Section 3: Programme Design and Development

Part A: Programme Design and Development

Version number	Date approved	Reason for production/revision	Author	Proposed next review date
V1.0	03/09/19 Academic Board	Annual review	Deputy Registrar	Annually and as required

Related policies
• Section 3, Part C, Periodic Review. • Section 3, Part D, Programme Documentation.

External Reference
UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Advice and Guidance: Course Design and Development. Programmes are designed in line with sector-recognised standards and meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework. Regular monitoring and evaluation are used to drive improvement and enhancement of these processes. UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Advice and Guidance: Partnerships. Processes are in place for the management and oversight of all aspects of the student academic experience by ICMP and its Awarding Bodies.

This section considers the process and principles for programme and module design, development and review.

This section considered the advice and guidance section for course design and development underpinning the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

1. New programme approval process

1.1. Introduction

The design of a new programme takes a significant amount of research and development. The proposals are developed in consultation with staff, students, employers, and external industry and academic expertise.

All proposals for new programmes require Gate 1 and Gate 2 initial approval before progressing to the internal approval event.

The final decision for approval rests with the relevant awarding body.

1.2. Timescales

The typical timeframe for the programme approval processes is 18 months from initial programme development to delivery. This includes the schedules of ICMP's various awarding bodies.

Note: New programme proposals must be planned in sufficient time, to take account of marketing and recruitment cycles, alongside the programme development and approval timeline.

1.3. New programme approval process overview

The approval process is divided in to two main stages:

  i.   Approval of the new programme proposal (Gate 1 and Gate 2)
  ii.   Approval of the new programme (Awarding Body)

The approval of the new programme consists of the following stages:

  i.   Programme development: The programme development team develop and produce the required documentation, with reference to relevant external reference points and benchmarks, and in consultation with staff, students and external expertise.

  ii.   Internal approval event: An internal event is held ahead of the formal awarding-body events to assure that all submitted documentation is of an adequate standard and provide the programme team with recommendations and the opportunity to enhance the submission prior to the approval event.

  iii. Formal approval event: The formal approval event is to formally approve the new programme proposal and to assure that the new programme meets the awarding bodies quality standards for delivery.

iv. Formal approval: The relevant awarding-body approves the new course and ICMP receives formal notification of approval.

v. Post approval: Approved programme documentation is provided to ICMP's Registry, Admissions and Marketing teams and an External Examiner is nominated.

1.4. Approval of the new programme proposal - Gate 1

The programme proposer should complete a New Programme Proposal Form.

The programme proposal form is considered by the Executive Committee in the first instance. The Executive Committee will either approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback.

Proposed programmes are presented to the Executive Committee to consider the rationale for the new programme, financial implications, projected student numbers, demand, resourcing requirements and alignment to the ICMP operational and strategic plans.

Where a proposal is approved with conditions, it is the responsibility of the Executive Committee to confirm if these conditions have been appropriately met.

Following approval by the Executive Committee, the proposal is submitted to the Academic Board.

1.5. Approval of the new programme proposal - Gate 2

The programme proposal will be submitted to the Academic Board to ensure that the programme aligns to ICMP's Portfolio Development Plan and considers relevant external inputs, including subject benchmark statements and the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

The Academic board will either approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback. Where a proposal is approved with conditions, it is the responsibility of the Academic Board to confirm if these conditions have been appropriately met.

Following approval, the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee, under the direction of the Academic Board, will receive the proposal and will appoint a nominated project lead charged with developing the programme.

1.6. Programme development

In developing the programme proposal, the programme development team will take account of the academic framework of ICMP's proposed awarding body. The programme development team will also be making use of industry and Higher Education sector experts, the RQF and FHEQ, the Subject Benchmarks, UK Quality Code for Higher Education and ICMP Tutors in order to develop the programme and any necessary validation documentation, programme specifications and programme handbooks in good time for any validation event.

1.7. Required programme approval documentation

The responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the documentation rests with the programme development team overseen by the programme leader. Procedural guidance is available from the Quality Team.

i. Validation Information Document (including academic rationale and external benchmark mapping)
ii. Draft Programme Specification (including draft course structure)
iii. Draft Programme Handbook
iv. Draft Module Specifications
v. External Adviser nomination

1.8. Internal approval event (ICMP)

The internal approval event will be held to assure that submitted documentation is of an adequate standard and provide the programme development team with recommendations and the opportunity to enhance the submission prior to the formal approval event.

The panel membership will include:

- Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, Chair
- Representative of the Senior Academic Management Team
- Programme Leader from a different programme

The servicing officer will be a nominated member from the Quality Team.

1.9. Formal approval event (Awarding Body)

A number of meetings will take place with the relevant awarding body as part of the validation process. The awarding body will be responsible for convening the meetings and will liaise with the ICMP Quality Team.

At the end of the approval event, the Panel will reach a decision on whether to approve or reject the programme. The approval may include a number of conditions or recommendations. The programme may not run until all conditions are met and validation has been completed. This will be confirmed by the relevant awarding body.

1.10. Post Validation

Following a validation event, approved programme documentation is provided to ICMP's Registry, Admissions and Marketing teams and an External Examiner is nominated. The programme development team is required to meet with the Registrar to discuss ICMP's programme approval procedures. This debrief meeting is used to encourage each team to critically reflect on their recent experience and provide recommendations to improve processes, or entries into ICMP's lessons learned log.

1.11. Criteria for the approval of new programmes

The new programme approval process (Gate 1, Gate 2 and Internal Validation Event) are required to consider the following criteria when reviewing and approving a new course proposal.

These criteria should also inform the development of the programme and its documentation throughout the design and approval of a new programme.

a) Academic Rationale
    i. The proposed programme promotes ICMP's mission and values, providing a relevant learning experience that effectively prepares potential students for industry
    ii. The proposed programme provides sufficient scope for potential students to be challenged at the appropriate academic level
    iii. The proposed programme is aligned with ICMP's graduate attributes
b) Strategic Rationale
    i. The programme supports ICMPs mission and strategic direction
    ii. The proposal includes market research to support the demand of the proposed provision
c) Quality Learning, Teaching and Assessment
    i. The programme incorporates a systematic, relevant and stimulating assessment strategy, which enables course and module learning outcomes to be met
d) Quality and Standards
    i. The programme has been appropriate aligned with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, including the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)
    ii. The programme refers to external reference points, including QAA subject benchmark statements
e) Programme Structure
    i. The programme structure meets the requirements of the awarding body
    ii. The programme structure takes account of the relevant pedagogical demands of the discipline and field.
f) Resource
    i. There will be sufficient human and physical resource available to deliver a high-quality academic experience
    ii. There will be adequate library and learning resource to deliver a high-quality academic experience
    iii. There will be appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience
g) Stakeholder Consultation
    i. The proposal considered feedback from students in the design and development of the programme
    ii. The programme has considered guidance from ICMPs Disability and Wellbeing Team
    iii. The proposal considered feedback from external stakeholders in the design and development of the programme

2. Programme development and re-approval process

2.1. Introduction

Programmes are typically re-approved through each relevant Awarding Body's Periodic Review process. However, it is recognised that modifications may be made following approval to enhance provision.

Opportunities to enhance provision may be identified through routine monitoring of programmes and modules, Periodic Programme Review (Part C, Section 3) and other reflective actively conducted by ICMP or our awarding bodies.

In keeping with new programme proposal, modifications to programmes and modules require re-approval from the relevant awarding body. The formal process ensures the integrity of our modules and programmes

Programme development **must** be supported by student consultation and external expertise.

Modifications cannot be applied retrospectively and can only be implemented at the start of term of an academic session following awarding body approval.

2.2. Programme development (modification) overview

Programme modifications can be categorised in three way:

  i.   Changes that constitute a significant change to the programme
  ii.   Changes that constitute a minor change to the programme
  iii. Normal and regular updating of core and option modules

Changes that constitute a significant change to the programme require full re-approval of the progamme.

All proposals are considered by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee on behalf of the Academic Board before being submitted to the relevant awarding-body for approval.

2.3. Timescales

Modifications cannot be applied retrospectively and can only be implemented at the start of term of an academic session following awarding body approval.

Modifications require awarding-body approval.

Note: Modifications to programmes and modules must be planned in sufficient time.

2.4. Minor Modification

Minor modifications include:

i.   Replacement of a core module
ii.   Additional, removal or reallocation of a core module
iii. Change in credit weighting of a core module
iv.   Change to the learning outcomes of a core module
v.   Change to the curriculum content of a core module
vi.   Change in the mode of delivery of a core module
vii. Change to an optional module
viii. Changes to core modules that do not involve changes to curriculum content or learning outcomes (e.g. length or nature of assessment, main aims or main topics of study, module title changes)

A significant number of proposed minor modifications in combination may need to be considered under the re-approval process. In such instances advice should be sought from the Quality Team at an early stage.

2.5. Normal and regular updates

Normal and regular updates include:
i.   Normal and regular updating of reading lists
ii. Corrections to typographical errors

These changes are normally completed prior to the start of an academic year. Updates should be made available to Quality with the modifications clearly identified.

These changes do not normally require stakeholder consultation.

2.6. Required documentation for programme modification

The responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the documentation rests with the Programme Team overseen by the Programme Leader. Procedural guidance is available from the Quality Team.

i.   Amendment proposal form
ii. Updated programme specification, if applicable
iii. Updated module specification
iv. Stakeholder consultation

2.7. Academic Standards and Quality Committee Approval

All proposals are considered by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee on behalf of the Academic Board before being submitted to the relevant awarding-body for approval.

The committee will ensure that submitted documentation is of an adequate standard and compliant with awarding body requirements.

2.8. Formal approval (awarding body)

The Quality Team will submit the proposal to the relevant awarding-body.

The awarding-body will reach a decision on whether to approve or reject the proposal and will communicate the outcome via the Quality Team.

2.9. Post approval

Following approval, approved programme documentation is provided to ICMP's Registry, Admissions and Marketing teams.

2.10. Programme re-approval process overview

The re-approval process is divided in to two main stages:

iii. Approval of the programme development proposal (Gate 1 and Gate 2)
iv. Re-approval of the programme (Awarding Body)

The re-approval of the programme consists of the following stages:

vi. Programme development: The Programme Proposal Team develop and produce the required documentation, with reference to relevant external reference points and benchmarks, and in consultation with staff, students and external expertise.

vii. Internal re-approval event: An internal event is held ahead of the formal awarding-body events to assure that all submitted documentation is of an adequate standard and provide the programme team with recommendations and the opportunity to enhance the submission prior to the re-approval event.

viii. Formal re-approval event: The formal re-approval event is to formally re-approve the programme proposal and to assure that the new programme meets the awarding bodies quality standards for delivery.

ix. Formal re-approval: The relevant awarding-body re-approves the programme and ICMP receives formal notification of approval.

x. Post re-approval: Approved programme documentation is provided to ICMP's Registry, Admissions and Marketing teams and an External Examiner is nominated.

2.11. Timescales

The typical timeframe for the programme development processes is 18 months from initial programme development to delivery. This includes the schedules of ICMP's various awarding bodies.

Note: Significant programme development proposals must be planned in sufficient time.

2.12. Re-approval of programme proposals - Gate 1

The programme proposer should complete a Programme re-approval Form.

The programme re-approval form is considered by the Executive Committee in the first instance. The Executive Committee will either approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback.

Programme re-approvals are presented to the Executive Committee to consider the rationale for the re-approval, financial implications, projected student numbers, demand, resourcing requirements and alignment to the ICMP operational and strategic plans.

Where a proposal is approved with conditions, it is the responsibility of the Executive Committee to confirm if these conditions have been appropriately met.

Following approval by the Executive Committee, the proposal is submitted to the Academic Board.

2.13. Re-approval of programme proposals - Gate 2

The programme re-approval form will be submitted to the Academic Board to ensure that the programme aligns to ICMP's Portfolio Development Plan and considers relevant external inputs, including subject benchmark statements and the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

The Academic board will either approve the proposal or reject the proposal with feedback. Where a proposal is approved with conditions, it is the responsibility of the Academic Board to confirm if these conditions have been appropriately met.

Following approval, the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee, under the direction of the Academic Board, will receive the proposal and will appoint a nominated project lead charged with developing the programme.

2.14. Programme development

In developing the programme proposal, the Programme Team will take account of the academic framework of ICMP's proposed awarding body. The Programme Team will also be making use of industry and Higher Education sector experts, the RQF and FHEQ, the Subject Benchmarks, UK Quality Code for Higher Education and ICMP Tutors in order to develop the programme and any necessary Validation Documentation, Programme Specifications and Programme Handbooks in good time for any validation event.

2.15. Required programme re-approval documentation

The responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the documentation rests with the Programme Team overseen by the Programme Leader. Procedural guidance is available from the Quality Team.

- v. Re-approval Information Document (including schedule of changes, academic rationale and external benchmark mapping)
- vi. Draft Programme Specification (including draft course structure)
- vii. Draft Programme Handbook
- viii. Draft Module Specifications

ix.   External Adviser nomination

2.16.   Internal re-approval event (ICMP)

The internal re-approval event will be held to assure that submitted documentation is of an adequate standard and provide the programme team with recommendations and the opportunity to enhance the submission prior to the formal re-approval event.

The panel membership will include:

- Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, Chair
- Representative of the Senior Academic Management Team
- Programme Leader from a different programme

The servicing officer will be a nominated member from the Quality Team.

2.17.   Formal re-approval event (Awarding Body)

A number of meetings will take place with the relevant awarding body as part of the re-approval process. The awarding body will be responsible for convening the meetings and will liaise with the ICMP Quality Team.

At the end of the re-approval event, the Panel will reach a decision on whether to approve or reject the programme. The approval may include a number of conditions or recommendations. The new programme may not run until all conditions are met and re-approval has been completed. This will be confirmed by the relevant awarding body.

2.18.   Post Re-approval

Following a re-approval event, approved programme documentation is provided to ICMP's Registry, Admissions and Marketing teams and an External Examiner is nominated.

The development team is required to meet with the Registrar to discuss ICMP's programme approval procedures. This debrief meeting is used to encourage each team to critically reflect on their recent experience and provide recommendations to improve processes, or entries into ICMP's lessons learned log.

3. Programme Closure

Recommendations for the planned closure of a programme will be considered by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee on behalf of the Academic Board.

A notification of the intention to close a programme should be approved by the Dean of Academic Studies by submission of the course closure form to the Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

The form should include:
   a) The basis on which the decision has been reached;
   b) The risk assessment of the impact of any closure, including consultation with relevant departments including Marketing and Finance;
   c) The proposed arrangements for the current students on the programme;
   d) The proposed programme closure action plan.

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee will make a recommendation to the Academic Board and Executive Committee for decision.

Following Academic Board and Executive Committee decision the Quality Team, on behalf of ICMP, will notify the relevant awarding-body.

Part C: Programme Design and Development

Section 2: Annual Monitoring

Version number	Date approved	Reason for production/revision	Author	Proposed next review date
V1.0	03/09/19 Academic Board	Annual review	Deputy Registrar	Annually and as required
Related policies				
- Part C, Section 3, Periodic Review. - Part C, Section 4, Programme Documentation.				
External Reference				
UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Advice and Guidance: Course Design and Development. Regular monitoring and evaluation are used to drive improvement and enhancement of these processes.				

1. Introduction

1.1. ICMP is committed to the continuous enhancement of the quality of progammes and student experience provided for all students

1.2. Annual monitoring forms part of the process by which programmes are monitored and reviewed thereby ensuring that quality and standards are being met. It also supports the enhancement of learning, student experience and learning opportunities.

1.3. Annual monitoring forms an integral element of the evidence base for periodic review that all programmes are required to undergo at least once within a six year cycle.

1.4. Annual monitoring applies to all undergraduate and postgraduate programmes at ICMP.

1.5. Monitoring activity is overseen by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee on behalf of the Academic Board and is undertaken by Programme Leaders with input from staff and students.

2. Purpose

2.1. The purpose of Annual Monitoring is to maintain and enhance the quality of ICMP's programmes, specifically:

- To provide a focus for quality enhancement;
- To confirm that the quality and academic standards of the provision have been maintained in accordance with all external and internal benchmarks and requirements;
- To reflect and analyse the data;
- To reflect on student feedback;
- To consider any external comments e.g. External Examiner Reports;
- To agree an action plan for the following academic year;
- To identify areas of innovative and good practice;
- To identify areas for improvements and ensure that concerns are recorded in the action plan;
- To report to awarding body or organisation on the health of the programme and meet the requirement of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

3. Ongoing and Annual Monitoring Process

3.1. A range of monitoring activity is undertaken both on an ongoing basis and at specific points in the quality cycle to ensure that programmes and modules remain current and effective.

3.2. **Ongoing Monitoring**

    3.2.1. Ongoing monitoring activities include:

- Semesterly module evaluations that is reviewed at programme and institutional level;
- Semesterly Programme Committees that monitor the ongoing action plan and the student experience throughout the year.

3.3. Annual Monitoring and reporting

3.3.1. Annual monitoring and reporting activities include:

- The production of module and programme annul reports
- The annual review of programme documentation and information (e.g. programme and module specifications)
- The production of external examiner reports
- Annual student satisfaction survey

4. Annual Programme Monitoring Review

4.1. The Annual Programme Monitoring Review (APMR) report provides a focus for improvement at module, programme and institutional level.

4.2. All module leaders are required to produce a Module Leader report upon completion of a module. The report will provide an overview of the module, review progress against any module improvement plans and consider student module feedback. This report will form part of the evidence base for the APMR.

4.3. All programme teams are required to produce an APMR report and objectives on an annual basis. In producing the report, programme teams will consider a range of evidence about the quality of their provision but will also be proactive in moving their programme forward and keeping them current via innovation and change in content, delivery and assessment.

5. Evidence Base

5.1. The Programme Annual Monitoring Review report will consider the following:
5.1.1. Module leader reports;
5.1.2. External examiner reports;
5.1.3. Review and analysis of programme datasets against benchmarks and trends:
- Recruitment and enrolment
- Retention
- Progression
- Achievement
- Completion
- Attainment
- National Student Survey
- Graduate Outcomes
5.1.4. Student feedback
5.1.5. Strengths and areas for improvement
5.1.6. Progress against the previous action plan

6. Student Engagement in annual monitoring activities

6.1. Student Feedback is incorporated into the Annual Monitoring process through:
- Consideration of the National Student Survey results
- Consideration of ICMP Student Satisfaction results
- Consideration of student feedback from Programme Committees
- Consideration of student Module Evaluations

7. Responsibilities

7.1. <u>Module Leader</u>
   7.1.1. The module leader will produce the module leader report.

7.2. <u>Programme Leader</u>
   7.2.1. Each programme leader is responsible for producing a Programme Annual Monitoring Review report that considers module leader reports, external examiner reports, data relating to recruitment, achievement, retention and success, and student feedback.

   7.2.2. Programme Annual Monitoring Review reports are principally authored by the Programme Leader, although where appropriate, the Programme Leader should include commentary and input from the wider Programme Team.

7.3. <u>Registry</u>
   7.3.1. The Quality Team will provide templates.

   7.3.2. The Data Team will generate statistical reports which form the evidence base for annual monitoring.

7.4. <u>Programme Committee</u>
   7.4.1. The programme committee is responsible for the overall quality of the programme.

   7.4.2. The programme committee will monitor and review programme and module action plans on a regular basis.

   7.4.3. The programme committee will consider and approve the Programme Annual Monitoring Review report.

7.5. <u>ASQC</u>
   7.5.1. The Academic Standards and Quality Committee is responsible for ensuring that the process is followed, and all programme reports are received in a timely manner.

   7.5.2. The Academic Standards and Quality Committee will coordinate a review of all programme reports and provide an overview, highlighting issues and good practice of institutional significance, to the Academic Board.

7.5.3. The Academic Standards and Quality Committee will monitor and review institutional, programme and module action plans on a regular basis.

7.6. <u>Academic Board</u>
7.6.1. The Academic Board holds overall responsibility for the development, management, oversight, monitoring and quality of all programmes across ICMP.

8. Timescales

	Activity
August	- Completion of annual monitoring executive summary
October	- Annual Monitoring Event (ASQC) - Programme Committee
November	- Production of Self-Evaluation Document
December	- Annual Monitoring outcomes (AcBo) - Module Evaluations (Sem 1)
January	- Module Leader Reports (Sem 1) - Completion of Self-Evaluation Document and Quality Improvement Plan
February	- Programme Committee - Mid-year AMR update
March	- Module Evaluations (Sem 2)
April	- Programme Committee (UG programmes)
May	- Module Leader Reports (Sem 2)
June	- Programme Committee Meeting (PG only)
July	- Module Evaluations (Sem 3)
August	- Module Leader Reports (Sem 3)

Part C: Programme Design and Development

Section 3: Periodic Review

Version number	Date approved	Reason for production/revision	Author	Proposed next review date
V1.0	03/09/19 – Academic Board	Annual review	Deputy Registrar	Annually and as required
Related policies				
- Part C, Section 1, Programme Design and Development - Part C, Section 4, Programme Documentation.				
External Reference				
[UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#), Advice and Guidance: Course Design and Development. Regular monitoring and evaluation are used to drive improvement and enhancement of these processes.				

9. Introduction

9.1. ICMP is committed to the continuous enhancement of the quality of progammes and student experience provided for all students.

9.2. Periodic review is an opportunity to undertake an self-critical evaluation of the performance of a programme over a period of time.

9.3. In addition to annual monitoring activities, a period programme review can be recommended by the Executive Committee or Academic Board for additional risk-based scrutiny of a programme.

10. Purpose

10.1.   The purpose of a periodic review is:

- to evaluate the quality of the student learning experience over a five academic year period and consider how it can be maintained and improved;
- to relate the student learning experience to the expectations set out in the ICMP's Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy;
- to ensure that a high standard of teaching and learning is maintained;
- to consider the continued appropriateness of module outcomes and content against student expectations and industry needs;
- to encourage the Programme Team to reflect upon their strengths and challenges, highlighting where support might be needed.
- to ensure the programme continues to meet the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

11. Key principles of Periodic Review

11.1.   The review is intended to be a supportive and useful process, in which conversations take place in meetings between ICMP staff and an independent panel of 'critical friends' in a visit usually over a period of one day.

11.2.   The Panel is expected to conduct the review according to the following principles:

11.2.1. the programme team will be encouraged to raise issues and highlight examples of good practice prior to and during the visit;

11.2.2. the Panel will establish a clear understanding of the overarching nature of the programme's ethos and purpose within ICMP's portfolio and work with an appreciation of its broad aims;

11.2.3. the Panel will acknowledge the standards and quality of provision as evidenced through reports relating to previous review activities;

11.2.4. information used by the Panel will be made available to the programme team; the Panel will take account of factors outside the immediate control of the programme team which challenge its ability to sustain or enhance the quality of its provision. Where appropriate, the Panel will highlight these factors in its findings.

12. Preparing for a Review

12.1.   The Dean of Academic Studies and the Quality Manager establish a series of regular meetings with relevant staff from the programme team.

12.2.   The first meeting will determine the approximate timing of the review and discuss the requirements for external representation on the review panel.

12.3.   The Quality Manager provides advice and guidance throughout the process.

12.4.   The Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) is responsible for monitoring preparations for a Review.

13. Documentation

13.1.   Central to the Review process is the Critical Evaluation Document (CED). The document fulfils two functions:

13.1.1. To provide an open and honest narrative of the Programme under review by evaluating performance and changes since the last review, the quality of the learning opportunities offered to students and the standards achieved by students;

13.1.2. To identify perceived strengths and areas for development by referring to appropriate evidence, to indicate actions being undertaken to address such areas for development and to comment on the success, to date, of such actions.

13.2.   The CED is structured as follows:

13.2.1. Overall aims of the programme under review;
13.2.2. Evaluation of the learning outcomes;
13.2.3. Evaluation of the curriculum and assessment;
13.2.4. Evaluation of the quality of the student experience;
13.2.5. Evaluation of the maintenance and enhancement of standards and quality

13.3.   The Critical Evaluation Document should be submitted on the correct template and supplemented with the following:

13.3.1. Programme and Module Specifications
13.3.2. External Examiner reports (since the last review)
13.3.3. Annual Monitoring Review reports (since the last review)
13.3.4. Examples of student feedback (e.g. Programme Committee minutes)

13.4.   Further guidance on writing the Critical Evaluation Document is available from the Quality Team.

14. Panel Membership and Selection

14.1.   The periodic programme review meeting shall be Chaired by a senior academic member of staff independent of the provision in question. Panel membership will also include the Registrar (or nominee), a student representative, two external panel members, and a servicing officer.

14.2.   Early in the process, the Dean of Academic Studies (or designated co-ordinator) nominates appropriate external subject advisers to take part in the review. The suitability of the external nominees is determined by the chair of the ASQC.

14.3.   The following criteria are taken into account when determining the suitability of the external nominee:

- the depth of subject knowledge;
- knowledge and experience of comparable programmes at other institutions;
- prior experience of teaching on programmes at the same level or above;
- professional expertise;
- prior experience as a QAA reviewer and/or External Examiner/Reviewer

14.4.   It is unlikely that any single nominee will meet all the requirements. In making judgments about the suitability of the proposed external subject advisers the chair of the ASQC takes into account the overall balance of expertise presented by the external advisers.

15. Periodic Review Meeting

15.1.   On the day of the review the panel will meet to decide what lines of questioning will be pursued. These will be based on the outcomes of the analysis of the CED.

15.2.   The Team under review will attend a meeting with the panel where a dialogue over the delivery and continued suitability of the qualifications in question will take place.

15.3.   Post meeting the Review team will aim to provide a set of recommendations designed to improve delivery of the programmes in question, and will highlight any good practice identified through the process.

15.4.   Once the recommendations have been received the Team under review will draft an action plan designed to take account of the recommendations, while also detailing how good practice highlighted will be further consolidated and built upon.

15.5.   The action plan will be monitored by the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee.

16. Report of the Review

16.1. A summary of any recommendations will be made available to the Panel and Programme Team within 5 working days. An outcome report will be circulated within 15 working days. The report will be submitted to the Academic Board for information.

Part C: Programme Design and Development

Section 4: Programme Documentation

Version number	Date approved	Reason for production/revision	Author	Proposed next review date
V1.0	03/09/19 Academic Board	Annual review	Deputy Registrar	Annually and as required
Related policies				
• Section 3, Part A, Programme Design and Development • Section 3, Part B, Annual Monitoring • Section 3, Part C, Periodic Review				
External Reference				
[UK Quality Code for Higher Education](), Advice and Guidance: Course Design and Development. Programme design and development result in high-quality definitive course documentation.				

1. Introduction

1.1. The programme documentation provides applicants and students with an accurate reflection of the programme and are key to validation, re-validation and modification processes. These documents are considered for approval by our Awarding Bodies.

2. **Programme Specification**

2.1. The Programme Specification provides a concise description of the programme and it's intended learning outcomes, and the means by which the outcomes are achieved and demonstrated.

2.2. Programme Specifications must be published in the agreed template and made available to students. Any proposed changes to the Programme Specification must be submitted to the Quality Office and agreed with the relevant Awarding Body.

3. Module Specification

3.1. Module specifications provide details of the aims and learning outcomes, learning and teaching methods and the means of assessment of individual modules.

3.2. Module Specifications must be published in the agreed template and made available to students via the Programme Handbook.

3.3. Any proposed changes to the Module Specifications must be submitted to the Quality Office and agreed with the relevant Awarding Body.

4. Programme Handbook

4.1. The Programme Handbook is the main reference for students in navigating the overview of their programme of study and overall ICMP experience.

4.2. It is expected that this document is reviewed annually to ensure the information remains accurate and up to date.

4.3. Programme Handbooks must be published on the agreed template.

5. Validation / Re-Validation information document

6. Critical Evaluation Document (CED) – Periodic Review

6.1. The CED provides a critical appraisal of the Programme under review by evaluating performance and changes since the last review, the quality of the learning opportunities offered to students and the standards achieved by students.

6.2. The document should reflect on the overall operational of the programme, relevant action plans, programme and module design, and external and student feedback.

6.3. The CED should be supplemented with the following items of evidence:
- Programme and Module Specification
- External Examiner reports (since the last revalidation)
- Annual Monitoring reports (since the last revalidation)
- Examples of student feedback at course level (where relevant)