

Academic Quality Framework Chapter 4

AQF4: Programme and Course Approval and Modification

Introduction	4
New Awards	4
Responsibilities Regarding Award Approval	4
Drivers for New Awards	5
Framework for New Award Approvals Overview	5
Timescales for New Award Approvals	6
New Award Approval Process	6
Award Development	8
Award Approval	8
Designing New Programmes and Courses	8
Programme and Course Titles	8
Modifying Existing Programmes and Courses	9
'Directed Study' Courses	9
'Special Topics' Courses	9
Programme and Course Approval and Modification Procedures	10
Responsibilities Regarding Programme and Course Approval and Modification	11
The Length of Time for which Programmes and Courses are Approved	12
Alignment with the UK Quality Code	12
Alignment with the Degree Apprenticeship Standard	12
Part 1: Programme Approval	13
Drivers for New Programme Development	13
Framework for New Programme Approvals	14
Timescales of the Programme Approval Process	14
New Programme Approval Process Overview	14
Stage 1: Approval of New Programme in Principle Overview	14

Stage 2: Approval of New Programme Content Overview	15
Stage 1: Approval of New Programme in Principle	16
Stage 2: Approval of New Programme Content	18
Programme Development	18
Development of New Programme Proposal Documentation	19
Nomination of External Panel Member	20
Faculty Review	21
University Approval Event	21
University Approval Panel Membership	21
Criteria for the Approval of New Programmes	22
Quality of the Learning Experience	22
Quality and Standards of the Programme	23
Programme Structure	23
Assessment	24
Regulatory and Technical Compliance	24
Student Support and Guidance	25
Programme Management	25
Agenda for University Approval Events	26
Outcomes of University Approval Event	27
Process Post University Approval Event	27
Publicity for and Marketing of New Programmes	28
Part 2: Approval of New Credit-Bearing Courses	28
Part 3: Approval of Northeastern University (NU) Programmes or Courses (excluding double degrees)	29
NU Programmes and Courses	29
Transition to UK Regulations and Frameworks	29
Procedure for Approval of NU Programmes	30
Development of Programme Documentation	30
External Subject Expertise	31
Approval Procedure	32
Criteria for the Approval of NU Programmes	32
Outcomes of Programme Approval Procedure	32
Process Post Programme Approval Procedure	32
Approval of NU Courses	33

Development of Course Descriptors	33
Approval Procedure	33
Outcome of the Course Approval Procedure	33
Process Post Course Approval Procedure	34
Part 4: Programme and Course Modifications	34
Modifications to Programmes and Courses	34
Consideration and Approval of Programme and Course Modification Proposals	34
Drivers for Modifications to Programmes and Courses	35
Framework for Modifications to Programmes and Courses	36
Timescales of Programme and Course Modifications	37
Categories of Modification	37
Approval of Course and Programme Modifications	38
Within-Session Modifications	39
Informing the University of Modification Approval	39
Version Control of Core Documentation	39
Appendix A: New Programme Approval Procedure Summary	40
Appendix B: Programme and Course Modification Procedure Summary	41
Appendix C: Modifications and Indicative Category	42
Category 1: Documentary Updates	42
Category 2: Minor Modifications	42
Category 3: Major Modifications	43
Version History	45

Introduction

1. This section of the Academic Quality Framework details the procedures that the University uses to design, develop and approve new awards, taught programmes and courses by Northeastern University London (the University). It also details how modifications may be made to such programmes and courses following approval, and aims to meet the following UK Quality Code theme: Course Design and Development:
“Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student’s achievement to be reliably assessed.”
2. Faculty at the University are required to review all programmes and courses on an annual basis as part of the annual monitoring and reporting procedures. This provides faculty with the opportunity to evaluate the quality and standards of the University’s taught provision and stimulate curriculum development. The development of new programmes and modifications to existing programmes, that may arise from annual monitoring, involves external peer review and consultations, thereby ensuring that practices and experiences of external peers are utilised and considered.
3. The overall aims of programme and course approval, review and modification are:
 - 3.1. To assure all stakeholders of the University and the public of the quality and standards of the University’s taught provision.
 - 3.2. To ensure that the University secures the highest academic standards and educational experience for its students.
 - 3.3. To ensure that the University offering remains current, attractive to prospective students and meets the strategic aim of the University.

New Awards

4. The University’s procedure for approving a new award is ratified by Academic Board.

Responsibilities Regarding Award Approval

5. Generally, the primary responsibility for new awards rests with the Deputy Dean & Associate Dean, Innovation & Enterprise, Faculty Director, Course Leaders, and faculty.

6. Academic and corporate committees also have roles in the review and approval of proposals.

Drivers for New Awards

7. The University's award portfolio evolves over time in response to a number of drivers including:
 - 7.1. Alignment with the Teaching and Learning, and Assessment Strategies.
 - 7.2. Intrinsic academic merit and intellectual enhancement.
 - 7.3. Securing entry into new subject areas.
 - 7.4. Entry into new subject areas through a collaborative partnership.
 - 7.5. Evidence of demand in student markets.
 - 7.6. Developments in academic strategies.
 - 7.7. The identification of new areas through staff research and enterprise.
 - 7.8. Demand from employers or professional bodies.
 - 7.9. Feedback from students, faculty, employers and External Examiners.
 - 7.10. Opportunities or threats from competitor providers.
 - 7.11. Changes in patterns of student progression.
 - 7.12. Changes in government policy.
8. In addition to responding to the above, and to ensure that the University's provision remains current and attractive to prospective students, new awards should also meet at least one of the following criteria within the resource capacity of the University:
 - 8.1. Attract viable new cohorts of students to the University.
 - 8.2. Increase the progression opportunities for students at the University including progression to postgraduate studies.

Framework for New Award Approvals Overview

9. Each proposal for a new award requires significant research and development, as well as detailed criteria to guide the approval procedure. The approval procedure is rigorous to assure the quality of the proposed provision.

10. It must be coherent and consistent with the University's strategy and must make business sense in terms of market demand, income generated, and the resources required to run it.
11. All proposals must consider relevant external inputs, including Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ), Subject Benchmark Statements (SBS) and the requirement of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) where applicable.
12. New awards are assessed against criteria in areas including strategic fit and viability, quality and standards, assessment, staffing, and learning resources.

Timescales for New Award Approvals

13. It is expected that the new award is approved prior to any new programme being proposed using the new award. New programmes should not begin their approval procedure until the new award has been approved and confirmed.

New Award Approval Process

14. The proposal of a new award must be reviewed by the Executive Committee (ExCo) and Northeastern London Board.
15. The award proposer should complete a New Award Proposal Form, to ensure the addition of a new award is in line with the University's strategic aim and is financially viable.
16. The proposal must be tabled at Faculty/Apprenticeship Team Meetings. This will enable the Proposer to update the Faculty/Team on the progression of the new award, and provide meeting members, including students, the opportunity to provide feedback.
17. The documentation is considered at ExCo, where there is a detailed scrutiny of the proposed award, focusing on the criteria listed above - see the Drivers listed in [Drivers for New Awards](#). ExCo can make the following decisions:
 - 17.1. Recommend that the proposed award proceed to Northeastern London Board for review/approval. ExCo can impose conditions, such as minor revisions to the document. If such conditions are imposed, these must be completed and approved by the Chair of ExCo before the proposed award is presented to Northeastern London Board.
 - 17.2. Advise the award proposer that the document(s) require(s) significant revisions. Detailed feedback will be provided, and the proposed award can be tabled again at ExCo.

- 17.3. Advise the award proposer that the proposal is not viable, and approval is not granted.
18. When approval to proceed has been awarded by ExCo, the award proposal will be added to the Northeastern London Board agenda. The New Award Proposal Form will be submitted to the Secretary of Northeastern London Board.
19. Northeastern London Board will review all the documentation submitted. This includes viability of the award, as well as market analysis of similar awards available in the sector. The Award Proposer is responsible for producing this documentation and ensuring it is included in the submission. The Award Proposer must work in conjunction relevant staff to ensure accurate data is clearly presented.

Table 1 Approval in Principle of the New Award Roles and Responsibilities

Approval in Principle of the New Award	Responsibility
For each award proposed, a New Award Proposal Form; New Taught Programme Approval: Academic Registrar; and Head of Quality Assurance.	Award Proposer
Initial scoping of the proposal documentation, prior to submission to Northeastern London Board, with the possible outcomes: Recommend proposal proceeds to Northeastern London Board, with or without conditions. Required revision of documentation for resubmission to ExCo. Proposal approval not granted.	ExCo
Consideration of the New Award Proposal Form to confirm that the award fits with the University's strategies, with the following possible outcomes: Approval to progress to development stage. Approval subject to recommended changes/further actions Approval of the proposal is not granted (or may be recommended for re-submission at a later date).	Northeastern London Board
Notify the Award Proposer and Head of Quality Assurance of the outcome of the Northeastern London Board's review of the new programme proposal.	Secretary to Northeastern London Board

If successful, the proposal should proceed to the development stage.	Head of Quality Assurance
--	---------------------------

Award Development

20. The Award development stage of the process will normally involve a range of activities to ensure that all academic areas and issues are addressed. These will include the consideration of internal and external benchmarks - namely the FHEQ, consultation with Marketing, Admissions, Finance, Human Resources, and Academic Services and other relevant staff, and consultation with students.

Award Approval

21. The Award will proceed to Academic Board for final approval.

Designing New Programmes and Courses

22. The design of new programmes takes a significant amount of research and development, and it is supported by consultation within the University (involving faculty, professional staff, students, and employers) and through engagement with external advisers.
23. The design phase culminates in University Approval Events (UAE) which are based on the peer review of documentation and meetings with staff, students and industry experts. These events enable the University to evaluate the academic strength, standards, quality, appeal and viability of the provision in detail.

Programme and Course Titles

24. When proposing new programmes and/or courses, documents should be prepared following these conventions:
 - 24.1. Use 'and' instead of an ampersand (&).
 - 24.2. Use full phrases instead of using abbreviations e.g., artificial intelligence instead of AI.
 - 24.3. Course titles showing Centuries to be written either:
 - 24.3.1. suffixed with 'Centuries', e.g., 19th. - 20th. Centuries, or
 - 24.3.2. shown as dates e.g., 1800-2000
 - 24.4. Course titles to be limited to a maximum of 80 characters without the reduction of grammatical consistency.

Modifying Existing Programmes and Courses

25. Modifications to existing programmes and courses may be made between programme approval and Periodic Review points to enhance provision. This may be instigated by student, employer or External Examiner feedback, or changes to sector or PSRB requirements.
26. The modification procedures involve consultation and peer review to a depth which is proportionate to the level of the proposed modification(s).

'Directed Study' Courses

27. Discipline focused and Interdisciplinary 'Directed Study' courses are offered as electives to students studying the undergraduate double degree programmes at the University. These courses are designed to provide students with an opportunity to undertake in-depth work on an agreed challenge, figure, or topic, under the guidance of an assigned faculty tutor. It has its own syllabus and online learning resources, including detailed guidance, rubrics, and structured assignments to facilitate progress. The challenge, figure, or topic will typically be drawn from another course, the syllabus and learning resources for which are available to the student to orientate and provide context for their study.
28. Due diligence for these courses must be completed by the end of September for implementation the following year.
29. Due diligence for the 'Directed Study' courses consists of:
 - 29.1. External consultation.
 - 29.2. Syllabus approval.
 - 29.3. Clear and coherent rationale.
 - 29.4. Maintenance of academic standards.
 - 29.5. Assessment approval.
30. The 'Topic' or 'Topics' must be approved by the Head of Discipline(s) and endorsed by the Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning and the Head of Quality Assurance.

'Special Topics' Courses

31. Discipline focused and Interdisciplinary 'Special Topics' courses are offered as electives to students studying the undergraduate double degree programmes at the University. These courses are designed to

- provide opportunities for students to address advanced material in emerging special interest topic areas not represented in the main curriculum. The special topics made available from time to time will be informed by factors such as emerging global trends, faculty research, and student interest.
32. Although the learning outcomes and assessment types for this course are fixed, they are designed to apply to a wide range of different topic areas that may be addressed within the discipline (and at intersections with other disciplines, where relevant).
 33. Due diligence for these courses must be completed by the end of September for implementation the following academic year.
 34. The criteria for approving Special Topics courses are:
 - 34.1. External consultation procedure completed.
 - 34.2. Syllabus approved.
 - 34.3. Clear and coherent rationale.
 - 34.4. Maintenance of academic standards.
 - 34.5. Assessment approval.
 35. The 'Topic' must be approved by the Head of Discipline(s) and endorsed by the Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning and the Head of Quality Assurance.

Programme and Course Approval and Modification Procedures

36. The University's procedures for approving and modifying programmes and courses are all ratified by Academic Board and are designed to adhere to the relevant Expectations and Practices as detailed in the UK Quality Code.
37. Academic Board delegates the responsibility of new programme approval scrutiny to the University Approval Panel (the Panel). See [University Approval Panel Membership](#) for further details.
38. The overall aims of programme approval and modification procedures are to ensure that:
 - 38.1. The University maintains strategic oversight of the procedures for the development and approval of programmes.
 - 38.2. Programmes are strategically and academically appropriate, and are developed in line with the University's Mission, Strategic Plan and Academic Regulations.

- 38.3. The University approves programmes that meet the appropriate quality and academic standards as defined by the University, the UK Quality Code, relevant Degree Apprenticeship standards, and expectations of relevant PSRBs.
- 38.4. Learning and other resources are adequate and available to support programme delivery and students.
- 38.5. The programme learning environment is fit for purpose.
- 38.6. New programme proposals are designed and developed appropriately according to the prescribed criteria and decision-making procedures.
- 38.7. Programmes are coherent and provide students with a developmental educational experience.
- 38.8. Quality and standards of teaching and assessment of the programme are in line with national practice and will be continuously enhanced.
- 38.9. The responsibility for academic ownership and quality management of programmes by the Faculty, teaching teams and other University departments are clearly communicated and acknowledged.
- 38.10. Programmes have prepared students sufficiently to enable them to meet employer expectations as appropriate.
- 38.11. External reference points and expertise are drawn upon to maintain and enhance quality standards regarding current developments and practices outside the University environment.
- 38.12. Students, faculty, employers and professional staff are appropriately involved in the design, development and approval of programmes.
- 38.13. Appropriate External Examiner appointments for new programmes are considered by the Teaching, Learning and Enhancement Committee and recommended for approval by Academic Board.

Responsibilities Regarding Programme and Course Approval and Modification

- 39. Generally, the primary responsibility for programme and course development, approval and modification rests with the Deputy Dean &

Associate Dean, Innovation & Enterprise, Faculty Director, Course Leaders, and faculty.

40. The Quality Team provides procedural support and monitors the completion of the required approval and modification stages.
41. Academic and corporate committees also have roles in the review and approval of proposals. Further details about specific responsibilities are contained in this document in the sub-sections below.
42. Programme approval and modification procedures are monitored by Academic Board, ensuring that they are followed appropriately and remain effective.

The Length of Time for which Programmes and Courses are Approved

43. Programmes and courses are normally approved for five years unless otherwise specified at the approval event, or until the next Periodic Review point, whichever occurs sooner.
44. Where a single programme is recommended for Periodic Review on the basis of substantial proposed changes or concerns, this will be considered and recorded as an 'approval' event and the programme approval process will apply.
45. Where a course has not been delivered for three consecutive academic years, the Course Leader and/or the Faculty Director must, as part of the annual monitoring and reporting procedure ([AQF5: Annual Monitoring and Reporting](#)), justify either keeping the course on or retiring the course from the University Course List.

Alignment with the UK Quality Code

46. Programme and course approval procedures are developed and operated at the University in line with the external body requirements and adhere to the UK Quality Code's theme: Course Design and Development, Expectation for Quality that:

"Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed."

Alignment with the Degree Apprenticeship Standard

47. Programme and course approval procedures are developed and operated at the University in line with the external body requirements and adhere to UK Degree Apprenticeship Standard.

Part 1: Programme Approval

Drivers for New Programme Development

48. The University's portfolio of taught programmes is regularly reviewed in order to maintain and enhance academic quality and standards. Programme portfolios evolve over time in response to a number of drivers including:
 - 48.1. Alignment with the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Strategy.
 - 48.2. Intrinsic academic merit and intellectual enhancement.
 - 48.3. The gradual development of existing programmes.
 - 48.4. Securing entry into new subject areas.
 - 48.5. Entry into new subject areas through a collaborative partnership.
 - 48.6. Evidence of demand in student markets.
 - 48.7. Developments in academic strategies.
 - 48.8. The identification of new areas through staff research and enterprise.
 - 48.9. Demand from employers or professional bodies.
 - 48.10. Feedback from students, faculty, employers and External Examiners.
 - 48.11. Opportunities or threats from competitor providers.
 - 48.12. Changes in patterns of student progression.
 - 48.13. Changes in government policy.
49. In addition to responding to the above, and to ensure that the University's taught provision remains current and attractive to prospective students, new programmes proposed for development should also meet at least one of the following criteria within the resource capacity of the University:
 - 49.1. Attract viable new cohorts of students to the programme.
 - 49.2. Increase the conversion of applicants and prospective applicants to registered students on existing programmes.

49.3. Increase the progression opportunities for students at the University including progression to postgraduate studies.

49.4. Includes a more effective and sustainable use of University expertise on existing programmes.

Framework for New Programme Approvals

50. Programme design and approval procedures are developed and operate in line with external body requirements, SBS (when relevant), Degree Apprenticeship Standards, and the UK Quality Code.
51. Each new programme proposal requires significant research and development, as well as detailed criteria to guide the approval procedure. The approval procedure is rigorous to assure the quality of the proposed provision.
52. Development of the programme portfolio must be coherent and consistent with the University's strategy and must make business sense in terms of market demand, income generated, and the resources required to run the programme.
53. All proposals must consider relevant external inputs, including SBS and the requirement of PSRB where applicable.
54. New programmes are assessed against criteria in areas including strategic fit and viability, quality and standards, assessment, staffing, and learning resources.

Timescales of the Programme Approval Process

55. The expected timeframe for the approval of a new programme is 18 months from initial programme development to delivery.
 - 55.1. Stage 1: 'Approval of New Programme in Principle' will normally take place six months prior to Stage 2
 - 55.2. Stage 2: 'Approval of New Programme Content' will normally take place 12 months before the programme starts.
56. The required programme approval documentation should be submitted to the Quality Team at least three weeks prior to each approval event.

New Programme Approval Process Overview

57. The approval process for new programmes is divided into two main stages: Stage 1 and Stage 2.

Stage 1: Approval of New Programme in Principle Overview

58. This procedure determines whether the proposed programme will:
 - 58.1. Align with the University's strategic objectives.

- 58.2. Demonstrate the academic case.
- 58.3. Demonstrate market demand and financial viability.
- 58.4. Demonstrate that resources have been reviewed.
- 59. This stage normally consists of the Faculty identifying a Programme Proposer (the member of faculty who will lead and be responsible for the development of the programme and progressing the programme through the programme approval procedure), and drafting the relevant documentation. The Faculty will be involved in the development of the new programme through consultations at Faculty meetings prior to it being submitted to the Quality Team for Executive Committee (ExCo) and Northeastern London Board review.
- 60. If it is deemed to meet each of the criteria above, the proposal should progress to the programme development stage.

Stage 2: Approval of New Programme Content Overview

- 61. This stage normally consists of the following:
 - 61.1. Programme content development – this process happens within the Faculty (leading on the programme for collaborative programmes). The required documentation is developed, reviewed and revised accordingly. External advisers are recommended throughout this process. A formal scrutiny of the documentation will be held within the Faculty prior to the proposal progressing. Where the programme is approved to be a ‘double degree’ with Northeastern University (NU), the University faculty will collaborate with NU faculty to produce programme documentation compliant with both English and US regulations.
 - 61.2. Approval in detail – This is the UAE where the Panel is satisfied with the programme and recommends approval of the new programme to Academic Board. If it is deemed that the programme requires further revisions, the Panel can refer to the programme and the Panel can reconvene at a later date.
 - 61.2.1. For double degree programmes, the relevant NU College committee must have approved the programme documentation prior to the UAE.
 - 61.3. Formal Approval – Academic Board has the final approval (ratification) of all new programmes.
 - 61.4. Post ratification– The programme documentation for the new programme is submitted to the Quality Team. The Quality Team is then responsible for sharing the documentation with

Academic Services and the Marketing, Admissions, Recruitment, and Visa teams. An External Examiner is nominated by the Faculty Director.

62. The New Programme Approval procedure can be seen in Appendix A.

Stage 1: Approval of New Programme in Principle

63. 'Approval in Principle' stage is the scrutiny of the business case for the proposed programme. This is completed in two phases.
64. For double degree programmes, where the University and NU have agreed at a strategic leadership level to proceed with a new programme or portfolio of programmes, it is considered by the University that 'Approval in Principle' has already been granted and this stage of the programme approval procedure is redundant. The procedure to approve these new programmes can commence at Stage 2: Approval of Content.
65. The nominated Programme Proposer should complete an Approval in Principle: New Taught Programme Proposal Form 1 (NPP1) in addition to the New Taught Programme Approval: General Resources Form and the Financial Model Form, to ensure that the development of the programme is in line with the University's strategic aims and is financially viable. The proposal must be tabled regularly at Faculty team meetings. This will enable the Programme Proposer to update the Faculty on the progression of the design of the new programme, and provide meeting members, including students, the opportunity to provide feedback.
66. The documentation is considered at ExCo, where there is a detailed scrutiny of the proposed programme, focusing on the criteria listed under Stage 1 in [Criteria for the Approval of New Programmes](#). ExCo can make the following decisions:
- 66.1. Recommend that the proposed programme proceed to Northeastern London Board for review/approval. ExCo can impose conditions, such as minor revisions to the document. If such conditions are imposed, these must be completed and approved by the Chair of ExCo before the proposed programme is presented to Northeastern London Board.
 - 66.2. Advise the Programme Proposer that NPP1 and/or associated document requires significant revisions. Detailed feedback will be provided, and the proposed programme can be tabled again at ExCo.
 - 66.3. Advise the Programme Proposer that the proposal is not viable, and approval is not granted.

67. When approval to proceed has been awarded by ExCo, the programme proposal will be added to the Northeastern London Board agenda. NPP1 and associated documentation will be submitted to the Secretary of Northeastern London Board.
68. Northeastern London Board will review all the documentation submitted. This includes financial projections for the viability of the programme, as well as information about resource requirements such as teaching staff costs, programme fees, and projected student numbers. The Programme Proposer is responsible for producing this documentation and ensuring it is included in the submission. The Programme Proposer must work in conjunction with the Director of Finance and Director of Resourcing and Operations to ensure as accurate as possible projections are made.
69. Table 2 identifies tasks and individual/committee responsibilities for each Approval in Principle application.

Table 2 Approval in Principle of New Taught Programme Roles and Responsibilities

Approval in Principle of the New Taught Programme Proposal Task	Responsibility
For each programme proposed, an Approval in Principle: New Taught Programme Proposal Form 1 (NPP1); New Taught Programme Approval: General Resources Form; Go to Market Form and Financial Model Form are completed in liaison with Director of Resourcing and Operations; Director of Finance; Director of Academic Services; Director of Marketing and Head of Quality Assurance.	Programme Proposer
Initial scoping of the proposal documentation, prior to submission to Northeastern London Board, with the possible outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recommend proposal proceeds to Northeastern London Board, with or without conditions. ● Required revision of documentation for resubmission to ExCo. ● Proposal approval not granted. 	ExCo
Consideration of the New Taught Programme Proposal Form 1 to confirm that the programme fits with the University's strategies, with the following possible outcomes:	Northeastern London Board

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approval to progress to programme development stage. ● Approval to progress to the programme development stage subject to recommended changes/further actions. ● Approval of the proposal is not granted (or may be recommended for re-submission at a later date). 	
<p>Notify the Programme Proposer and Head of Quality Assurance of the outcome of the Northeastern London Board's review of the new programme proposal.</p>	<p>Secretary to Northeastern London Board</p>
<p>If Stage 1 is successful, notify Academic Board and Director of Admissions, Marketing, Recruitment and Visa, that the new programme proposal has progressed to the programme development stage.</p>	<p>Head of Quality Assurance</p>

Stage 2: Approval of New Programme Content

70. The following stages of the approval of new programme content are documented below:
- 70.1. Programme Development.
 - 70.2. Development of the new programme proposal documentation.
 - 70.3. Nomination of the External Panel Member (EPM) for the Panel.
 - 70.4. Nomination of External Examiner.
 - 70.5. Ongoing Faculty review.
 - 70.6. The Panel.
 - 70.7. Academic Board ratification.

Programme Development

71. The programme development stage of the process will normally involve a range of activities to ensure that all academic areas and issues are addressed. These will include the consideration of internal and external benchmarks, consultation with Marketing, Admissions, Finance, Human Resources, and Academic Services and other relevant staff, and consultation with students (at Faculty Meetings and/or electronically).
72. Where areas within a programme are developed, discussions programme proposer and Faculty Director should also take place to ensure that

efficiency and effectiveness of design and effective internal and external communications and involvement are considered.

73. Where the programme is a double degree programme, the collaboration between University and NU faculty is central to the programme mapping and development.
74. Programme approval documentation should also be developed during this stage of the approval procedure, as detailed below.

Development of New Programme Proposal Documentation

75. Responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of programme approval documentation rests with the Programme Proposer. Support is available from the Quality Team.
76. Version control procedures should be used when completing programme approval documentation. Support is available from the Quality Team.
77. Programme approval documentation should be produced using the referenced forms and templates provided by the Quality Team.
78. Programme approval documentation that is normally required is listed in Table 3.

Table 3 Required Programme Approval Documents

Required Programme Approval Document	Document Description
Application for New Taught Programme Form 2 (NPP2)	This form provides the detail of the programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Programme content, design and delivery ● Teaching, Learning and Assessment ● Programme Management ● Exemption from University Regulations requests
New Taught Programme Approval	This form is completed once the Approval in Principle has been granted and the programme can be marketed 'subject to approval'.
Programme Specification	One Programme Specification should be produced for each programme. The Programme Specification provides essential information about the programme. The Programme Specification should be written with students as the intended audience.

	<p>It is important that all sections of the Programme Specification are accurate and completed in full.</p> <p>The Programme Specification is normally published on the University's website to provide prospective students with information about the programme.</p>
Course Descriptors	<p>One Course Descriptor should be produced for each course of the programme.</p> <p>Course Descriptors provide essential information about specific courses.</p> <p>Course Descriptors should be written with the students as the intended audience.</p> <p>It is important that all sections of the Course Descriptors are accurate and completed in full.</p> <p>The Course Descriptor is normally published on the University's website to provide prospective students with information about the programme.</p>
External Examiner Nomination Form	<p>If a new External Examiner is required for the new programme, the Programme Proposer should work with the Faculty to provide the name of an External Examiner.</p> <p>Reference should be made to AQF11 External Examining and the criteria for the nomination of a new External Examiner.</p>

Nomination of External Panel Member

79. The Programme Proposer will be required to nominate an EPM, who should not have been:
 - 79.1. An External Examiner or member of staff at the University within the last three years.
 - 79.2. Involved in the development of the programme or courses.
 - 79.3. Collaborated with relevant faculty, either on a research or teaching learning project within the past three years.
80. It is the responsibility of the Programme Proposer to ensure that the EPM Nomination Form and their nominee's CV are endorsed and signed off by the Faculty Director and then submitted to the Quality Team no later than three months prior to the UAE. For further information on the EPM please refer to the [External Panel Member Policy](#).

81. The Head of Quality Assurance will confirm acceptance of the nominations to the Programme Proposer.
82. The Quality Team will be responsible for liaising with the nominated EPM regarding the arrangements and logistics of the UAE.
83. Any proposed change to an EPM will require approval by the Head of Quality Assurance.

Faculty Review

84. This review of the new programme is normally held at regular intervals to support the Programme Proposer in the development of the programme and preparation of the documentation. The purpose of this is to assure that all submitted programme approval documentation is of high quality and provides the Programme Proposer with recommendations and opportunities to enhance their programme prior to the UAE.
85. The Faculty should:
 - 85.1. Review all the programme approval documentation.
 - 85.2. Contribute to discussions and decision-making as required of its role.
 - 85.3. Consider the new programme in accordance with the stipulated criteria for approval of new programmes.
86. The Faculty Director should formally support the submission of the new programme documentation, and this must be recorded at the Faculty meeting prior to submission.

University Approval Event

87. This is organised by the Quality Team. The Panel's role is to review the programme design and documentation against the criteria set out in [Criteria for the Approval of New Programmes](#) and make recommendations to Academic Board.

University Approval Panel Membership

88. Each Panel will normally consist of at a minimum:
 - 88.1. Dean (Chair) or appointed replacement.
 - 88.2. Academic Registrar or appointed replacement.
 - 88.3. One Faculty Director not related to the new subject under approval, r and the External Examiner.
 - 88.4. One Student Panel Members, appropriate to the programme being proposed. Where there is a postgraduate programme in the Faculty of the same subject, a postgraduate student should be included.

88.5. One independent EPM from another higher education institution, appropriate to the programme being proposed.

88.6. A member of the Quality Team (Secretary).

89. The remit of the Panel is to scrutinise the documentation, question the Programme Proposer and relevant faculty, come to a conclusion, and determine any conditions and/or recommendations.
90. It is expected that the individual Panel members will review the proposed programme documentation prior to the event. Normally, Panel members will be expected to attend the event, but attendance can be via virtual methods if required.
91. The Head of Quality Assurance is responsible for the organisation of the event and the circulation of the documentation and may sit in during the Panel meeting to assure the process is consistent and fair.
92. The Chair is responsible for overseeing the event itself and ensuring a thorough review of the programme materials is conducted, in order to recommend the approval or non-approval of the programme.

Criteria for the Approval of New Programmes

Quality of the Learning Experience

93. The proposed programme provides students with a coherent and developmental educational experience.
94. The design and organisation of the curriculum are effective in promoting student learning and creating conditions for the learning outcomes to be achieved.
95. The programme documentation is clear and conforms with the University's regulations, such that students, faculty and professional staff would know what is expected of them.
96. The learning outcomes relate appropriately to the relevant internal and external reference points and aims of the provision.
97. The graduate/postgraduate outcomes for students represent a good return on their investment.
98. Engagement with relevant employers and/or professional bodies throughout the programme is sufficient to confirm that the student experience is informed by current and contemporary practice.
99. The expectations of students, employers and other relevant professional bodies have been considered within the programme development procedures.

100. The provision is consistent with the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy, and promotes an inclusive environment for learning by anticipating the varied requirements of learners (for example, because of a declared disability, specific cultural background, location or age), and aims to ensure that all students have equal access to educational opportunities.

Quality and Standards of the Programme

101. The aims and objectives of the provision are consistent with the University's educational aims and objectives.
102. There is a balance of academic, practical and personal development elements.
103. There is a robust logical and intellectual coherence to the programme ensuring a high-level experience for students, which is clearly related to the programme aims and learning outcomes.
104. The proposed programme complies with the University's academic regulations, unless a variation to these regulations is proposed and detailed within the approval documentation (e.g., on the recognition of prior learning, admissions, etc.).
105. The University's policies on the design of programmes and courses have been met.
106. The programme has been appropriately aligned with the UK Quality Code, including the FHEQ.
107. Relevant external reference points, including QAA SBSs, Degree Apprenticeship Standards and appropriate industry/professional standards, have been considered and addressed appropriately within the development procedure.
108. The research and scholarly activity of the faculty is sufficient to maintain the standards of provision and enrich the curriculum with contemporary developments in the subject, particularly to underpin work at FHEQ.
109. The learning outcomes for the programme, and the standards that will be achieved, are appropriate to the level of the proposed award and title, and are appropriately distinct from any other award and/or titles offered or already proposed for approval.
110. There are opportunities for academic progression to and from the proposed programme, with entry and exit requirements in line with the University's policies and regulations.

Programme Structure

111. The curriculum and learning outcomes match the rationale for the programme.
112. The educational rationale is sound and the curriculum is coherent, with clear progression in the subject matter.
113. The increasing demands on the learners as they progress through the levels of the programme are clearly articulated.
114. The teaching methods are appropriate to the curriculum, and the learning outcomes reflect the educational aims of the programme.
115. The programme is balanced in terms of subject specialism and skill development.
116. There is sufficient evidence that the curriculum and programme design have been informed by current thinking within its discipline, by recent developments in learning and teaching, enterprise and advanced professional practice of faculty.
117. The programme structure takes into account the entitlements of students with diverse characteristics, including ensuring that the learning outcomes, learning and teaching activities, learning environment, and planned assessment methods do not create unnecessary barriers.
118. There is evidence that the quality of teaching and standards of assessment in the subject are likely to be consistent with national practice.

Assessment

119. The [Teaching and Learning Strategy](#), and a variety and balance of assessment methods employed will effectively enable and support student learning, the achievement of the learning outcomes, and will promote inclusive practice.
120. The learning outcomes are tested through the assessment process.
121. The [Assessment Strategy](#) is clear, with students exposed to appropriate methods of assessment for the subject.
122. Individual assessments within courses are clearly identified and provide an effective measurement of performance, with an acceptable and balanced overall student experience.
123. University policies and procedures associated with assessment management are recognised and met.
124. Assessment practices are inclusive and equitable, and the methods, tasks and procedures do not advantage or disadvantage any group or individual.

Regulatory and Technical Compliance

125. The programme does not contain any elements or procedures at variance with the University's academic regulations, other than any exceptions for which approval is explicitly sought during the approval procedure. The Programme Proposer will need to have completed the Variance to Academic Regulations Form with the programme documentation for the Panel to review and approve at the UAE.
126. The University's policies and procedures are applied consistently, or identified and justified as variations.
127. University expectations in respect of academic provision and its delivery are met in full.
128. Any relevant PSRB requirements and Degree Apprenticeship standards are met and aligned appropriately with the University's requirements and expectations.
129. External requirements relevant to the provision are met.
130. The programme complies with the University's [Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy](#).

Student Support and Guidance

131. Student support and guidance (excluding standard University support systems):
 - 131.1. Arrangements are in place for support required by particular groups of students (e.g., overseas), and provision is made for students from diverse backgrounds and/or educational experience, and students with a range of characteristics including protected characteristics.
 - 131.2. Induction arrangements are appropriate to any specific programme features.
 - 131.3. Support is available, from the Academic Advising team to students in respect of any critical programme-related choices or decisions (e.g., course options).
 - 131.4. There are appropriate opportunities for, and sound arrangements in place, for the management of work related learning, mentoring, projects, etc.

Programme Management

132. There are procedures in place for the management of quality assurance procedures, such as the appointment and reporting of External Examiners, annual monitoring, and programme review.

133. The Faculty understands the responsibilities in respect of the management of student learning opportunities with regard to teaching, learning and assessment procedures and learning resources.

134. There are appropriate mechanisms in place for obtaining and responding to student feedback on the programme and the student experience.

Agenda for University Approval Events

135. The indicative agenda, below, may be adapted as necessary:

Table 4 Sample Agenda for University Approval Events

Time	Agenda Item and Areas for Discussion	Individuals Involved
10.00	Private meeting of the Panel to discuss the format for the day and lines of enquiry.	Panel
10.30	Meeting with senior staff to discuss how the programme fits with institutional and faculty strategic aims, staffing, resourcing and staff development.	Panel Faculty Director
11.30	Private meeting of Panel to consider comments made by Programme Management Team in the light of the next meeting.	Panel
12.00	Meeting with the Faculty to discuss the structure, curriculum, delivery, assessment, pedagogic and operational issues of the proposed programme, and especially the relationship to the QAA Benchmarks and the University's Academic Regulations. This meeting should include all the staff who will deliver the programme together with Academic Services representatives.	Panel Programme Proposer Faculty Director/Course Leaders and other faculty
13.30	Lunch: private meeting of the Panel, or meeting with students on cognate programmes.	Panel Students
14.30	Tour of the facilities, if required	Panel Faculty Director

Time	Agenda Item and Areas for Discussion	Individuals Involved
15.30	Provisional feedback to the Faculty	Panel Programme Proposer Faculty Director/Course Leaders and other faculty

Outcomes of University Approval Event

136. The Panel may select:

- 136.1. Approval with no conditions or recommendations and endorsing the programme to Academic Board for final ratification.
- 136.2. Approval with conditions to be met, to be signed off by the UAE Chair, prior to recommending the programme to Academic Board for final ratification.
- 136.3. In addition to Approval with conditions, the panel can add some recommendations to the Programme Proposer. These recommendations must be monitored through the programme management structure, updating progress to TLEC with escalation to Academic Board if required.
 - 136.3.1. Advisable - this is where the panel considers that there could be the potential to put quality and standards at risk which requires monitoring and reporting, with potential subsequent review.
 - 136.3.2. Desirable - is where the panel sees future propositions to enhance the programme which the programme proposer should explore and discuss at programme management level.
- 136.4. Suspension of the process with conditions or recommendations.
- 136.5. Non-approval, with feedback.

Process Post University Approval Event

- 137. The outcome of the UAE will be recorded at a subsequent Academic Board, and the Chair of the Panel will confirm that the conditions have been met and/or recommendations have been reviewed and modifications have been made.

138. The Head of Quality Assurance is responsible for informing the departments within the University on the outcome of the programme approval procedure, such as Marketing, Recruitment, Admissions, Visa and Academic Services.
139. For double degrees, if any modifications are required or proposed by NU after the UAE, the Head of Quality Assurance will collaborate with the Chair of the Panel to review the modifications. All required or proposed modifications should be recorded, and outcomes noted. If the modifications call into question the programme's compliance with the University's academic regulations or UK external regulations, the EPM could be recalled to review the modifications. If necessary, the approval of the proposed programme can be suspended by the Chair until such complications are resolved.

Publicity for and Marketing of New Programmes

140. In line with the UK Quality Code and the Competition and Markets Authority and all the guidance relating to publicly available information about higher education provision, the University works to ensure the accuracy of the public information.
141. Information presented through the University's public website is verified as accurate by the Faculty Director in conjunction with the Quality Team, following approval of the programme.
142. Where a new provision is being developed, the programme may only be advertised formally once the programme has been ratified by Academic Board. Prior to this point the programme can only be marketed as 'subject to approval' after approval from Stage 1 has been granted. Following confirmation from the Head of Quality Assurance that conditions and/or recommendations have been met and final ratification has been gained, this caveat may be removed.

Part 2: Approval of New Credit-Bearing Courses

143. New credit-bearing courses, credit rated in multiples of 5 (i.e., 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30, with a 30-credit course being the maximum size of a single course), at levels 4-7, can be approved by applying this procedure. It should be noted that normally courses are rated as 15-credits. A clear rationale will need to be submitted to request a deviation to this norm.
144. Course Descriptors should be prepared in accordance with the University's template and an appropriate External Examiner should be consulted to ensure that the proposed course will be comparable with other courses in terms of standards and quality of the student learning

experience. Student consultation should also be undertaken via Faculty meetings.

145. Where new courses will form part of an existing programme structure, this will be dealt with as a programme modification, and will need to also meet the requirements as set out below.
146. The following criteria will be used in deciding whether to approve the new courses:
 - 146.1. Clear and coherent rationale for the new course.
 - 146.2. Documentation is correct and consultation process completed.
 - 146.3. Appropriate learning outcomes, assessment, and content for credit value and level.

Part 3: Approval of Northeastern University (NU) Programmes or Courses (excluding double degrees)

NU Programmes and Courses

147. The University is developing its portfolio of programmes and courses to support its important role as NU's London Campus, a central part of NU's global university system and student mobility programmes.
148. NU has a robust accreditation procedure for the approval of its own programmes and courses. It is therefore deemed acceptable to modify the new programme and course procedure outlined in Part 1 of this AQF chapter (above) when the University is approving established NU's programmes and/or courses. Where the direction comes from Northeastern London Board to develop and approve programmes and courses.

Transition to UK Regulations and Frameworks

149. UK approved programmes have to meet the expectations of the UK Quality Code, and the key expectations are:
 - 149.1. To meet the FHEQ and SBS.
 - 149.2. The value of qualification in-line with UK sector standards.
 - 149.3. The inclusion of external expertise for alignment with UK sector standards.

- 149.4. Resource qualified faculty, facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality student experience.

Procedure for Approval of NU Programmes

150. There are two streams of approval that are required, which can be done synchronously:

Table 5 Approval Streams

Resource Planning/Approval	Academic Content Approval
Teaching location	Programme specifications
Recruitment of sufficiently qualified faculty	Course descriptors
Student accommodation	Mapping to FHEQ & SBS
Student route visa allocation	
Approved by Northeastern London Board	Approved by Academic Board

Development of Programme Documentation

151. Responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the programme documentation rests with the Programme Proposer. A designated Quality Team member will be assigned to support them in the development of the programme documentation.
152. Programme approval documentation should be produced using the templates provided by the Quality Team.
153. The programme documentation required for the approval of NU programmes is listed in the table below:

Table 6 Required Programme Approval Documents for NU Programmes

Required Programme Approval Documents	Document Description
Programme Specification	One Programme Specification should be produced for each programme. The Programme Specification provides essential information about the programme.

Required Programme Approval Documents	Document Description
	<p>The Programme Specification should be written with students as the intended audience.</p> <p>It is important that all sections of the Programme Specification are accurate and completed in full.</p> <p>The Programme Specification is normally published on the University's website to provide prospective students with information about the programme.</p>
Course Descriptors	<p>One Course Descriptor should be produced for each course of the programme.</p> <p>Course Descriptors provide essential information about specific courses.</p> <p>Course Descriptors should be written with the students as the intended audience.</p> <p>It is important that all sections of the Course Descriptors are accurate and completed in full.</p> <p>The Course Descriptor is normally published on the University's website to provide prospective students with information about the programme.</p>
External Examiner Nomination Form	<p>If a new External Examiner is required for the new programme, the Programme Proposer should work with the Faculty to provide the name of an External Examiner.</p> <p>Reference should be made to AQF11 External Examining and the criteria for the nomination of a new External Examiner</p>

External Subject Expertise

154. The Quality Team member will propose that a suitable External Subject Expert as an adviser to provide impartial and independent scrutiny on academic standards and assessment processes.
155. A record of the External Subject Expert experience and suitability for the post will follow that of the procedure noted above for new programmes. Please see Nomination of External Panel Members.

Approval Procedure

156. As the programmes have been approved by NU, the approval procedure will be desk-based and undertaken by the Head of Quality Assurance (with the Academic Registrar and the Academic Director of Student Mobility Programmes where requested), to ensure that the University's regulations and external frameworks are met.
157. Scrutiny of the programme documentation, mapping the programme outcomes to the FHEQ, and if required QAA SBSs, will be conducted.
158. The External Subject Expert will also undertake a desk-based analysis of the programme and provide comments to the Head of Quality Assurance. A remote meeting can be held if the External Subject Expert has significant concerns about the programme. The External Subject Expert must approve the programme, with or without recommendations agreed by the Head of Quality Assurance.

Criteria for the Approval of NU Programmes

159. The criteria for the approval of NU programmes under the degree-awarding powers of the University will meet the criteria as set out in [Criteria for the Approval of New Programmes](#) of this document.

Outcomes of Programme Approval Procedure

160. The External Subject Expert and Head of Quality Assurance may recommend:
 - 160.1. Approval with no conditions and recommending the programme to Academic Board for final ratification.
 - 160.2. Approval with conditions to be met, to be signed off by the Head of Quality Assurance, prior to recommending the programme to Academic Board for final ratification.
 - 160.3. Suspension of the process with conditions or recommendations.
 - 160.4. Non-approval with feedback.

Process Post Programme Approval Procedure

161. The outcome of the approval procedure will be recorded at the subsequent Academic Board, and the Head of Quality Assurance will complete the approval procedure outcome report and tracking documents to follow up on any actions.
162. The Quality Team is responsible for informing the departments within the University and colleagues at Northeastern University Boston, on the outcome of the programme approval procedure, such as Marketing, Recruitment, Admissions, Visa and Academic Services.

163. The Quality Team will finalise the final versions of the programme documentation and ensure that all public information is accurate.

Approval of NU Courses

164. The University supports NU's strategy for the global university system and student mobility. Being part of the NU community, London is a very attractive location for NU students to select for their study abroad experience.
165. NU students will have the opportunity to study on University courses, dependent on the programme that they are registered on at NU. It is also recognised by both institutions that there might be a need for NU courses to be approved under the degree-awarding powers of the University, for example, pre-matriculated students, who require courses that are more aligned to the American delivery style, rather than the England learning approach.

Development of Course Descriptors

166. Responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the Course Descriptor rests with the Faculty Director and/or faculty responsible for the delivery of the course at the University. A designated Quality Team member will be assigned to each Course Proposer to support them in the drafting of the document and the University's template should be used.
167. The Course Descriptor:
 - 167.1. Provides essential information about a specific course.
 - 167.2. Should be written with the students as the intended audience.
 - 167.3. All sections of the Course Descriptor must be completed accurately and in full.

Approval Procedure

168. The Faculty Director and/or faculty responsible for the delivery of the course will submit the Course Descriptor to the Head of Quality Assurance for a desk-based approval procedure.
169. The Head of Quality Assurance (with the Assistant Director of Academic Services and Academic Registrar and the Academic Director of Student Mobility Programmes where requested) will scrutinise the Course Descriptor, to ensure that the aims, learning outcomes and assessment elements are at the required FHEQ level and meet UK standards.

Outcome of the Course Approval Procedure

170. The Head of Quality Assurance will approve (with or without recommendations) or reject the course. Once the course has been approved, a Course Code will be allocated by the Quality Team.

Process Post Course Approval Procedure

171. The Head of Quality Assurance will confirm at the subsequent Academic Board that the course has been approved and added to the portfolio of approved courses.
172. The Quality Team is responsible for informing the departments within the University and colleagues at NU, on the outcome of the programme approval procedure, such as Marketing, Recruitment, Admissions, and Academic Services.
173. The Quality Team will finalise the final versions of the programme documentation and ensure that all public information is accurate.

Part 4: Programme and Course Modifications

Modifications to Programmes and Courses

174. Programmes and courses are normally approved for a period of five years. The University acknowledges that modifications may be required before the periodic review to enhance the provision.
175. Faculty may identify opportunities for enhancing approved programmes and courses as part of routine monitoring and other reflective activity.
176. As with new programme development, modifications to programmes and courses must be coherent and consistent with the University's strategic plan, must make business sense, and must be approved through the relevant modification approval procedure outlined below. In all cases, a rationale for the proposed modification must be provided by the Faculty Director, Head of Discipline, or Course Leader. The modifications to the programmes and/or courses must be identifiable in the core documentation (Programme Specification and Course Descriptor) and consultation with appropriate stakeholders must be evidenced.

Consideration and Approval of Programme and Course Modification Proposals

177. Programme and course modification proposals are approved by Academic Board. Major changes which have a resource implication are also considered by the ExCo. Proposed modifications are then approved through the relevant procedure according to the level of modification.

178. Proposals for programme and course modifications are subject to peer-review and external and internal consultation to provide assurance of the maintenance of academic quality and standards prior to their final approval.
179. Consultation may be undertaken at relevant meetings and through electronic communication. Where electronic consultation is undertaken in place of discussion at a meeting, this should be noted at the next available meeting and documented in the minutes.
180. In the case of student consultation, all affected students must be able to consider the modifications and give feedback to the member of faculty proposing the change.
 - 180.1. Normally, it is expected for the member of faculty proposing the modification to present the changes to the students and open the forum up to questions. Students are expected to confirm their approval, either at the end of the presentation or via email.
 - 180.2. Students are normally given a 14 calendar day consultation period where they can ask questions or raise concerns, when the faculty will respond to the concerns raised.
 - 180.3. If an affected student is not satisfied with the response from the faculty regarding the modification, and the modification is approved, the student can use the University's Complaints Procedure for Students to escalate their concern(s). Where the modification is approved and the student remains unhappy, the University will offer support to the student to change programmes or transfer to another higher education provider.
181. For all modification proposals, the Quality Team will liaise with the Faculty Director, Head of Discipline, and/or Course Leader as appropriate regarding details of timelines and documentation, to provide process support, and to monitor the completion of the required approval stages as outlined below.
182. The Quality Team will monitor that the modification approval stages are followed, and will report this to the Teaching, Learning and Enhancement Committee and Academic Board.

Drivers for Modifications to Programmes and Courses

183. Programmes and courses are typically approved for a period of five years from the point of approval to the point of periodic programme review. During this period, it may be identified that modifications to a programme and/or its courses would enhance the provision. Faculty Director, and

Course Leaders may propose in response to a number of sources of information, including:

- 183.1. External Examiner reports
- 183.2. Faculty, student, employer and graduate feedback
- 183.3. Student progression data and other relevant data
- 183.4. PSRB requirements
- 183.5. Degree Apprenticeship Standard requirements
- 183.6. Institutional goals and mission
- 183.7. Strategic academic and resource planning
- 183.8. Subject sectoral developments
- 183.9. Changing external environment
- 183.10. Good practice in other programmes or courses at the University, or other sources of good practice

Framework for Modifications to Programmes and Courses

184. The approval of programme and course modifications is subject to clear identification of the modifications, the production of sound rationale, and evidence of undertaking appropriate consultation with stakeholders.
185. As with new programme and course development, modifications to programmes and courses must be coherent and consistent with the University's Strategic Plan, make business sense, and be academically sound and appropriate.
186. The following areas of the Programme Specification and Course Descriptor may not be changed:
 - 186.1. Programme Code
 - 186.2. UCAS Programme Code
 - 186.3. Course Code
187. The following programme and course modifications can be approved by this process:
 - 187.1. Changes to the teaching and learning strategy, learning outcomes or assessment of courses.
 - 187.2. Changes/additions to the mode of course delivery.
 - 187.3. Changes to credit weightings of courses.
 - 187.4. Changes to course level.
 - 187.5. Removing, replacing or adding courses in the programme structure.

- 187.6. Changes to course aims and programme/level learning outcomes.

Timescales of Programme and Course Modifications

188. There are normally two time points within the year when programme and course modifications may be proposed for approval and implementation in the next academic year:
 - 188.1. September for undergraduate programmes and courses
 - 188.2. November for postgraduate taught Work Related Learning programmes and courses. (in response to External Examiner/employers recommendations only)

Categories of Modification

189. Category 1: Documentary Updates
 - 189.1. Modifications to programme specifications or course descriptors to provide minor clarifications or to correct typographical/grammatical errors.
 - 189.2. These changes can be made at any point during the academic year and must be agreed by the Quality Manager, in consultation with the Course Leader, Head of Discipline or Faculty Director.
190. Category 2: Minor Modifications
 - 190.1. Modifications that have no impact on the overall programme aims, learning outcomes, objectives, structure and balance of the programme, SBSs and PSRB requirements. Modifications should not alter the fundamental character of the programme.
 - 190.2. Proposals for minor changes must be endorsed by the Faculty Director and approved by the Head of Quality Assurance.
191. Category 3: Major Modifications
 - 191.1. Extensive modifications often across multiple courses where a programme's overall aims, learning outcomes, structure and balance may be affected. Modifications may include those that more significantly affect the programme's award, aims and objectives, teaching, learning and assessment strategies, overall structure or its management.
 - 191.2. Proposals for Category 3 modifications must be reviewed by the Programme and Course Modification Review Group (PCMRG), whose membership will be the Assistant Director of

Academic Services and Academic Registrar (Chair), Head of Quality Assurance and another Faculty Director. This review can be conducted electronically, and if questions arise a meeting between the Faculty Director and Course Leader(s) and the PCMRG will be convened.

192. For further information, please see [Appendix C](#).

Approval of Course and Programme Modifications

193. Following the [Framework for Modifications to Programmes and Courses](#), all proposed Category 2 and 3 programme modifications should be discussed at a Faculty Team meeting which, where possible, includes student representatives. If student representatives are not present, an electronic consultation can be carried out (see paragraph 134).

194. Where proposed modifications impact on assessment or the learning outcomes, the External Examiner for that subject should be consulted prior to the submission of the proposal to the Quality Team.

195. The proposal for a programme/course modification, including the proposals for new courses, will be reviewed by the PCMRG. If the modification is approved, the PCMRG will recommend the modification to Academic Board.

196. In assessing the change request, feedback received from the External Examiner(s) and students will be taken into account.

197. The following criteria will be used in deciding whether to approve proposed modifications:

197.1. The reason for proposing the modification meets one or more of the drivers outlined in [Drivers for Modifications to Programmes and Courses](#).

197.2. Correct documentation.

197.3. Consultation procedure completed - confirmation and evidence of consultation with students, including copies of the student feedback submitted, must be specifically provided.

197.4. Clear and coherent rationale.

197.5. Maintenance of academic standards.

197.6. Enhancement of the integrity of the course and/or programme.

197.7. Enhancement of the students' learning experience and/or performance, enabling them to more clearly demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes.

197.8. Improvement of the overall quality of the provision.

- 197.9. Improvement of the operational effectiveness of the course and/or programme.
- 197.10. Volume and impact of modifications made and/or proposed to the programme since it was approved.

Within-Session Modifications

- 198. Exceptionally, there may be a need to change a course/programme within the academic session it is running. In such circumstances, and where appropriate internal and external consultation has been demonstrated and agreement of the students has been obtained, Academic Board's Chair's action may be taken. A course that is delivered in the first semester and repeated in the second semester should have the same teaching, learning and assessment strategy. No changes can be made between the first and second semester.


Informing the University of Modification Approval

- 199. Once the proposed modification has been approved by Academic Board, the Quality Team will inform the relevant departments, which can include:
 - 199.1. Faculty Director – responsible for informing the students, Course Leader, faculty and employers.
 - 199.2. Academic Services – responsible for preparing for the modifications in the following academic year.
 - 199.3. Director of Marketing Admissions, Recruitment & Visa Compliance – responsible for updating the website.
 - 199.4. Marketing, Admissions, Recruitment and Visa Teams.

Version Control of Core Documentation


- 200. The Quality Team is responsible for updating the following core documentation, where appropriate:
 - 200.1. Course Descriptors
 - 200.2. Programme Specifications
 - 200.3. Programme Handbooks
- 201. The Course Leader is responsible for updating or producing the Course Syllabus, using the University's course syllabus template.

Appendix A: New Programme Approval Procedure Summary



Appendix B: Programme and Course Modification Procedure Summary

Programme and Course Modification Procedure Summary



Appendix C: Modifications and Indicative Category

CD – Course Descriptor; PS – Programme Specification

Category 1: Documentary Updates

Modification Type	Modification Impact
Corrections/clarifications to documents which do not change approved content or learning outcomes	Document changes (CD and/or PS)
Change of Course Leader	Document changes (CD)
Change in term of delivery	Document changes (CD)
“Course Description” section of the CD	Document changes (CD)
Course’s areas of study	Document changes (CD)
Course’s additional assessment information (online submission, grade marking, anonymous marking)	Document changes (CD) (Grade marking exemptions are subject to separate scrutiny and approval)

Category 2: Minor Modifications

Modification Type	Modification Impact
Course title change	Document change (CD & PS)
Changes to pre/co-requisite details on CD	Document changes (CD)
Course Learning and Teaching Strategy	Subject to scale and scope – may be treated as major following consideration by the University. Document changes (CD & PS). Possible impact on learning outcomes.
Course assessment type	Subject to scale and scope – may be treated as major following consideration by the University. Document changes (CD & PS). Possible impact on learning outcomes.
Course length/duration of assessment	Documentation changes (CD & PS)

Modification Type	Modification Impact
Course assessment weighting	Documentation changes (CD & PS)
Course aggregation of assessment	Documentation changes (CD & PS) (Separate approval arrangements cover requests to exempt from aggregation or cessation of exemption)
Course re-assessment	Documentation changes (CD & PS)
Programme structure changes involving option courses <40UG, including course closure	Documentation changes (CD & PS)

Category 3: Major Modifications

Modification Type	Modification Impact
Course credits	Likely to require a programme structure modification
Course level	Documentation change (CD & PS) May require a programme structure modification
Course designation	Documentation change (CD & PS). Should only occur where existing course becomes a non-credit bearing course.
Changes/addition to course delivery mode	Document change (CD & PS). Rationale for new mode – impact on programme and student learning experience.
Changes to the Course Learning Outcomes	Document change (CD & PS). Rationale for modification – impact on programme learning outcomes.
Programme learning outcomes	Documentation change (PS).

Modification Type	Modification Impact
	Possible impact on programme learning outcomes.
Programme structure changes involving core courses	Document changes (PS). Possible impact on student learning and experience
Programme structure changes involving option courses >30 UG, including course closure	Document changes (PS). Possible change to balance of programme.
Programme aims/programme learning outcomes	Document changes (PS) but change likely to arise out of other modifications (not likely as a separate occurrence).

Version History

Title: Academic Quality Framework Chapter 4: Programme and Course Approval and Modification				
Approved by: The Quality Team				
Location: Academic Handbook/ Academic Quality Framework				
Version Number	Date Approved	Date Published	Owner	Proposed Next Review Date
23.6.0	July 2023	July 2023	Head of Quality Assurance	July 2025
<i>Version numbering system revised March 2023</i>				
5.1	February 2023	February 2023	Head of Quality Assurance	July 2025
5.0	January 2023	January 2023	Head of Quality Assurance	July 2025
4.1	November 2022	January 2023	Head of Quality Assurance	July 2023
4.0	November 2021	November 2021	Head of Quality Assurance	July 2022
3.0	January 2021	January 2021	Head of Quality Assurance	September 2021
2.2	November 2020	November 2020	Head of Quality Assurance	September 2021
2.1	September 2020	September 2020	Head of Quality Assurance	September 2021
Referenced documents	AQF5 Annual Monitoring and Reporting; AQF11 External Examining; Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy.			
External Reference Point(s)	UK Quality Code theme: Course Design and Development; FHEQ, Subject Benchmark Statements; Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies; Framework for Higher Education Qualifications; Competition and Markets Authority; UK Degree Apprenticeship Standard			