

## Procedure for Second Stage Review of New Undergraduate Programmes

---

- 1.1. The second stage review will take place during the second or third year of operation of the new undergraduate programme of study. The new programme would be expected to meet the objectives originally laid down and satisfy specific criteria as set out below. If the programme under review is a collaboration between the College and an external organisation / institution then the review panel will take a particular interest in the management of the partnership and the programme, the student experience and welfare arrangements.
- 1.2. The second stage review will be conducted by a sub-committee of the Programmes Committee, appointed by the Chair of the Committee. The sub-committee will comprise an internal Chair, members of the Programmes Committee and of the relevant Faculty Education Committee, a student representative and an external assessor.
- 1.3. The Head of the Department running the new programme will be asked to provide the names and contact details of possible external assessors to approach to assist with the review. It is good practice to recommend external referees from different institutions and those who have not acted as external examiners for taught programmes at the College in the last five academic years. However, the Chair of the Programmes Committee will make the final decision as to which external should be asked.
- 1.4. The Head of Department will also be asked to prepare a report on the programme for the second stage review. The report should cover the following topics:
  - 1.4.1. **Objectives**
    - i. Are the stated objectives being fulfilled?
    - ii. Is there sufficient time for students to be able to relate the knowledge and skills they have learned into a wider context?
  - 1.4.2. **Curriculum**
    - i. Is the pattern of teaching appropriate (e.g. lectures, tutorials, seminars, laboratories, placements, electives, field trips, site visits, e-learning)?
    - ii. Are approaches to learning flexible and inclusive?
    - iii. Where the programme includes e-learning/blended learning, how is this managed, monitored and reviewed? (A sample of e-learning material should be made available for review.)

- iv. Is the curriculum satisfactory in the sense of syllabus content, workload and contact hours and does it provide suitable development of insight and creativity on the part of the student? Importantly, does it take the student in a staged approach from the fundamentals of the subject to the cutting edge?
- v. Is the balance between programme content and student workload suitable?
- vi. Are students given the opportunity to develop a sound knowledge and understanding of broad principles and concepts and to study specialist areas in depth?
- vii. Are students encouraged to develop independent learning skills, to read the relevant literature and to develop a critical and analytical approach to evaluating scientific evidence?
- viii. Are students given appropriate personal support and feedback on their progress?
- ix. Is the programme academically sound in that it forms a satisfactory body of knowledge upon which to build an honours degree?

#### **1.4.3. Recruitment & Viability**

- i. Is the marketing of the programme appropriate and effective?
- ii. Is the student demand for the programme reaching the intake targets set, and are the students of suitable calibre?
- iii. Is the programme financially viable?
- iv. What procedures are in place for succession planning and for ensuring the on-going stability of the programme?

#### **1.4.4. Resources**

- i. Have adequate resources been made available in terms of qualified academic staff, support staff, personal tutors, equipment, non-staff budget, library and IT provision, space?
- ii. For collaborative programmes has adequate provision been made for site visits?
- iii. Have appropriate operational structures been established to ensure that placement opportunities and electives are robustly managed?
- iv. Have appropriate health and safety checks and risk analyses been carried out for activities that will take place away from College campuses (e.g. placements and electives)?

#### **1.4.5. Progression**

- i. Are students satisfactorily completing each year of study and progressing through the programme?
- ii. If appropriate, will students graduate with an appropriate distribution of degree honours?

#### **1.4.6. Career Prospects**

- i. Does it appear that the training offered by the programme will provide a student with adequate career prospects?
- ii. Are students offered appropriate advice and training to develop professional skills?

#### **1.4.7. Collaborative Programmes**

- i. Copies of the minutes of Joint Management Committee meetings since programme inception should be included in the submission
- ii. Copies of any site visit reports that have taken place since the programme's inception should also be included.
- iii. Relevant extracts from Memorandum of Agreement (or any amendments) should be included in the submission

#### **1.4.8. Student Surveys**

- i. Copies of the results of any student surveys conducted for the programme since its inception should be included in the submission.

1.5. The Registry will also supply a copy of the latest annual monitoring report for the programme, along with data on application numbers, offers and admissions and student progression since the programme's inception.

1.6. The sub-committee will meet to consider this documentation and will usually hold discussions with staff, including, where appropriate staff from collaborative partners, and student representatives from the programme.

1.7. Following the sub-committee's review meeting, the Chair of the sub-committee will write a report, in consultation with other members of the sub-committee, on the findings of the second stage review and the Department's response to the criteria set out in 3.4. Upon receipt of this report, the department will be invited to make a response. The sub-committee's report and the departmental response is then submitted to the Programmes Committee.

1.8. Following consideration of the report, the Programmes Committee will submit a report to the Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee (QAEC).. Any action required by the department as a result of the second stage review will normally be followed-up as part of the annual monitoring process, unless the Programmes Committee and QAEC determine that earlier follow-up action is

required. QAEC will report the outcome of the second stage review to Senate.

- 1.9. If the report recommends that approval of the programme cannot be confirmed, and consequently that the programme should be withdrawn, the College will ensure that students currently registered on the programme will be able to complete their degrees.

Approved by Senate  
February 2013

Revised February 2016

<b>Document title:</b>	Procedure for Second Stage Review of New Undergraduate Programmes		
<b>Version:</b>	2	<b>Date:</b>	Feb 2016
<b>Location and filename:</b>	R:\7.Quality Assurance\3. Policy Framework\1. Programme Design & Modification\Procedure for the Second Stage Review of New UG Programmes		
<b>Approved:</b>	Feb 2013 / revised Feb 2016		
<b>Effective from:</b>	Feb 2013 / revisions from 1st January 2016		
<b>Originator:</b>	Registry Quality Assurance & Enhancement Team		
<b>Contact for queries:</b>	Assistant Registrar (Quality Assurance)		
<b>Cross References:</b>	Procedure (New Programme Approval)		
<b>Notes and latest changes:</b>	Revisions to reflect new committee structure from Jan 2016 Formatting Changes made on 07/03/2016		