

06.2

PERIODIC AND ELECTIVE REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMMES

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

PERIODIC AND ELECTIVE REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMMES

Introduction

1. This section aims to set out the purpose of and procedure for the periodic review and elective review of programmes. It covers:
 - An Outline of Periodic and Elective Review;
 - Purpose of Periodic and Elective Review;
 - The Standing Panel;
 - School Quality Assurance;
 - Documentation to be Submitted for Review;
 - Formulation of Standing Panel Decisions;
 - Review Checklist;
 - Guidance on Preparing a Self-Evaluation Document (Appendix 1).
2. Guidance on submitting a proposal for a significant change to an existing programme to PDC, and approval and validation checklists for proposers, QED and the Standing Panel are contained in Volume 2, Section 3 of the Academic Handbook.
3. Guidance Notes and Templates for Programme Specifications and Module Descriptors are also contained in Volume 2, Section 2 of the Academic Handbook.
4. Details of the University's curriculum principles and parameters can be found on the [QED Design and Planning](#) webpages.

Periodic and Elective Review in Outline

5. Programmes must undergo periodic review on a cyclical basis with all programmes normally undergoing review every five years. The review cycle for each academic session will be determined by the Academic Quality & Standards Committee (AQSC) following scrutiny of relevant Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP) data and proposed School plans for curriculum change.
6. As part of this process, Schools may apply to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee to bring forward a programme's scheduled review to within a five-year period. Such applications should be made as early as possible, but normally not later than the October preceding the intended elective review.
7. As both periodic and elective review gauge a programme's fitness for purpose and include the opportunity for the Programme Team to propose changes, whether minor or major, the timing of the review is the only difference between the review types.
8. Periodic and Elective Review may be of an individual programme or, where acceptable to Academic Quality & Standards Committee, of a scheme or group of related programmes (sometimes referred to as a matrix).

9. Wherever possible, franchise programmes will be reviewed with, and at the same time as, the equivalent University programme.
10. In order to give full consideration to programmes undergoing review, it may be acceptable for schemes which incorporate several generically related programmes to be reviewed together. Examples of this might be closely related programmes, such as an HND, HNC and foundation degree programmes, or a grouping of cognate programmes with a substantial degree of commonality at sub-degree and degree level.
11. Programme reviews will normally be scheduled to be undertaken no later than the early spring term, though at the discretion of the Academic Quality & Standards Committee, for example where considerable change is proposed or to accommodate a PSRB, the Standing Panel may be approved to consider the proposals later in the spring term.
12. If substantial change is envisaged, this should be outlined in good time to the Quality Enhancement Directorate (QED), who may decide to recommend that the School makes an application to the Portfolio Development Committee, should it be necessary to ascertain whether adequate investigation has taken place regarding the marketability of the programme, if changed, and/or that the programme, if changed, would remain aligned to the University Mission. Proposed changes to programme titles or awards, mode of study or language of study will need to receive PDC approval before the periodic review takes place.
13. The Quality Enhancement Directorate, in consultation with Schools, will plan in the autumn term the timelines for the submission of draft and final academic approval documentation to the Standing Panel. It will try to avoid duplication of review scrutiny by other, especially professional, bodies and seek close working relationships with them.
14. The QED and the School Deputy/Associate Dean should provide the necessary guidance to prepare for a review. The documents required (see list below) should mostly already be in existence and the Self-Evaluation Document (SED) (see below) should be succinct and concentrate on a critical review of the programme, changes made and, if incorporating modifications, on developments proposed. They should also include a copy of the current student programme handbook(s), Programme Enhancement Plans, external examiners' reports and Programme Team responses thereto, programme committee minutes for the previous 2 years, any previous review reports and reports from external bodies (e.g. professional bodies). The Standing Panel may request further information before or during scrutiny. Additional information and documents, such as examples of the work of students, may be requested in some cases (particularly where professional/accrediting bodies are involved) in advance of scrutiny by the Standing Panel.
15. The modification procedure should not normally be used in a periodic/elective review year, as any proposed changes should be incorporated into the periodic/elective review.

16. Prior to a submission to the Programme Approval Standing Panel, the School should ensure that it has:
 - .1 Gained approval from the PDC for any proposed changes to the award, title, mode or language of the programme. Such proposals must be submitted to PDC by its October meeting in respect of changes to be applied to provision for the following September;
 - .2 Alerted QED to any proposed deviation from the University's academic regulations or curriculum parameters in the early stages of academic development for early consideration by the Standing Panel;
 - .3 Have nominated, gained QED approval of, and liaised with, an External Adviser, Student Adviser and (where applicable) Industry Adviser in the development of the curriculum.

Purpose of Periodic Review and Elective Review

17. The purpose of a substantial review of an existing programme is critically to appraise its state of health, its continuing validity and relevance, and to approve any proposed changes. It will focus both on changes that have taken place since initial validation (or an earlier review), on quality enhancement, on standards achieved, and on developments planned. It will ascertain whether the programme remains aligned to the University's Mission, Student Engagement Strategy and Curriculum Principles, has attained appropriate levels of quality and standards and continues to take cognisance of external benchmark statements as necessary, including relevant QAA subject benchmark statements (for foundation degrees, the QAA Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark, for Apprenticeships, the QAA Characteristics Statement), FHEQ qualification descriptors, the CQFW, and the requirements of employers and relevant PSRBs.
18. Proposed changes may include the introduction of delivery in blended and online modes and the offering of modules as short courses. In such cases, the proposals must have gained PDC or Short Course Panel approval prior to the review, and additional scrutiny of the approach to blended or online learning will be required in line with the University's Procedure for the Validation of Blended or Online Programmes.

Standing Panel

19. Periodic and Elective Reviews will be conducted by the University's Programme Approval Standing Panel, which will be comprised from:

PVC Student Engagement (Chair)
Director of Learning Enhancement (Deputy Chair)
Students' Union Vice-President
Director of Registry Services
Director of Student Services

Academic representatives drawn from Schools

Co-opted members with expertise in the following areas will be invited by the Chair to consider proposals where deemed necessary:

Apprenticeships
Employability/Entrepreneurship
PSRBs
Welsh language provision
TNE provision
Online/blended provision
Dual/double/joint awards

20. The QED will facilitate and record the review event.

School Quality Assurance

21. The lead-in to submission of the review documentation is a crucial period during which Schools should engage with the QED regarding any re-design/development of the programme. Following AQSC approval of a periodic review, the QED will link with the proposers to discuss the support needs of the Programme Team. Programme Teams who fail to engage with QED will not be permitted to submit their proposed curriculum changes to the Standing Panel. Schools should also consult employers, students and, if appropriate, PSRBs and any franchise partners during programme re-design/development. The standing panel, with the student experience the focus of their scrutiny, has the right to expect that the SMPT has ensured thorough preparation of both the submission documentation and the Programme Team, including peer review of the draft submission to inform the DD's release of the document to the Panel. The Quality Enhancement Directorate will also review proposals prior to the submission to the Standing Panel. Incomplete or poorly considered documents, or proposals that deviate from the University's curriculum parameters without prior Standing Panel approval, will not be considered by the Standing Panel.
22. The Programme Director and Programme Team will produce the programme review documents. These documents will be the basis for Standing Panel scrutiny and its quality will be of crucial importance. The QED must receive the documents for draft consideration by the Standing Panel at least 8 weeks before the date set for final consideration by the Standing Panel; failure to do this will result in the review being deferred to a later date when the Standing Panel has capacity to consider the documentation.
23. Before submitting programme documentation for periodic or elective review to the QED, measures must be taken within the School (via the Deputy/Associate Dean) to ensure that:
- .1 the form, content and quality of the documentation complies with requirements, including those on the 'Proposer and DD/AD Submission Checklist' (Volume 2, Section 1.2 refers);

- 2 there is ownership of the documentation by the Programme Team, which will respond to any QED or Standing Panel commentary or required changes;
- 3 the resources needed to deliver the programme will continue to be available and, in the case of any proposed changes to the programme, will be made available;
- 4 if appropriate, that any servicing required from other Schools will continue to be available and, in the case of allowed proposed changes to the programme, is properly organised and will be available;
- 5 the design of the programme complies with the University's Curriculum Principles, relevant academic regulations, structural framework and curriculum parameters and has taken account of the programme design process and any consultation with External Advisers, Student Advisers, Industry Advisers, employers, students and franchise partners;
- 6 the programme incorporates the University's statutory requirements, for example, in regard to assessment regulations and skills development, etc. including the number of re-assessment attempts (1 or 2) for the programme;
- 7 the programme incorporates and is aligned to the requirements of any relevant external benchmark statements, including QAA subject benchmark statements, (for Foundation Degrees, the QAA Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark), FHEQ qualification descriptors, and the requirements of relevant PSRBs;
- 8 the programme incorporates the desired policy direction and EDGE, as outlined in the current University Corporate Strategic Plan and Student Engagement Strategy;
- 9 the School has fully considered the pedagogic and resource implications of adopting blended or online learning and the proposal aligns with the University's '10 Principles of Online Learning';
- .10 the programme endorses and demonstrates means for adopting employability skills through its learning and teaching strategies, and any recommendations made by the Employability team have been addressed;
- .11 the programme enables students to understand, learn and benefit from research-based enquiry, particularly that which is relevant to their discipline; where appropriate, undertake such research; and acquire and apply research skills appropriate to their level and discipline;
- .12 if applicable to the programme, that its Key Information Set has been scrutinised.

24. On submitting the draft documentation to the QED, the QED will undertake an initial scrutiny of the submission to ascertain that the documentation is compliant with requirements (structural, regulatory) and will inform the Standing Panel of any areas that require further development. Following scrutiny by the Standing Panel and the QED, Standing Panel recommendations for changes will be passed to the Deputy/Associate Dean and the Programme Director for consideration before the submission of revised documentation for final academic approval.
25. In instances where the documentation is deemed to be unsatisfactory, the Quality Operations Manager will require the submission to be postponed or cancelled.

Documentation to be Submitted for Periodic and Elective Review

26. The documentation should be submitted to QED and should be organised in such a way as to make for ease of access, referencing and reading. An indication of what is to be found in each document package is useful, particularly where trailing of issues is concerned.
27. Most of the documentation required should normally be already available. Programme Directors/School Deputy/Associate Deans are encouraged to use existing documents as widely as possible and to collect and present them to best advantage. In essence, the review should be a substantial, extended version of the Programme Enhancement Planning/monitoring of programmes.
28. The following will be included in the submission for review:
 - .1 a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) from the Programme Director using the corporate template and comprehensively addressing each point (see guidance and template in Appendix 1), including the rationale and detail of any proposed modifications, together with evidence of their approval-in-principle by the external examiner(s);
 - 2 the programme document updated with any proposed modification(s) and incorporating the updated programme specification and appendices*, and module descriptors (a standard proforma is available in the Academic Handbook); core modules for which failure by students cannot be compensated must be identified; templates and guidance for programme specifications and module descriptors are in the Academic Handbook;

* such appendices include mappings referred to in the programme specification, for example:

- a) programme learning outcomes and modules;
- b) assessment methods, learning and teaching strategies and modules;
- c) EDGE and modules;
- d) Programme and module learning outcomes to relevant benchmark statements (QAA subject benchmark statements, FHEQ qualification descriptors, Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark, relevant PSRB requirements);

- 3 the curriculum vitae of all staff who teach on the programme (corporate CVs are available from the Human Resources Unit) and a map or diagram relating module tutors to module titles;
- 4 for HE programmes, a copy of the relevant QAA subject benchmark statement where appropriate;
- 5 current student programme handbook(s) (all programmes must have a student programme handbook);
- 6 the validation report or the last periodic review report (whichever is the most recent);
- 7 appropriate evidence that past changes to the programme have taken place through the correct mechanism;
- 8 Programme Enhancement Plans for the last 2 years, including those for any franchise; for reviews covering large areas of School provision, the most recent School Student Engagement Plan should also be provided;
- 9 all external examiner/verifier reports for the last 2 years and the Programme Team's responses thereto, including those for any franchise;
- .10 records of all Programme Committee meetings for the last 2 years;
- .11 copies of any external (PSRB) reports on the programme, which refer to the period in question;
- .12 a copy of the placement learning handbook and learning contract, where relevant;
- .13 Access for the Panel to the programme learning platform;
- .14 if applicable to the programme, its Key Information Set.
- .15 A copy of the Race Equality reflection exercise undertaken by the Programme Team;
- .16 For collaborative provision only:

Moderators'/Link Tutors' reports for last 2 years; authorised memoranda of programme agreement.

N.B. The School should ensure that if the submission is in whole or in part in Welsh, that English translations are included.

29. In addition to the above, a selection of students' work; examination examples,

assignments, etc. should also be made available.

Definitive Programme Document

30. Once a programme periodic or elective review has been approved through the University academic committee structure, Programme Directors are required to send to the QED an electronic PDF version of the definitive programme document, which will be held as a source of information about the reviewed programme.
31. Amendments to the programme document as a result of a review or significant changes to the programme must be sent to the QED immediately after such amendments have been approved.

Academic Approval by the Standing Panel: Scope and Process

Scope

32. The nature of the Standing Panel's scrutiny of the proposal will reflect the nature of the submission. For all reviews, details of the facilities that are available to the programme will be included in the submission documentation. In the case of collaborative partners, a tour of facilities (in-person or virtually) by the Standing Panel may be required.
33. The Standing Panel will review the programme(s), taking cognisance of any proposed incorporated modifications that the School proposes to make (and hold meetings with the Programme Team where deemed necessary), and assure itself of the following:
 1. The curriculum aligns with the Student Engagement Strategy and Curriculum Principles, and any recommendations made by PDC have been observed;
 2. Any proposed deviations from the University's curriculum parameters, including those for contact hours, optional modules, credit weightings, placements and authentic assessment, and modes of delivery are supported by a robust academic case;
 3. The academic coherence of the programme and the appropriateness of the programme aims, learning outcomes and outcomes across the proposed modules;
 4. The soundness of the student journey through the programme, including the rationale linking learning outcomes, content, learning and teaching methodologies, and assessment strategies (including feedback to students) and the balance of assessment methods;
 5. That the proposer has taken into account any recommendations in regard to embedding employability through curriculum design;
 6. That the proposal has been responsive to stakeholder feedback internally and externally;

7. That the proposal aligns with the University's requirements for different modes of learning (on-campus/blended/online);

8. The relationship/comparability of the programme in relation to any national benchmarks or standards (e.g. QAA subject benchmark statement, FHEQ qualification descriptor, Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark, QAA Apprenticeships Characteristics Statement, PSRB requirements, local ministry requirements);

9. Where professional practice, work placement, etc. are incorporated, the management, support and assessment principles involved and that there is general compliance with the University's policy and guidelines for work-based and placement learning;

10. Where student exchange and/or other forms of study away from the University which might involve third party assessment, the management and supervision of such elements, and the methods by which both academic credit and marking/assessment levels will be assured with regards to those required by the University;

11. In instances where online or blended learning is to be employed, the approach to be used, support available, the learning materials proposed and the alignment of the proposals with the University's 10 Principles for Online Learning;

12. That any proposed changes reflect the performance of the programme to date and that the standards set at the introduction of the programme(s) or since the last periodic review have been maintained. That quality enhancement by virtue of taking action on issues raised has taken place, that appropriate programme updates have occurred and via the correct mechanisms;

13. In the case of major projects or dissertations or similar, the arrangements for their selection, supervision and assessment;

14. The quality of the Student Programme Handbook and learning platform;

15. Arrangements for personal tutoring;

16. That all required documentation for approval has been completed fully and appropriately.

In the case of programmes at collaborative partners, the Panel will also seek to ensure:

17. That the management and academic staffing continue to ensure that academic standards are achieved successfully and that the quality of provision is at a comparable level;

18. That appropriate learning resources and student support mechanisms are in place to deliver the programme;

19. In the case of franchised provision, that any minor changes proposed to the curriculum (e.g. to contextualise) are acceptable in terms of content, breadth and academic level.

Standing Panel Scrutiny

34. In most cases, reviews will be undertaken via the scrutiny of submitted documentation and meetings between the proposers and the Standing Panel. In the case of large portfolios, complex modes of provision, or where there is a significant PSRB requirement, the Panel may determine that meetings, in addition to those listed below, should also be held. Meetings for a periodic review will typically include:

- .1 a meeting of the Panel with the Dean of School, School Deputy Dean, Associate Dean: Student Engagement and Programme Director to explore context and management issues;
- .2 a meeting, or meetings, of the Panel with the Programme Team to investigate fully the programme proposal including rationale, content, assessment and entry to the programme; it is expected that all Programme Team members, including external lecturers where there is substantial input, will attend this meeting; the Dean of School and/or School Deputy/Associate Dean may also be present as appropriate;
- .3 a tour of facilities, both general (for example, library and information technology) and those specific to the programme;
- .4 where appropriate, a meeting with students from the School in which the programme is to be located.

Formulation of Review Decisions

35. Recommendations to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee for the continuation of approval should not normally be made if the Panel retains major reservations about the way the programme has operated since validation or the previous review, about the standards achieved or about the staffing and resources associated with the programme.
36. The situation which causes most difficulty arises where the document is deficient but where the reservations of the Panel have been satisfied in discussion. In such cases, the Panel must be satisfied that the issues have been or can be resolved and that the documentation will be amended accordingly.
37. Following consideration of the final academic proposal, the Standing Panel may make the following recommendations:

- .1 that the programme be approved to continue;

- .2 that the programme be approved subject to minor changes to the documentation;
 - .3 that the programme be approved to continue subject to ongoing monitoring by AQSC. In the case of resource issues, including staffing, this may result in a requirement for an action plan, to be monitored through the Academic Quality & Standards Committee;
 - .4 that the programme be not approved to continue but resubmitted after a process of further development or re-design;
 - .5 that the programme be closed, on the grounds that neither the application of changes nor further development would result in a programme of appropriate quality or standard.
38. In the case of recommendation 1, 2 or 3 above, AQSC will be advised to approve the continuation of the programme (following, where applicable, the completion of any minor changes or an appropriate action plan). In the case of recommendation 5, the outcome will be reported to the Portfolio Development Committee.

Periodic Review of Programmes Undergoing Discontinuation

39. In circumstances where review falls during the period following formal discontinuation of the programme by Academic Board, then review will consist of the scrutiny of the APR report for the programme by the QED and a short report to the Academic Quality & Standards Committee.

Programme Review Checklist

| Action | Responsibility | Deadline |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Consider programme health data and plans for curriculum change, and propose School review cycle for following session to AQSC | QED/Schools | April |
| Approved programme review cycle for following academic session | AQSC | June |
| Alert QED to any proposed significant changes to programmes | Dean of School | By September |
| Create employability report (as appropriate) | Employability | By October |
| Submit substantial changes for approval to PDC | Dean of School | By October |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|--|
| Meet with QED to confirm proposed date for final academic approval and curriculum design support needs | Lead Proposer/DD/AD | By November |
| Present annual schedule of reviews and proposals to Standing Panel and Academic Quality & Standards Committee | QED | By November |
| Propose External Advisor(s) for QED approval | DD/AD | By November |
| Allocate Student Reviewer(s) | QED | By November |
| Submit draft academic proposal to QED | School D/AD | 40 working days before final approval date |
| Undertake review and submit report and proposal documents to Standing Panel | QED | 35 working days before final approval date. |
| Submit comments on draft academic proposal. Confirm if any additional meetings are required with the proposers | Standing Panel | 30 working days before final approval date |
| Inform School of QED and Panel recommendations and provide support as necessary | QED | 30-25 working days before final approval date |
| Submit final academic proposal to QED | School D/AD | 15 working days before final approval date |
| Review final proposal and inform School of any recommended changes | QED | 10 working days before final approval date |
| Submit final academic approval to QED for Standing Panel scrutiny | DD/AD | 5 working days working days before final approval date |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Meetings of proposing team and Standing Panel held | School/Standing Panel/Partners | Final approval date |
| Approve final academic proposal or refer back to School | Standing Panel | Final approval date |
| Communicate outcomes and submit any recommendations for ongoing approval to AQSC or discontinuation to PDC | QED | 5 working days after final approval date |

Guidance for Completing the Self-Evaluation Template Document for Periodic/Elective Review

Introduction

The Academic Handbook Entry 'Periodic and Elective Review of Existing Programmes' requires that in submitting documentation for review events, the documentation submitted must incorporate a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) from the School, normally from the Programme Director.

The purpose of this guidance is to provide the template for the construction of the SED, bearing in mind: -

- a) the need to ensure that the procedures will help Programme Teams, Schools and the institution to satisfy the requirements of external stakeholders whilst retaining flexibility and cost-effectiveness;
- b) that Schools may submit generic groups of programmes for review as opposed to individual programmes.

Template for the Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

The SED must comprehensively address the following headings, as well as providing a summary of the modifications during the approval period and a summary of any proposed modifications and likely future developments. The Panel will expect the SED to be analytical and evaluative, providing a critical review of the programme, including reflections on past changes and developments. The SED must clearly identify and rationalise any proposals for change to be approved by the Panel.

Introduction

1. A summary of the submission and what it is trying to achieve.

Background to the Programme

2. A brief outline of the programme, its background, development history and its current context, including: identification, if appropriate, of any delivery via blended or online learning; and identification, if appropriate, of any modules delivered or intended to be delivered as short courses.
3. A summary of any modifications during the approval period, indicating those which

were in response to internal and external feedback, including the outcome of Programme Enhancement Plans, external examiner reports and reports of relevant professional bodies. The following table must be completed to supplement this summary.

| Summary Table of Modifications Approved During the Review Period | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| Year | Modification (summary of change and modules affected) | In response to (e.g. external examiner) | Evaluation of Effectiveness (with reference to KPI data) | Enhancement of Student Learning |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Rows may be added to accommodate all modification activity

4. The effectiveness of these changes and the extent to which they have enhanced student learning (please refer to programme current and trend KPI data wherever possible).

Proposed Changes to the Programme

5. A rationale for, and a summary of, any modifications proposed, which must be cross-referenced clearly to where such changes can be located in the programme document. To supplement the rationale and summary, the following chart and table must be completed:

5a. A table or chart contrasting the existing programme structure with the proposed new structure must be included here. Modules shared with other programmes must be identified.

5b. The following table summarising proposed changes to modules must be completed:

| Summary Table of Proposed Modifications | | |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of Proposed modification (identify any module[s] affected) | Rationale for modification (identify any module[s] affected) | Evidence of modification in programme documentation e.g. identifying where in the programme specification or which module descriptor |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Rows may be added to accommodate modification proposals.

Academic Handbook 2023/24 – Volume 2 – 06.2 – Periodic and Elective Review of Existing Programmes – modified 27.09.11, 25.10.11, 20.08.12, 19.07.13, 10.10.13, 06.01.14, 20.10.15, 22.06.16, 27.02.18, 29.09.19, 13.08.21; last modified 26.08.22

- 5c. It must be made clear whether the proposed changes will apply to the existing cohort.
- 5d. Complete the Modifications Summary of Changes form in Appendix 2 as part of the submission.
6. Evidence of approval-in-principle by the external examiner(s) must be provided in the submission documentation and referenced here.
7. If the proposed changes include a change to mode, award title, programme title, language or location, you must confirm that PDC approval has been granted.
8. If your proposed curriculum includes any deviation from the University's curriculum parameters, you must confirm that you have gained previous approval by the Standing Panel.
9. If franchised, evidence of consultation with the collaborating partner must be provided in the submission documentation and referenced here, together with the proposed implementation date should this vary from the University's (see also paragraph 28).

Aims and Learning Outcomes/Performance Criteria

10. How the aims and learning outcomes/performance criteria relate to internal drivers such as the University Corporate Strategy, Student Engagement Strategy and the Curriculum Principles.
11. How the stipulated aims relate to the learning outcomes/performance criteria.

Curricula

12. The effectiveness and appropriateness of the curriculum in fulfilling the stipulated aims and learning outcomes/performance criteria.
13. The appropriateness and continued relevance of the curriculum, as demonstrated by student and employer and practitioner feedback (citing evidence in the submission document) and recognised good practice within the discipline, including teaching and learning developments and/or learner guidance and research.
14. A summary of any amendments that have been introduced to reflect developments within the discipline, or as a consequence of the outcome of internal debate or student, employer or external feedback.

Assessment

15. The effectiveness of the chosen assessment strategies and methods in promoting student learning and ensuring that students fulfil the learning outcomes/performance criteria and in enabling discrimination between categories of performance.
16. The effectiveness of assessment strategies in relation to both formative and summative assessment.
17. The effectiveness in the approach to feedback to students and marking verification (such as double marking).
18. The extent to which student achievement demonstrates the requirements for the award in relation to subject benchmarks, learning outcomes and qualification frameworks.

Teaching and Learning Opportunities

19. A summary of the student journey through the programme, including the rationale linking learning outcomes, content, learning and teaching methodologies, and assessment strategies (including feedback to students) and the balance of assessment methods. This can be provided as a text narrative or include graphic depictions where useful.
20. The effectiveness of the teaching and learning strategies and/or learner guidance and how they have developed during the approval period.
21. The effectiveness of the approach to authentic learning, including the arrangements for work-based or placement learning opportunities. Where a placement or work-based learning element isn't included in the programme, please give an overview of the approach to authentic assessment.
22. The effectiveness of the programme approach to inclusivity to include a summary of the alignment of the proposal to relevant curriculum principles and the Student Engagement Strategy. This should include a reflection on the forms of assessment proposed across the programme and the arrangements to be put in place for alternative assessment opportunities for students.
23. Issues relating to student workload.
24. Any factors, which may impede or limit the quality of the learning and teaching environment.
25. The effectiveness of academic tutorial, counselling and mentor support.

26. The development of EDGE attributes, and where appropriate, skills derived from subject benchmark statements.
27. The effectiveness of arrangements for any Work-Based Learning.
28. The effectiveness of arrangements for PDP.

Maintenance and enhancement of Standards and Quality

29. The overall standards achieved and the measures/comparators against which judgements are made.
30. Consideration of progression and completion rates.
31. Employment destinations of graduates/award holders.
32. Action taken in response to External Examiners' or Verifiers' Reports and those of any relevant professional bodies, etc.

Collaborative Provision (if relevant)

33. Where the programme is also offered collaboratively in a partner institution or partner institutions, the critical appraisal should incorporate the operation of collaborative programmes with reference to all of the above, and in relation to the partnership should also comment upon: -
 - a) the effectiveness of the work of the moderator(s)/link tutor(s) in assisting collaborating institution programme delivery;
 - b) the effectiveness of inter-institutional communication;
 - c) the effectiveness of arrangements for joint assessment and joint examination boards;
 - d) initiatives relating to joint or exchange teaching, student exchanges and/or visits;
 - e) the effectiveness of student progression arrangements;
 - f) evidence of consultation on any proposed modifications, stating the proposed date of implementation at the partner if that differs from the University.

**Cardiff Metropolitan University
Academic Quality & Standards
Committee**

**MODIFICATION(S) Summary Form
(to be used in conjunction with Academic Handbook Volume 2, Section 4.1
– [04.1 Modifications to Programmes](#))**

Guidance on when to complete this form:

To maintain compliance with Competition and Marketing Authority (CMA) guidelines, the University is required to inform applicants of changes to the curriculum that could influence their decision to enrol on their chosen programme of study. Consequently, this form must be completed when any element of the proposed modification results in a change in the content of published material and/or other information provided to applicants.

Examples of modifications that require completion of this form include:

- *Programme level changes that result in a change to the published definitive programme specification.*
- *Module level changes that result in a change to the published definitive programme specification.*
- *Programme and / or module level changes that contradict information provided in marketing material (e.g. prospectus, course leaflets, web pages).*
- *Programme and / or module level changes that contradict information provided in Open Day recruitment activities.*

Please direct all enquiries related to the completion of this form to Lisa Bowen in Admissions (lbowen@cardiffmet.ac.uk).

Note:

The School Minor Modification Committee or Major Modifications Committee will not consider proposed minor/major modifications that potentially impact on applicants when not supported by a completed 'Modifications Summary Form'.

FOR SCHOOL USE

Name of Programme(s):

School Modification Number:

Name of Programme Director(s):

Area of Study (AOS) Number:

Modification Implementation Date:

Summary of Proposed Modification (Please write a concise and student-facing summary of the proposed curriculum modification. Do not use language that will be unfamiliar to an applicant with little or no experience of higher education):

Please forward the completed form to Lisa Bowen in Admissions (lbowen@cardiffmet.ac.uk).