



University of Surrey
Faculty
Department/School

Periodic review of **programmes**
SUBMISSION DOCUMENT

Month / Year of production

PLEASE NOTE: If you feel that a section is not applicable or is covered elsewhere within the document please do not delete the section, please just list NA or reference the relevant section.

When preparing the review documentation please bear in mind:

- The submission document is written for the panel
- The programme handbook is written for the students
- The programme specification and module descriptors are public documents that are written for several audiences
- The information within the submission document should be an overview of the programme(s) which is supported by the appendix, which contain further / more detailed information e.g. module descriptors

Post event activity

If you are required to amend the documentation to meet any conditions and / or recommendations set by the panel following the review event please ensure that you highlight the changes so that the panel can easily locate the amendments.

Key

Guidance text in red

Section titles in black

Contents

1. PROGRAMME INFORMATION.....	5
1.19 Programme rationale and aims	6
1.20 Programme structure.....	6
1.21 Recruitment and entry qualifications	7
1.22 Programme specification	7
1.23 Module descriptors and/or taught unit descriptors.....	8
2. EVALUATION	8
2.1.1 Strengths and success of the programme	8
2.1.2 Changes that have been made to the programme(s) since the last validation/review.....	8
2.1.3 Areas of the programme which require further attention and change.....	9
2.1.4 How the programme has mapped against competing programmes	9
2.1.5 How any staff changes have influenced the programme	9
2.1.6 Staff achievements in learning and teaching	9
2.1.7 How all of the above have impacted on the students	9
2.1.8 Future opportunities or threats that are likely to influence the continued development or viability of the programme	10
2.2 Critical review	10
2.3 Cohort analysis.....	10
3. LEARNING AND TEACHING, ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK.....	10
3.1 Learning and teaching and research strategy	10
3.2 Learning and teaching and delivery.....	11
3.3 Ethical issues.....	11
3.4 Assessment overview.....	11
3.5 Assessment strategy rationale	12
3.6 Alternative assessment	12
3.7 Assessment criteria	13
3.8 Feedback.....	13
4. BENCHMARKING AND CONSULTATION	13
4.1.1 Framework for Higher Education Qualifications for England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ).....	13
4.1.2 Subject benchmark statements.....	14
4.1.3 Programme and module learning outcomes	14
4.2 Quality Assurance	14
4.3 Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements (PSRBs).....	14
4.4 Consultation.....	15
5. RESOURCES	15
5.1 Staffing	15
5.1.1 Staffing overview.....	15

5.1.2	External staffing	16
5.1.3	Additional staffing	16
5.1.4	Staff development / training	16
5.2	Programme handbook	16
5.3	Learning resources	17
5.4	Access	17
5.5	Public information	18
5.6	Other resources	18
6.	PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT	18
6.1	Personal Development Planning (PDP)	18
7.	COLLABORATIVE PROVISION.....	19
7.1	Other collaborative activity	19
7.2	Industry.....	19

1. PROGRAMME INFORMATION

1.1	Principal programme award and title	
1.2	Subsidiary award(s) and title(s)	<p>Postgraduate taught programmes usually include – Postgraduate Certificate Postgraduate Diploma</p> <p>Undergraduate programmes usually include – Certificate of Higher Education Diploma of Higher Education Ordinary degree</p> <p>Please see the <i>Regulations for taught programmes</i> for credit values.</p> <p>If you do not list one of the above subsidiary awards please provide a rationale in section 1.16</p> <p>Ensure that you list the <u>title</u> as well as the award as they may differ from the principal award to recognise levels of specialist knowledge</p>
1.3	Framework for Higher Education Qualifications for England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) level of study	
1.4	JACS code (existing or new if any changes requires an updated code)	
1.5	Date of review event	
1.6	Date of previous review / validation event	
1.7	Date programme first offered	
1.8	Faculty/Associated Institution and Department submitting the review documentation	
1.9	Other Faculties/Departments/Schools supporting the programme, if any	
1.10	Programme Leader	
1.11	Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) or other external bodies that provide accreditation, endorsement or recognition of the programme(s)	
1.12	Other external or collaborative body that contributes towards the programme(s)	

1.13	Modes of learning (full-time /part- time /sandwich/distance learning)	
1.14	Length of study	
1.15	Recruitment and entry requirements	
1.16	Student intake targets (projection for the next five years)	
1.17	External examiner	
1.18	Articulated progression route (for Foundation degrees only)	

1.19 Programme rationale and aims

Provide the panel with the rationale and aims of the programme detailing whether they have changed over time and whether they are still appropriate and current.

Are the programme and module learning outcomes set at the correct level and are achievable?

Please ensure that you provide a rationale as to how the content of the programme is current and relevant

Elaborate on any other Faculties or Departments/Schools that are supporting the programme and insert or append their written consent. The Executive Dean or Head of Department/School will need to write a supporting statement which acts as their acknowledgement and consent for supporting the programme. Please ensure that you stipulate how they are supporting the programme, ie through teaching, providing modules, content, marking etc. The written consent can be a letter or an e-mail.

1.20 Programme structure

1.20.1 Detail the structure of the programme, ie does it conform to the University's structure. Please ensure that you clearly stipulate any parts of the programme which do not conform or slightly deviate from the University's structure and provide a detailed rationale with any form of approval previously given.

This section can be completed by providing a diagram or a narrative. If the programme under review has several pathways and options a diagram will need to be provided to demonstrate to the panel how students can progress and complete through the various routes. A narrative is also desirable to compliment the diagram and further explain the rationale for the various pathways.

If detailed in this section or another you will need to demonstrate the module breakdown showing: the module title, assessment weightings, whether they are core/compulsory/optional, credit ratings.

Detailed information will need to be provided to show student progression and transfer opportunities. For example if you have several programmes within a department which operate a common first year how do the students choose their programme initially and how and when can they transfer to another programme if they feel that they have chosen incorrectly in the first instance. Taking in to consideration pre- and co-requisites demonstrate how a student is able to progress and specialise in certain sections within the wider subject area.

1.20.2 *If the programme has several modes of study such as full-time/part-time/distance learning then please provide details on how the differing modes will be managed in relation to: teaching, learning, assessment and student support to ensure a good student experience.*

Also detail how the structures work and coincide, for example if a programme has a full time and part time modes are the students on both modes expected to attend the same modules? Are the modules scheduled to allow flexibility for the part time mode? How will the personal tutoring system work?

Provide a break down for each individual mode of study to demonstrate: Whether they are structured or unstructured, ie over two years or students can complete over five years and how many modules a students will be expected to complete in order to satisfy registration regulation.

For distance learning you will need to detail how the programme is delivered and managed, ie lecture notes, seminar/tutorial sessions, learning material, assessment and feedback, additional student support, personal tutoring etc.

1.20.3 *To support the above narrative in relation to part time and distance learning please provide an indicative schedule (by month) detailing the delivery of study materials and assessment*

Please note: if any of the above sections are not applicable or you feel it is covered elsewhere please list NA or reference the relevant section

1.21 Recruitment and entry qualifications

Do the qualifications conform to the University's minimum requirements? Rationalise the entry qualifications set for this programme detailing where they were agreed, ie Executive Board.

Detail whether the entry qualifications have been raised in comparison to previous years and note the rationale.

Provide reasons behind the preferred A-Level subjects and how this area will help prepare the students to study this programme, eg Mathematics provides the basic knowledge needed to understand the theory behind the subject area, without this students have been known to struggle with some of the content, for example...

If the IELTS score is set higher than the University's (ie 6.5 overall with a minimum of 6.0 in each component) then please provide a rationale.

1.22 Programme specification¹

Insert or append the programme specification and ensure that the document is clear and accurate.

¹ The first phase of the Quality and Curriculum Management project is due to go live during the 2017/18 academic year which mainly affects the modification process, programme specifications and module descriptors. Following the publication of this Code of practice there may be some amendments to the process, specifically the collation of programme and module records and how they are submitted as part of the validation/review documentation. For further information please contact QES (qualitysupport@surrey.ac.uk).

1.23 Module descriptors and/or taught unit descriptors²

MODULE DESCRIPTORS: One standard template is used across the University for all module descriptors at **FHEQ levels 4, 5, 6 and 7.**

TAUGHT UNIT DESCRIPTORS: The taught unit descriptor should be used when programmes at **FHEQ level 8** adopt non-credit bearing taught components, e.g. EngD and PsychD programmes. One standard template is used across the University in these instances.

Clearly list which modules/taught units are new and which are existing.

If an existing module has been amended are the changes substantial enough to warrant a new module code?

Append the module descriptors/taught units (noting the number of the appendix in this section) and ensure that they are clear and accurate.

Please ensure that you use the correct template for new modules and refer to the Code of practice on assessment and feedback to ensure that the modules meet University expectations.

Please also use this section if you wish to provide a summary of how the modules/taught units have been developed to demonstrate student progression and the programmes journey.

You will need to provide all professional training year modules.

2. EVALUATION

TO SUPPORT THIS SECTION PLEASE APPEND THE PAST THREE YEARS WORTH OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS, YOUR RESPONSE TO THE REPORTS, ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW REPORTS AND ANY PSRB REPORTS FOLLOWING (RE)ACCREDITATION EVENTS.

THIS SECTION SHOULD ACT AS A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME(S) UNDER PERIODIC REVIEW, WHICH LOOKS AT THE FOLLOWING AREAS:

2.1.1 Strengths and success of the programme

2.1.2 Changes that have been made to the programme(s) since the last validation/review

Have any changes been made to the programme since the last validation /review event? If so please clearly list them with a brief indication as to when they were introduced / approved and why.

If a programme or programmes have been withdrawn since the last review you will need to provide further information on:

² The first phase of the Quality and Curriculum Management project is due to go live during the 2017/18 academic year which mainly affects the modification process, programme specifications and module descriptors. Following the publication of this Code of practice there may be some amendments to the process, specifically the collation of programme and module records and how they are submitted as part of the validation/review documentation. For further information please contact QES (qualitysupport@surrey.ac.uk).

- Why the programme has been withdrawn
- Whether there are any remaining students on the programme(s)
- Whether a withdrawal form has been submitted. If not, why not?
- If there are remaining students, what arrangements are in place to ensure standards are maintained and that the students continue to be supported

The aim of this is to assure the panel that standards will be maintained during the teach-out period.

Where possible please append the approved withdrawal form and provide

2.1.3 Areas of the programme which require further attention and change

You are able to make changes to existing programmes through the periodic process, which the panel will consider and subsequently approve, where appropriate. If you are proposing changes through the review process you will need to complete the below table clearly listing: what you wish to change, what it was, what it will be, whether marketing have been consulted (where applicable) and whether it has been considered at a Board of Studies meeting as well as other relevant committees prior to submitting the change to the panel for approval.

PLEASE NOTE: only major changes should be submitted to the panel for institutional level consideration and approval. All other changes that are considered minor should be considered through the minor modification process, prior to the review process where possible, and receive final approval at Faculty level. For further information on what is considered a major or minor change please see the programme modification process flow chart at http://www.surrey.ac.uk/quality_enhancement/validation/index.htm.

If you are submitting a major change for panel approval you will **not** need to also complete a programme modification form, you just need to complete the table below.

Reference	What it was	What it will be changed to	Marketing consideration (if applicable)	Where the change has already been considered

2.1.4 How the programme has mapped against competing programmes

2.1.5 How any staff changes have influenced the programme

2.1.6 Staff achievements in learning and teaching

2.1.7 How all of the above have impacted on the students

2.1.8 Future opportunities or threats that are likely to influence the continued development or viability of the programme

2.2 Critical review

Detail how the information listed in section 2.1 have been influenced and informed by the following sources:

- *Annual programme review reports*
- *External examiners' reports*
- *Formal and informal student feedback (eg the National Student Survey (NSS), Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs), Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSL), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES), PGR Student Engagement Fora (PGR SEF))*
- *Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements*
- *Advisory Boards*
- *External Influences (eg stakeholders, industry, alumni)*

Detail how you have responded to student feedback and kept the student informed of any changes made to the programme in view of their feedback. Please provide examples if possible.

2.3 Cohort analysis

Provide a table which demonstrates student intake, progression and completion rates since the last validation / review event and provide a narrative which compliments the above questions and discusses:

- *whether the rate of progression is acceptable*
- *whether the completion rates are acceptable*
- *an analysis of trends in degree performance / levels of achievement*
- *an analysis of referrals and drop outs*

Try to explain the above and demonstrate what may have caused the results and also detail what actions have been taken to address any issues that arise from the analysis.

3. LEARNING AND TEACHING, ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

3.1 Learning and teaching and research strategy

Please provide an outline of the teaching and learning strategy of the programme(s) which underpins the design of the curriculum and delivery of the programme.

Are the learning and teaching methods appropriate to enable the intended learning outcomes to be achieved?

You will need to detail how the programme(s) learning and teaching strategy has been informed by the University and Faculty/Department/ School learning and teaching strategy to demonstrate how the programme is meeting the strategy at programme, faculty and institutional level.

For postgraduate research programmes explain how the programme fits into the Department/Faculty research strategy.

3.2 Learning and teaching and delivery

Detail how the programme will meet the learning and teaching requirements for the differing modes of study, i.e. full time, part time, distance learning, e-learning

- *Induction, training and on-going support*
- *Support for overseas students*
- *Opportunities for students to engage in academic discourse with their peers and academic staff*
- *Details of any technical considerations including piloting of the material undertaken*
- *For postgraduate research programmes provide details on the research environment and how it adds value to the programme*

3.3 Ethical issues

Please provide details of any learning, teaching or assessment methods that present any ethical issues and how they will be / have been addressed.

In the case of postgraduate research programmes provide details of how students are supported in gaining ethical approval for projects and are educated about research integrity.

3.4 Assessment overview

Please provide an overview table which demonstrates the overall assessment strategy of the programme. Typically a table will be inserted in to the submission document and contain the following columns:

Module code	Module title	Semester	Formative / summative	Assessment type (unit/ element)	Assessment length	Assessment weighting	Indicative timing, e.g. week 9

Please ensure that the assessment strategy is informed by the Code of practice on assessment and feedback.

The purpose of this table is to demonstrate to the panel that the assessment strategy meets the University's requirements and demonstrates the assessment trends within the programme as the students' learning and understanding increase.

The assessment type column should demonstrate whether the assessment is coursework or examination, with further details on its form, ie presentation, poster, performance, essay, portfolio, multiple choice questionnaires etc. Please ensure that you clearly differentiate between units and elements of assessment.

Please ensure that you specify whether the assessment is formative or summative, if an assessment is formative then it should not have any marks which count towards the module mark. All formative and some summative assessments should give students the opportunity to learn practices and content which will inform other assessments within the module, so essentially feed-forward.

The assessment length column should be used to detail the length of an exam, eg two hours, or coursework, eg 2000 words etc.

The indicative timing column should be used to demonstrate the hand in deadlines for coursework and the timings of examinations, such as: coursework week 8 and examination week 13. When completing this section you should bear in mind the academic year schedule agreed by the University and allow enough time for the students to receive any feedback and analyse it in time to inform the next assessment.

3.5 Assessment strategy rationale

Provide a rationale for the overall assessment strategy detailing how it will ensure that the students meet the module and programme learning outcomes. Are methods of assessment appropriate to demonstrate the achievement of the learning outcomes?

Also comment on how you will ensure comparability of the assessment load across the modules of the same credit volume and how the number of the individual units of assessment and their weightings have been determined. Is the assessment loading similar within modules and across levels throughout the programme?

Demonstrate how a variety of assessment methods have been utilised to test student achievements.

Detail how formative assessment has been embedded in to the assessment strategy and how it is being used. Please give examples, ie within this module the following formative assessment has been designed to complement the summative assessment...

Evidence the assessment schedule and indicative timings of each assessment and how it meets University requirements, eg assessment deadlines.

3.6 Alternative assessment

Where alternative assessments have been adopted please complete the following table to demonstrate why they are needed and how they have been designed to ensure that they enable the students to meet the learning outcomes. It is advisable to provide further narrative to accompany the table if necessary:

Module code	Module title	Original Assessment	Alternative assessment	rationale

Within the rationale column you need to demonstrate how the alternative assessment has been designed to stay as close to the original assessment as possible and allows the student to meet the module learning outcomes.

Please note that all group work should offer an alternative assessment and students should have the opportunity to re-sit any failed components in the late summer resit period to avoid them having to wait a full academic year in order to re-sit one assessment.

Further information for this section should include any limitations experienced by the programme team during the reassessment period which may limit the choice of possible alternative assessments.

3.7 Assessment criteria

THIS SECTION SHOULD ACT AS AN OVERVIEW OF YOUR ASSESSMENT CRITERIA, YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON EACH INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT AND HOW IT IS MARKED.

Provide an overview of how the assessments will be marked and whether the University grade descriptors have been developed to create any assessment marking schemes.

Please provide information on how certain assessments, such as practical/performance assessments, will be marked and moderated. If an external marker is involved what is the extent of their involvement? How will they be supported by an academic member of staff?

Provide, where appropriate, examples of marking criteria for the panel's consideration.

3.8 Feedback

THIS SECTION SHOULD ACT AS AN OVERVIEW OF YOUR FEEDBACK STRATEGY, YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON HOW FEEDBACK WILL BE PROVIDED FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT.

How are students provided with feedback in relation to their assessments? Does the feedback meet the three week turnaround deadline set by the University?

Have there been any instances where the deadline has not been met and what actions have been taken by the programme team to ensure that it is met in the future.

Detail the ways in which students will receive feedback, ie via the VLE, verbal or written etc. How do you ensure that students know when they are receiving feedback?

4. BENCHMARKING AND CONSULTATION

The purpose of this section is to demonstrate how the programme(s) meets national and internal benchmarks and how its development has been informed by internal and external sources

4.1.1 Framework for Higher Education Qualifications for England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ)

This national benchmark provides guidance on the competencies students should achieve for each level of study. You will need to provide a mapping document or a narrative on how the programme meets the FHEQ requirements.

The document can be found at <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=2843#.VOxzjXNFDct>.

Please ensure that you only review the levels relevant to the programme being reviewed

You may also wish to review further guidance documents that have been produced by the QAA such as the Masters and Doctoral characteristics documents for taught postgraduate and postgraduate research programmes.

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

4.1.2 Subject benchmark statements

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) has also developed specific subject guidance which acts as a national guidance on minimum threshold standards for specific subject areas for undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes.

The subject benchmark statements can be found at:

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

Some subjects may be specialised and not have a specific statement, however, there will be some benchmarking which is relevant within the broad subject area guidance documents. You will need to provide a mapping document or a narrative on how your programme meets the relevant requirements set out within the relevant subject benchmark statement(s).

4.1.3 Programme and module learning outcomes

This section should demonstrate how the module learning outcomes have been developed to meet the requirements of the programme learning outcomes and aims. An exercise would need to be carried out each time a learning outcome is amended or a new module added to the programme to ensure that the module learning outcomes are relevant.

It is strongly advised that a mapping document or clear narrative is provided to satisfy this section to show the links between the levels.

For further guidance on writing or linking learning outcomes as well as the pedagogical elements of programme amendment and design can be sought from the Department of Higher Education <http://www.surrey.ac.uk/dhe/>.

Some other helpful guidance references are as follows:

<http://www.seec.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/seec-files/SEEC%20Level%20Descriptors%202010.pdf>

<http://www.learningandteaching.info/learning/bloomtax.htm>

4.2 Quality Assurance

Please use this section to comment on any quality assurance mechanisms, if they differ from the standard university model, eg composition of the Board of Studies, Board of Examiners.

When does the current external examiner appointment end? What provisions are in place to make a new appointment?

4.3 Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements (PSRBs)

4.3.1 Provide details of any accreditation, endorsement or recognition attached to the programme, the nature of the relationship.

Note when the last (re)accreditation event took place. Please ensure that you comment on any recommendations following the event and whether the programme was (re)accredited.

4.3.2 *Provide a mapping document or a narrative, which demonstrates how the programme meets the requirements of the PSRB or relevant external body.*

4.3.3 *Provide a detailed list of any requirements that differ from the University's Regulations and Codes of practice as a result of PSRB requirements and provide any written approval that has been previously issued to support the difference.*

You will need to reference the requirements to the external body's guidance documents so that they can be checked by the panel and support the difference.

4.4 Consultation

YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED TO CONSULT ALL OF THE GROUPS LISTED BELOW. YOU ARE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE DETAILED INFORMATION WHERE ANY OF THE BELOW HAVE BEEN CONSULTED.

Detail if any of the following groups may have been used to inform its development and give specific examples on how this feedback has changed elements of the programme and what the impact had / has been on the student experience.

- *Academic staff within the University from a different subject area*
- *Staff within the University with professional services expertise, such as educational developers, library staff, additional learning support etc*
- *Staff from other higher education providers*
- *Contacts in industry*
- *Contacts in professional practice*
- *Contacts in research*
- *PSRBs*
- *External examiners*
- *Employers*
- *Organisations within the community*
- *Collaborative links*
- *Former students and / or students studying in cognate area*

5. RESOURCES

5.1 Staffing

5.1.1 Staffing overview

Provide details of all academic, external and support staff who are and will be involved in the programme(s) under review; you will need to detail their responsibility and contribution to the programme. There is an appendix which can be used to complete this section.

Please ensure that you clearly indicate the job role of the staff member, eg associate lecturer, guest lecturer, administrative support, lecturer etc.

You can also provide CVs if you feel that they are necessary, however this is not a requirement.

Is the number of staff currently contributing towards the programme enough to run the programme?

Is the level of administrative support effective in supporting the programme(s)?

5.1.2 External staffing

Please provide a narrative to support the previous section detailing the types of external involvement in the programme, their contribution and responsibility.

How are externals trained and kept up to date?

It is very important that the University know how people who are external to the University but contribute to the programme are informed of University Regulations and practice.

5.1.3 Additional staffing

Provide details on any additional members of staff that will be required in the future to support the programme and whether the faculty are aware of this.

5.1.4 Staff development / training

Provide details of any staff development which has taken place since the last validation / review.

Also provide details of any staff development that is planned for the future to support the continuing development of the programme.

What training opportunities are available to staff?

Please specify any professional practice or formal qualifications that are required to teach on the programme

5.2 Programme handbook

Programmes at FHEQ levels 4, 5, 6 and 7 will need to complete and submit the following sections of the programme handbook for the panel's consideration and ensure that they reflect the upcoming academic year:

- *key contacts*
- *programme information (including all listed sub sections)*
- *Professional Training Year (if applicable)*
- *professional and statutory body requirements (if applicable)*
- *external examiners*
- *dissertation / project*

Following the completion of the review process the sections that have been considered by the panel must be incorporated in to the programme handbook once the new template becomes available. All references to the University's Regulations and Codes of practice must have links only.

Postgraduate research programmes (FHEQ level 8) will need to refer to the standardised PGR handbook template which is available at http://www.surrey.ac.uk/quality_enhancement/pgr/index.htm and ensure that the programme specific content is updated to reflect the upcoming academic year.

5.3 Learning resources

Detail the learning resources available to the students on the programme such as the VLE and the library. In particular note whether additional learning resources are required and any examples of best practice.

5.4 Access

You will need to complete the following questions to satisfy this section and demonstrate that there are no unnecessary barriers to access by disabled people.

1a. Have competence standards and learning outcomes been reviewed in order that disabled students can demonstrate competence & learning outcomes by alternative means and forms of assessment?	
1b. Can reasonable adjustments be found to achieve the learning outcomes while maintaining competence standards? For example, signers for the deaf, assistants for the blind or those with mobility difficulties.	
1c. Have health and safety and professional requirements been reviewed to ensure changes in practice have been reflected in the review?	
2. Is there any recent experience within the Faculty of having supported students with disabilities on a similarly constructed course?	
3. What experience can be identified and drawn upon elsewhere in the UK of students with disabilities on similar courses being supported to achieve the learning outcomes, whilst maintaining competence standards?	
4. What extra resources will be needed to adapt existing facilities to enable access and inclusion on the programme?	
5. Does the programme require any fieldwork or work away from the University that may make additional demands on the student and will need to be accommodated?	
6. Have agreements been made with associated institutions e.g. Farnborough College, about the inclusion of disabled students?	
7. Is a professional placement normally part of the programme? If so, in what way will work placements be promoted positively to disabled students? Have you undertaken reviews to identify which of your current placement providers may be appropriate for disabled students and what	

adjustments may need to be made? Are students able to study abroad as part of an ERASMUS or similar programme? If so, what preparations and provision are made for students with disabilities?	
8. What strategies will be used to market the new programme to people with disabilities?	
9. Do admissions criteria reflect the flexibility that is possible for applicants to demonstrate learning outcomes or competence standards? How is this flexibility communicated to applicants? Have admissions statements been reviewed to ensure these do not create unnecessary barriers for disabled people?	
10. What statistics in the University can be found to show recruitment, progression and achievement of students with disabilities? What qualitative data is being collected to support the statistical data? Have the views of disabled students been actively sought during the review of the programme?	

5.5 Public information

Provide a narrative to demonstrate to the panel that all advertising material and information available to the public in relation to the programme(s) under review are appropriate; and that the information is an accurate representation of the programme. Please ensure that you comment on:

- *the website*
- *the prospectus*
- *KIS data*

Please check all programme and module additional cost information to ensure that it is up to date and accurate. You will need to comment within this section that you have carried out the necessary checks and document whether you are happy with the information's accuracy or note what changes need to be made.

5.6 Other resources

Please provide information on any relevant issues around other resources such as computing, teaching accommodation, space requirements, equipment, clinical or practical placement resources, residential accommodation etc, for the panels consideration.

6. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

6.1 Personal Development Planning (PDP)

PDP is used to help students develop skills which will help them within industry. Examples include: discipline specific software, CV development, completing applications and interview training, as well as developing transferrable skills such as report writing.

Provide details of how PDP has been embedded in to the programme(s), with particular reference to research, employability, transferable, information literacy and communication skills.

Please provide examples.

For postgraduate programmes please demonstrate how the skills training provided by RDP is embedded in to the programme.

7. COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

7.1 Other collaborative activity

In determining which provision falls within the scope of collaborative provision, Chapter B10 states that the critical factor is whether the achievement of the learning outcomes for the module or programme are dependent on the arrangement made with the other delivery or support organisation(s).

Provide a brief evaluation on any collaborative activity, outside of the PTY, which are included within the programme and count towards the final award that falls within the following categories (credit bearing for undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes):

- *Work-based learning within a module*
- *Progression arrangement*
- *Articulation arrangement*
- *Partnership delivery*
- *Doctoral training centre*
- *PGR collaborative co-supervisor*
- *PGR split-site collaboration*
- *PGR off-site collaboration*

The evaluation should include information on how the placement is operating and how it is contributing to the overall student experience. DO NOT INCLUDE ANY AGREEMENTS WITHIN THE REVIEW DOCUMENTATION.

In the context of this guidance, the University determines that the provision of learning opportunities that do not directly contribute to the award of academic credit; nor activities that are not assessed; or contain an element of delivery enhancement, do not constitute collaborative activity and therefore not subject to this Code. Such activities may include voluntary placements, visiting lecturers who are not involved in assessment of student's work, mentoring sponsorship schemes.

Please refer to the [Code of practice for collaborative provision](#) for further guidance on the approval process for credit bearing collaborative activity and any relevant templates.

7.2 Industry

Provide information on how the programme has / will engage with industry and the extent of the involvement.