resources and services, including Library, IT, and educational technology resources (these should be identified and agreed in advance of the event as part of Stage 2 Programme Approval as described on page 11);

- Others (please specify).

Normally, it will not be necessary for the panel to discuss resource issues in depth, as resource requirements will have been discussed and agreed through the Programme Approval process. However, if the panel does have questions it may be appropriate to raise these at the event. GQE staff can provide guidance, as required.

Management of the Programme

Management arrangements including the constitution and terms of reference of the Programme Committee, Student-Staff Consultative Committee, the role of the programme leader, module co-ordinators and Personal Academic Tutor. Normally these will be consistent with QMU regulations. In this case it is appropriate to cross refer to relevant sections of the Quality website.

Quality Assurance Procedures

Quality assurance arrangements for the management, operation and monitoring of the programme, including student feedback arrangements, evaluation mechanisms, provision for student representation and student support. The documentation should identify any areas where the programme deviates from the standard University quality assurance procedures, citing the reasons, such as professional and statutory body requirements. This section should also be used to highlight any innovative approaches to quality assurance either planned or in operation.

Regulations

Draft regulations should be submitted with the documentation where necessary. In most areas the programme team will use the University regulations. It will be sufficient to state that the programme conforms with QMU regulations where this is the case. Validation and review panels will evaluate the validity of any specific regulations for the programme(s) in question. It is recommended that programme teams wishing to introduce programme specific regulations consult the Assistant Secretary, Registry and Academic Administration, before submitting the validation document to the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement.

Module Descriptors

Electronic copies of the module descriptor forms and instructions for completion are available on the Quality website (<https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/forms-and-guidance/forms-for-programme-design/>). It is important to ensure that they are completed in full and in a standardised format.

Particular attention should be paid to ensure the following:

- Module descriptors are complete (including the SCQF level and SCOTCAT credit value) and standardised;
- Texts cited in module descriptors are reviewed and updated;
- Pre- and co-requisites have been included;
- Notional hours of student effort have been included.

Programme teams are strongly encouraged to seek advice from the Centre for Academic Practice on the completion of module descriptors.

Preparation and planning

Validation of new collaborative programmes

Collaborative validation procedures follow those outlined on pages 11 to 13 above with the following exceptions:

Site visit report and risk assessment

If the proposed programme is with a new partner, a senior member of staff must visit to view the facilities. The Portfolio Development Group will decide on who should visit the partner and at what stage, taking into account the individual circumstances of the partnership negotiations. A site visit report will be written and filed by GQE.

The Academic Link Person must then meet with a member of staff from GQE to complete a Risk Assessment (selection of new partners) form. This will take into account evidence from the site visit report and any other evidence available, such as reports from the British Council, documents supplied by the partner or statements of support from other universities already working with the partner. The Partnership Development Manager will be able to advise on the type of evidence required to complete the risk assessment.

Note that for new programmes with existing partners a risk assessment is still required but normally a site visit will not be necessary prior to validation.

Timescale

The validation event normally takes place a minimum of five months prior to the commencement of the programme. This is longer than the minimum necessary for a standard programme but is necessary to allow time for the formal collaborative agreement to be signed off. Further information about different types of collaborative agreement is available from the GQE and on the Partnerships website at <https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/partnerships/>.

Validation location

The event is normally held at the partner institution. This allows for evaluation of the partner organisation's resources (including Library, IT and educational technology resources), facilities, staff, traditions, ethos, and academic and non-academic capability. The validation report is supplemented by the completion of a checklist intended to allow validation panellists to comment on issues such as learning resources and the physical learning environment.

For new programmes with existing partners it may not be necessary to hold the validation at the partner institution unless particular specialist facilities are required to support delivery.

The documentation for collaborative validation and review events is as described on page 15 above. The following additional information is required:

- A written statement from the prospective partner providing evidence of equivalence of procedures and processes (This is only necessary where there is deviation from QMU policy)
- Evidence (in a summarised form) of the consultation carried out in the development of the new programme, including the outcome of any 'fact finding' visits. Details of who was consulted, by what means and the information those

consulted received on which to base their opinions must also be included. A statement on the relationship between QMU and the partner institution and proposed arrangements for quality assurance, including arrangements for moderating student work, and communication between the partners

- A statement on the language of instruction and assessment: if this is not English, the documentation must include details of mechanisms to assure the standard and quality of student work

Further information about the operation of collaborative programmes is available in the Operational Manual for Collaborations, which is published on the Partnerships website. <https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/partnerships/qmu-collaborations-manual/>

Preparation and planning

Review of existing programmes (including collaborative programmes)

All currently validated programmes require to be reviewed and re-validated before the expiry of the validation period (normally five years). It is the responsibility of the programme team and GQE to know when a programme is due for review. However, School Managers should also have a record of validation periods for all programmes in the School. Programme teams may bring forward reviews for good reason, e.g. changes to external reference points, changes to professional body requirements, work-load planning.

KEY POINT

The planning for programme review should begin 12 months prior to the review event. The review event normally takes place **no later than four months** prior to the commencement of the programme. This is the minimum time required to address any conditions attached to approval.

The documentation for the event must be submitted to the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement **no later than four weeks** before the event.

Postponement of reviews is not normally allowed unless there is a robust, justifiable reason, e.g. delay in publication of professional body requirements. Postponement must be recommended by the School Academic Board to the Learning and Teaching Panel of the Student Experience Committee. GQE will provide guidance.

The purpose of the review is to critically reflect on evidence of the quality of the programme over the period of validation, to identify examples of good practice for dissemination and to examine aspects of the programme which may require modification because it:

- Contains flaws;
- Is no longer current/relevant;
- Is not responding to external drivers, e.g. markets, professional standards/regulations/needs, government policies, QAA expectations, student profile;
- Is no longer aligned with QMU policies or strategies.

The review process involves both review of the current programme and development of the revised programme for re-validation. Note that no Programme Approval paperwork is required unless:

- i) There is an add-on such as extension of a PgCert to additional awards of PgDip or Masters or from a BSc to BSc (Hons)
- ii) There is a significant change, e.g. a merger of two programmes into one new programme or a change of title

Staff from GQE should be contacted for advice in the event that any such changes are planned.

A programme review and planning team should be established as set out on pages 3-4. It is good practice for the team to include representation from students, recent graduates, employers and (if applicable) service users.

The first step is to seek evidence from a wide range of sources regarding the effectiveness of the current programme and possible areas for change. Types of evidence to consider are listed below under the requirements for the Review Document.

Having considered the evidence, the planning team should then make recommendations for changes to the existing programme. The re-designed programme is set out in the validation document as described on pages 15-18 above.

The programme team is responsible for contacting external panellists initially (except where regulatory or professional bodies are involved), as above, but also former students, current students, employers and practitioners to determine their willingness and availability to be interviewed by the panel on the day(s) of the review

Required documentation for review

The review of the programme should document information which provides a critically reflective response to summary evidence of the academic viability, quality and standards, fitness-for-purpose, recruitment and resource efficiency of the programme.

All the above information should be presented in the Programme Review Document, which is normally separate from the Validation Document describing the revised curriculum.

Effort should be made to reduce paper as much as possible by summarising and cross-referring to existing documents.

All other documentation is the same as that listed on page 15 above, but much of the work will involve revision of existing documents.

Review document

The principal requirements of the review document are listed below:

- A statement on conditions and recommendations from the previous validation or review event and the team's response;
- A statement on the operation of the programme during the most recent period of validation, including the extent to which it has met its aims and objectives;
- Critical appraisal of the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning methods;
- Detailed information relating to any changes during the period;
- Annual monitoring reports for the previous two academic sessions, including a summary of progression statistics and data on graduate employment;
- External Examiners' reports and the programme team's response for the previous two academic sessions;
- A statement on feedback from employers, service users and other stakeholders and the programme team's response;
- A statement on feedback from staff and the team's response;

- A statement on mechanisms for gathering student feedback, any issues raised by students during the previous two years and the programme team's response;
- A statement of any resource implications that have arisen since the most recent validation or review event; and
- A clear statement of proposed changes to the programme.

Arrangements

Panel membership

The size of the validation or review panel varies depending on the nature of the event, but as minimum guide the following will apply:

- A Convener, preferably drawn from the School other than that which houses the programme under consideration;
- Two internal members of staff who have no direct involvement in the programme and who have previous experience as panellists at QMU;
- At least one external panellist (sometimes two);
- One student panellist; and
- Members of appropriate professional/statutory bodies if applicable

To promote staff development each panel will normally also include at least one internal member with no prior experience of validation and review at QMU.

Where practical, members of a review panel are drawn from the original validation or previous review to ensure continuity.

Staff participating in validation and review are asked to note that the secretary, whose role is described on pages 6-7, is **not** a member of the panel.

Selection of internal panel members

Internal panellists are nominated by the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement and are subject to the criteria included in the Governance and Regulations (<https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/committees-regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulations-policies-and-procedures/> - see section on Programme Development, Modification, Monitoring and Review). Student panel members are appointed in consultation with the Students' Union. Training is provided for Conveners and panel members through the Centre for Academic Practice; and for student panellists by the Students' Union.

Selection of external panel members

External panel members for some validation and review events are nominated by the relevant regulatory or professional body. This applies to all programmes requiring approval from the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) or the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC). For all other programmes, external panel members are nominated by the programme team. Where this applies, it is the team's responsibility to make initial contact with external panel members who meet the criteria identified below and to determine their availability. Once approved, external panellists liaise directly with staff in the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement regarding

their role, documentation, accommodation other arrangements. Appointment is on an unpaid basis, but all costs for travel and subsistence are reimbursed. Exceptionally, where a panellist is self-employed, payment can be made for loss of earnings.

The criteria for external panel members are as follows:

- Experience in academia in an appropriate subject or discipline; and
- Experience in professional practice of that subject, in the employment of graduates, or industry; and
- Experience of the validation and/or review process.

External panellists should meet one or more of the above and should have no current or previous involvement in the programme under consideration. This means that former⁴ University students, former members of staff, visiting lecturers, and examiners with current or recent⁵ responsibility for the programme under consideration will not be appointed.

Normally, the programme team should nominate one external panel member who fulfils the criteria above. It may be desirable to nominate more than one external panellist for some programmes, for example where it is difficult to identify one person who meets all of the criteria, or where the panel is asked to consider two or more related programmes rather than a single outcome. It can be beneficial to involve panel members from outside Scotland to gain an international perspective. However it is recognised that this is not usually practical.

Approval of panel members

All panel members need to be approved by the Deputy Principal, University Secretary and Head of Division housing the programme. Heads of Division are required to declare any possible conflict of interest at the point of approval. In the case of joint validation and professional accreditation of a programme, the full membership of the panel is agreed with the regulatory or professional body.

⁴ 'Former' in this context can normally be interpreted as 'within the previous five years'

⁵ 'Recent' in this context can normally be interpreted as 'within the previous five years'

Arrangements

Submission of documents

KEY POINT

It is the responsibility of the programme team to forward the validation or review documentation to GQE by the date agreed which is **no later than four weeks** prior to the event. Please note that this deadline is not flexible and that failure to comply may result in the event being cancelled.

In the case of a joint validation or review event, the deadline for submission of documentation is agreed in consultation with the relevant professional or regulatory body. In some cases professional and regulatory bodies can require documentation up to eight weeks in advance of the meeting. It is therefore essential to check requirements early in the planning process. This is the responsibility of GQE.

The programme team is required to submit one copy of each of the documents required to GQE. All documentation should be submitted electronically. Staff from GQE will arrange for copies to be made and forwarded to the panel and professional body representatives in advance of the meeting. Other documents will be made available on the day only except on request. Please note that GQE is not responsible for making or sending copies to members of the programme team. This is the responsibility of the programme leader.

Other information required from the programme team

Staff in GQE will also need the following information in advance of the meeting: list of all staff members, students, placement educators and others attending on behalf of the programme planning team. This is required to organise name plates.

Documents provided by the GQE

GQE will circulate the following documentation to each member of the panel three weeks in advance of the meeting:

- Agenda (a sample agenda has been included as Appendix 1);
- Background document, including the panel's remit;
- List of panel members;
- Copy of documentation provided by the programme team;
- A link to the SCQF level descriptors;
- An electronic copy of the checklist for validation or review (see below for further details)

The Secretary will also provide a copy of the agenda and a list of panel members to the programme leader. It is the programme leader's responsibility to circulate this information to the team and others attending the event on behalf of the team.

Validation and review checklist

Panellists are invited to submit comments on the validation or review documentation prior to the event using the University's validation and review checklists. The purpose of the checklist is partly to act as an aide memoire to ensure all important issues are covered and partly as a tool to help prepare the agenda for the meeting with the programme team.

A consolidated version of the checklist is forwarded to the panel and programme team, usually no later than three days prior to the event. This process allows for the clarification of questions or concerns prior to the event and for the complete preparation of the team so that the event itself runs smoothly and effectively. Programme teams are asked to note that whilst the checklist is normally used to inform the agenda for the meeting with the programme team, it does not constitute an exhaustive list of issues and that panellists can raise other issues as they consider appropriate during the validation or review event.

Panellists who wish to refer to their own checklist, as well as the consolidated version, during the validation or review event are asked to retain a copy for this purpose.

On the day

Expectations

Validation and review events provide opportunities to engage in academic debate about all aspects of programmes with the intent of validating its integrity, quality and fitness-for-purpose. Furthermore, they provide excellent opportunities to discuss enhancement and share good practice. The expectation is that all members of the team will participate, not just the programme leader(s). As it is meant to be a constructive dialogue, the team will have the opportunity not only to respond to requests for clarification but also to provide examples of good practice. All areas which might be problematic and lead to conditions or failure to validate must be explored during the meeting so that the team can defend and explain their rationale, and so that they will understand the outcome. When the panel's decision is announced, the team will have the opportunity to ask for clarification.

Meetings

Validation meetings

On the day of the validation a number of meetings are scheduled as detailed below. The secretary, who is a member of the GQE, will be in attendance for all meetings. It is not usual for the panel to meet the evening prior to the event, although this may be a requirement for some professional body events.

Private meeting of panel

Normally lasts about 1 hour

During this meeting the panel will use the validation checklist to identify the main issues to be explored with the planning team, students and other participants. The convener will also allocate specific areas of questioning to members of the panel.

Meeting with programme team

Normally lasts about 2 hours

During this meeting the panel and team will discuss the proposed new programme. The panel will use the agenda agreed during the private meeting as a basis for discussion with the team.

Private meeting of panel

Normally lasts between 1 and 1.5 hours

The purpose of the second private meeting is to allow the panel to reflect on its discussion with the programme team and agree the outcome of the event (possible outcomes are listed on page 29). Occasionally the panel may ask for a supplementary meeting with the programme leader and / or other key staff to clarify an issue which was not fully explored in the main meeting.

Optional additional meetings

For certain events, in particular those conducted in conjunction with a professional or regulatory body, some or all of the following additional meetings may be required:

- Meeting with students and recent graduates
Normally lasts 30 minutes. It may be useful to talk to students on a related programme and recent graduates as their experience may be similar to that expected for the new programme.

- Meeting with senior managers
Normally lasts 30 minutes. The purpose of the meeting with senior staff (e.g. Dean of School, Deputy Principal) is to discuss resources committed to supporting the programme.
- Meeting with clinical managers / placement providers
Normally lasts 30 minutes. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that suitable arrangements are in place for the provision of work-based learning and that potential employers are supportive of the planned programme (in terms of design and rationale).

Decision relayed to programme team

Normally lasts between 15 and 30 minutes

Following the private meeting, the panel meets again with the team to communicate the overall decision, conditions, recommendations and commendations as appropriate.

The team has the opportunity to ask for clarification if needed.

Review meetings

The agenda for programme review is similar to that for a validation event (see above) with the following additional meetings:

Meeting with students and recent graduates

Normally lasts between 30 minutes and 1 hour

The purpose of this meeting is to allow students and graduates to reflect on their experience of the programme and how it has prepared them for employment. Likely areas for discussion with students and graduates include the following: curriculum; assessment and feedback; placement arrangements; student support; information provided for students e.g. student handbook; proposed changes to the existing programme; student involvement in the review.

For some programmes, including distance learning and part-time programmes, it can be difficult to organise meetings with students. If this is the case, students are invited to provide written comments for the panel's consideration. It is the responsibility of the programme leader to provide contact details for students who are willing to provide feedback. The event secretary is responsible for liaison with students who are unable to attend.

Meeting with supervisors/practice placement educators (programme dependent)

Normally lasts between 30 minutes and 1 hour

The purpose of this meeting is to allow supervisors/practice placement educators to reflect on their experience of the programme and working with QMU students. Likely areas for discussion include the following: quality of QMU students and graduates; curriculum and relationship with external benchmarks; assessment; arrangements for communication with QMU and other supervisors/practice placement educators; advice and support provided by QMU for assessing students; proposed changes to the existing programme; employer involvement in the review.

Other optional meetings

Tour of facilities

The validation or review panel may wish to tour facilities and inspect the adequacy of resources to support the programme. This applies to all collaborative validation events (see page 19) and also to some events involving professional and regulatory body representatives.

Private meeting of panellists who are members of professional bodies

Some professional and regulatory bodies require private meetings during the event to discuss professional approval or accreditation. Typically these meetings do not involve QMU staff.

Outcomes

The validation or review panel will make one of the following recommendations to the Learning and Teaching Panel which reports to the Student Experience Committee (acting on behalf of Senate):

- 1 That the programme (continues to) be validated subject to conditions (all conditions must be satisfied before the programme can be considered validated);
- 2 That the programme (continues to) be validated (with further advisory recommendations, if appropriate);
- 3 That the programme should not be (re-)validated

Conditions of validation relate to issues that, if not satisfactorily addressed, would prevent the programme from running. Recommendations are advisory in nature, although it is expected that programme teams will give these serious consideration. Panels are therefore expected to maintain a clear distinction between mandatory conditions and recommendations.

Where the panel imposes a significant number of conditions, this may bring into question the validity of the programme. The maximum number of conditions applied normally should not exceed five. In cases where more than five conditions are set by the panel, the programme will not normally be validated. Panels are asked to state conditions and recommendations in clear and unambiguous terms.

If the programme is (re-)validated, or (re-)validated subject to conditions, then the panel must also set the date for review. This is usually five years, based on the nature of the programme, mode of delivery and duration. A shorter period of validation, whilst possible, would be wholly exceptional. A shorter validation period than five years may reflect the degree of confidence the panel has in the programme, or may reflect some changes anticipated in the short term. Where the period of validation is shorter than five years, the reasons for this decision will be clearly recorded in the report of the event.

The panel will identify aspects of the programme worthy of noting, commendation and wider dissemination. Commendations are detailed in the event report and summary and disseminated through meetings of key academic committees.

The panel's decision is communicated to the team directly after the final private meeting.

If for any reason the programme team disagrees with the panel's decision, this should be reported to the School Academic Board. The School Academic Board can make a request to Senate, that the panel's decision be reviewed. Any such recommendation must be supported by a clear statement explaining the rationale for the request.

Decisions made by validation and review panels may **only** be overturned by Senate.
The decision of Senate in such matters is final.

After the event

Report

The secretary to the validation or review panel, who is normally a member of the GQE, will prepare a summary report of the event, normally within 48 working hours, for circulation to all panel members for comment and to the programme leader for accuracy. A full report is normally produced within 20 working days and circulated for comment to all panel members and for the accuracy to the programme leader. The relevant Dean(s) of School and Head(s) of Division receive copies of the report for information.

The overall recommendation and any conditions set by the panel are considered by the Learning and Teaching Panel, which recommends approval of the programme to the Student Experience Committee on behalf of Senate. All validation and review reports are also noted by the School Academic Board.

Response to conditions

The team's response to conditions of validation must be submitted, in writing, to the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement no later than the deadline specified at the event. The response should include a cover page, quoting each of the conditions followed by an indication of how this has been met, plus any supporting documentation required by the panel. The nature of conditions will determine whether or not a revised definitive document needs to be submitted for scrutiny by the panel. The event secretary can advise on the presentation of the team's response to conditions.

Whilst recommendations are advisory rather than mandatory, it is good practice to provide an account of any action taken in response to recommendations shortly after the event. This should be submitted to the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement at the same time as the response to conditions. Programme teams' responses to recommendations, some of which encourage action to be taken over a longer period of time, are reviewed through the Annual Monitoring process.

The secretary to the event is responsible for forwarding the response to members of the panel and professional body representatives as appropriate. Panel members are asked to confirm by a specified date that the response is satisfactory. If necessary, panellists can request additional information from the team before recommending approval. If the panel is not satisfied with the response, the issue will be referred to the School Academic Board for consideration. The Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement is responsible for recording the status of conditions and reporting progress to the Student Experience Committee through the Learning and Teaching Panel on behalf of Senate.

Once the panel has approved the response to conditions the programme leader receives written notification of this from the event secretary.

Definitive document

The programme leader is required to produce a definitive programme document for submission to the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement once the response to conditions has been approved by the panel and at least one month prior to the start of the programme. The definitive document is based on the validation document and incorporates all changes made in response to the validation conditions. It is a factual account of what is in the programme and how it should be delivered and provides a source of reference to all who are involved in the programme. For instance, at exam boards the definitive document may be referred to in order to confirm programme specific regulations or options available for a student with special circumstances.

The definitive document is expected to be available to students, prospective students, professional bodies and other bodies or authorities that need to know about the programme. A full set of definitive programme documents is held by the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement.

The following represents the minimum information to be provided in a definitive document:

- The full programme title or titles;
- The host department for the programme;
- The award or awards to which the programme leads;
- The normal length of time which it is planned a student would spend on the programme (or limits thereto), and the mode or modes of attendance;
- The patterns of attendance on the programme including structure of periods of placement or professional training and duration of placement periods, or the nature of part-time or mixed-mode study (this should include a statement on the use of Library and IT resources);
- The aims and outcomes of the programme;
- The regulations for admission of students, and the criteria for exemptions and admission with advanced standing;
- The regulations for progression through the programme, including the regulations governing the choice of a programme of studies (e.g. specification of core subjects and options required);
- The regulations for assessment, progression and award, and the assessment schedule;
- The curriculum (i.e. the subjects or fields of study included in the programme, any modules into which the programme is divided and the formal relationships between the subjects or modules), and the balance of teaching and assessment methods to be used for each module;
- Module descriptors;
- A clear statement defining the cohorts of students to which the document refers.

Each student enrolled on the programme has a right to receive the above information, which may also serve as a formal statement of the programme. The information supplied to students may contain additional material on e.g. learning and teaching methods, booklists for the year, any resources required (e.g. laptop, Internet access) study notes, information on membership of professional bodies, etc.

Staff are required to inform students at the start of each year of the detailed basis of the continuous assessment to be used in each subject. The student handbook for the programme can serve as the vehicle for the provision of such information.

The programme leader is responsible for ensuring any necessary revisions are made to copies of the definitive document held by the Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement once changes have been approved.

Module codes

Once the programme has been approved and the definitive document submitted to the GQE a copy of all module descriptors will be forwarded by the GQE to staff in the Student Records Section of Registry. This will allow for updating of information on SITS.

Further information and contacts

Further information on all aspects of the validation and review process and hard copies of this booklet are available from:

Dawn Martin, Assistant Secretary, Governance and Quality Enhancement
Email: dmartin1@gmu.ac.uk

Further information on curriculum development, the preparation of validation and review documentation and training for staff participating in validation and review is available from:

Professor Roni Bamber, Director, Centre for Academic Practice
Email: vbamber@gmu.ac.uk

This booklet is available in different formats on request.

All key resources and templates are available on the Quality website:
<https://www.gmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/resources-for-validation-and-review/>

Feedback can be submitted electronically to Dawn Martin (contact details as above)

References

QMU Quality website	www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality
SCQF website	www.scqf.org
QAA website	www.qaa.ac.uk
Teachability website	www.teachability.strath.ac.uk

Abbreviations

CAP	Centre for Academic Practice
HCPC	Health and Care Professions Council
IS	Information Services
LTP	Learning and Teaching Panel
PDG	Portfolio Development Group
PDP	Personal Development Planning
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
GQE	Division of Governance and Quality Enhancement
QMU	Queen Margaret University
SAB	School Academic Board
SCQF	Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework
SEC	Student Experience Committee
SETS	(HCPC) Standards of Education and Training
SITS	Student Records System
SOPS	(HCPC) Standards of Proficiency

Acknowledgements

This booklet was co-written with Dr Kate Morss, former Director for the Centre of Academic Practice.



Queen Margaret University

EDINBURGH

QUEEN MARGARET UNIVERSITY

Review and revalidation of MSc PUBLIC HEALTH PRACTICE

27 April 2009

Large Boardroom, Craighall

09.30 – 10.30	Private meeting of Panel
10.30 – 12.45	Meeting with the Programme Team giving the Panel the opportunity to discuss the Programme and any issues relating to the following points ⁶ : <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Programme title, overall aims and objectives• Demand for the Programme, recruitment and admissions• Structure and content• Learning, teaching and assessment• Programme management, QA and enhancement• The student experience• Staff experience
12.45 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 13.45	Private meeting of Panel
13.45 – 14.15	Meeting with current students and graduates ⁷
14.15 – 14.45	Meeting with practice education facilitators
14.45 – 15.00	Private meeting of Panel
15.00 – 15.15	Optional second meeting with Programme Team to clarify any outstanding issues or issues raised by students and practice education facilitators
15.15 – 16.15	Private meeting of Panel, to include discussion of due process of event
16.15 – 16.30	Panel conclusions to Programme Team

⁶ These are the same categories listed in the review checklist

⁷ The timing of meetings with students, graduates and placement educators depends on the availability of these participants