Programme validation/review report (event number)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 1 – Programme information** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Principal programme award and title | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.2 | Subsidiary award(s) and title(s) | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.3 | Framework for Higher Education Qualifications for England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) level of study | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.4 | Date of validation / review event | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.5 | Date of previous validation / review event or Name of the programme the proposed programme is replacing (if applicable) (validation only) | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.6 | Date programme first offered / date of introduction | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.7 | Faculty/Associated Institution and Department submitting the documentation | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.8 | Other Faculties/Departments/Schools supporting the programme | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.9 | Programme Leader | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.10 | Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) or other external bodies that provide accreditation, endorsement or recognition of the programme(s) | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.11 | Other external or collaborative body that contributes towards the programme(s) | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.12 | Modes of learning (full-time /part- time /sandwich/distance learning) | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.13 | Length of study | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.14 | Recruitment and entry requirements | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.15 | Student intake targets (min, max, optimum) | | | |  | | | | |
| 1.16 | Articulated progression route (for  Foundation degrees only) | | | |  | | | | |
| **Section 2 – Event details** | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Purpose and nature of event (validation, periodic review, accreditation, conjoint event with PSRB/Collaborative body) | | | |  | | | | |
| 2.2 | Panel membership: | | Chair | |  | | | | |
|  |  | | Internal(s) | |  | | | | |
|  |  | | Student panel member | |  | | | | |
|  |  | | External(s) | |  | | | | |
|  |  | | Validation and review co-ordinator | |  | | | | |
| 2.3 | Programme team attendees (including attendees from practice settings where applicable) | | | |  | | | | |
| 2.4 | Student attendees | | | | (give programme name and level of study. Do not use names) | | | | |
| 2.5 | Documentation submitted | | | |  | | | | |
| 2.6 | Additional Information provided | | | |  | | | | |
| **Section 3 – Outcomes** | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Recommendation for (re)validation approval  The Panel recommends to the Quality and Standards Sub-committee and to the PRSB that the programme(s) detailed above be approved for a further period of 5 years from 1 September 2015 to 31 August 2020.  Approval is subject to the fulfilment of the conditions outlined below and a satisfactory response to the Panel’s recommendations.  [or, where applicable, that Approval is not granted] | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 | Commendations/ best practice/ distinctive features of programme  The Panel thanked the Team for their openness during discussion on the day and the documentation provided. A number of Commendations were noted by the Panel: | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3 | Conditions of approval  Approval is subject to the fulfilment of the following conditions listed below and detailed in the report.  (Reference numbers from the report) | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4 | Panel recommendations  Approval is also subject to a satisfactory response to the following  Recommendations  (Reference numbers from the report) | | | | | | | | |
| 3.5 | Date for response to conditions  The conditions listed in 3.3 above are to be met by xx/xx/xx (date). An electronic copy of the amended documentation should be submitted for approval with a copy of the completed Conditions and Recommendations form (appendix A) and the minor amendments form (appendix B) (where applicable) to the Validation and Review Co-ordinator of the Panel.  The programme team will be notified of any outstanding amendments/conditions by the Secretary and any subsequent submission deadlines will be negotiated at that point. | | | | | | | | |
| 3.6 | Changes that have been approved by the panel  Please list the changes that have been approved by the panel through the validation / periodic review process and note whether further information can be found within the report or the documentation. Please note that only major changes should be approved through the review process, all minor changes should be managed through the minor modification process.  If no changes have been made / approved please list NA. | | | | | | | | |
| **Reference** | **Type of change** | | **What it was** | | **What it will be** | **When it will be implemented** | | |
| Section 4, event report / section 1.17 of submission document | Programme name change | | MSc Advanced Ground Engineering | | MSc Advanced Geotechnical Engineering | September 2015 | | |
|  |  | |  | |  |  | | |
|  |  | |  | |  |  | | |
| **Section 4 – The programme (rationale, aims, learning outcomes, content, structure, recruitment and entry requirements, programme specification and module descriptors)** | | | | | | | | **Y** | **N** |
| 4.1 | Rationale, aims and learning outcomes of the programme and modules are clear and appropriate | | | | | | |  |  |
| 4.2 | Content is current and relevant | | | | | | |  |  |
| 4.3 | Programme structure conforms with the University’s academic infrastructure for programmes | | | | | | |  |  |
| 4.4 | Consideration has been given to differing modes of study (if applicable) | | | | | | |  |  |
| 4.5 | Entry qualifications conform to the University’s minimum requirements | | | | | | |  |  |
| 4.6 | The English language entry standard for non-native speakers of English (IELTS or equivalent) is appropriate for the qualification and conform to the University’s minimum (i.e. 6.5, normally with a minimum of 6 in each component), if different a rationale has been provided | | | | | | |  |  |
| 4.7 | Programme specification has been provided and is clear and accurate | | | | | | |  |  |
| 4.8 | Module descriptions have been provided and are clear and accurate | | | | | | |  |  |
|  | Comments | | | | | | | | |
| **Section 5 – Assessment, feedback, learning and teaching** | | | | | | | | **Y** | **N** |
| 5.1 | Learning and teaching methods are appropriate to enable the intended learning outcomes to be achieved | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.2 | The learning and teaching strategy is clear and links to the institutional / Faculty and department level strategies | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.3 | Ethical issues have been identified and addressed | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.4 | The overall assessment strategy meet the requirements of the University’s *Regulations* and *Code of practice for assessment and feedback* | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.5 | Assessment methods are appropriate to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.6 | Assessment loading is similar within modules and across Levels throughout programme | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.7 | A variety of assessment methods are utilised to test student achievements | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.8 | Formative assessments have been adopted and are clearly embedded within the programme | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.9 | Where necessary, alternative assessments have been provided and rationalised | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.10 | Marking / assessment criteria is clear and referenced to the University’s grade descriptors | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5.11 | Timely and constructive feedback is provided to/planned for students on their assessments | | | | | | |  |  |
|  | Comments | | | | | | | | |
| **Section 6 – Benchmarking and consultation** | | | | | | | | **Y** | **N** |
| 6.1 | Programme Learning outcomes/award standards are consistent with Framework for Higher Education Qualifications for England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) | | | | | | |  |  |
| 6.2 | Programme is in line with the minimum threshold standards of the subject benchmark statement(s) where applicable | | | | | | |  |  |
| 6.3 | The programme learning outcomes are adequately reflected in the module learning outcomes | | | | | | |  |  |
| 6.4 | Quality assurance mechanisms are appropriate and conform with University requirements | | | | | | |  |  |
| 6.5 | Accreditation is current and certified where not being sought in conjunction with the periodic review event.  OR  Accreditation will be sought following success validation | | | | | | |  |  |
| 6.6 | Evidence that the programme is in line with the standards of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (if applicable) | | | | | | |  |  |
| 6.7 | Relevant parties have been consulted during the design / development of the programme | | | | | | |  |  |
|  | Comments | | | | | | | | |
| **Section 7 – Resources** | | | | | | | | **Y** | **N** |
| 7.1 | Staffing (academic, professional, administrative and service) is adequate and appropriate to the programme of study | | | | | | |  |  |
| 7.2 | External involvement in the programme is clear and appropriate training is planned / has been carried out | | | | | | |  |  |
| 7.3 | Programme handbook is accurate | | | | | | |  |  |
| 7.4 | Learning resources are in place / planned to support the programme | | | | | | |  |  |
| 7.5 | There are no unnecessary barriers to access by disabled people | | | | | | |  |  |
| 7.6 | Is the information available to the public an accurate representation of the programme? i.e. the website | | | | | | |  |  |
|  | Comments | | | | | | | | |
| **Section 8 – Collaborative provision** | | | | | | | | **Y** | **N** |
| 8.1 | The Professional Training Year (PTY) is in with the *Code of practice for professional training* and the *Regulation’s* | | | | | | |  |  |
| 8.2 | Sufficient information on industry involvement has been provided? | | | | | | |  |  |
| 8.3 | Sufficient detail on the nature, arrangements, supervision and assessment of any collaborative activity within the programme has been provided (not including the PTY) | | | | | | |  |  |
| 8.4 | Memorandum of Agreement(s) or equivalent is signed and up to date / in the process of being developed (if applicable) | | | | | | |  |  |
| 8.5 | Has proportionate due diligence and risk assessment been undertaken? | | | | | | |  |  |
| 8.6 | The collaboration meets the *Code of practice for approving and managing collaborative provision* and the *Regulation’s* | | | | | | |  |  |
|  | Comments | | | | | | | | |
| **Section 9 – Personal development** | | | | | | | |  |  |
| 9.1 | There are appropriate opportunities for personal development planning (PDP) | | | | | | |  |  |
|  | Comments | | | | | | | | |
| **Section 10 – Evaluation (review only)** | | | | | | | | **Y** | **N** |
| 10.1 | An appropriate critical evaluation of the programme(s) under review have been provided, which looks at: programme changes, strengths and successes, competing programmes, staff changes and development, impact on students, annual programme reviews, external examiner reports, student feedback, PSRB requirements and any relevant external influences. | | | | | | |  |  |
| 10.2 | Teaching on information skills is imbedded in the programme | | | | | | |  |  |
| 10.3 | Is rate of progression acceptable? (If not have actions been taken to address issues) | | | | | | |  |  |
| 10.4 | Is rate of completion acceptable? (If not have actions been taken to address issues) | | | | | | |  |  |
| 10.5 | Have trends in degree performance/level of achievement been analysed and where appropriate actions taken to improve performance? | | | | | | |  |  |
| 10.6 | Has information on good degrees been provided? | | | | | | |  |  |
| 10.6 | The National Student Survey results have been evaluated and appropriate actions taken or planned to respond to feedback | | | | | | |  |  |
| 10.7 | The Programme team respond, as appropriate, to results from student evaluations (such as Module Evaluation Questionnaires) | | | | | | |  |  |
| 10.8 | There is evidence that the programme team has considered and responded (as appropriate) to issues raised by student representatives | | | | | | |  |  |
|  | Comments | | | | | | | | |

**APPENDIX A**

**Programme team’s response to conditions and recommendations**

**Award and programme title**

**Review / validation – date of event**

**Conditions from the event**

The Programme Leader is asked to demonstrate how the programme team has responded to the conditions set out in Section 3.3 of the event report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Conditions** | **Programmes team’s response** | **Panel approval / comments** |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |

**Recommendations from the event**

Programme teams are not expected to incorporate all the panel recommendations (set out in section 3.4 of the report), but they are expected to consider them all appropriately using the table below. It is expected that the recommendations will be monitored through the Annual Programme Review’s.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Recommendations** | **Programme team’s response** |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |

**APPENDIX B**

The below information is in relation to the conditions of approval for the validation of award and programme. In order for the panel to consider the conditions met further clarification will need to be given and amendments will need to be made within the validation documentation and advertising material.

Please note that if the below changes affect any other provision that is not being considered as part of this event then it is the responsibility of the programme team to ensure that any relevant amendments / corrections are made. The panel are only considering and approving the information and documentation provided in relation to the proposed programme(s).

*Condition ?: Amend or revise all minor amendments listed within appendix B of the event report.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Amendment / correction** | **Programme team’s response** | **Panel approval / comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |