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Part 1: QA Context

**Part 1 Contents**

[INTRODUCTION 8](#_Toc204083602)

[Changes for the August 2025 edition 10](#_Toc204083603)

[Section A: Committee structure, terms of reference and responsibilities 11](#_Toc204083604)

INTRODUCTION

This handbook provides a short guide to the procedures which the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee, University Research Committee, Graduate Board and Senate have adopted for the validation and annual evaluation of courses, programmes of study and research awards, including those validated by external bodies, and for the review of teaching, research and academic support services. The procedures have been developed and align with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code), as published by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), to ensure that academic standards are set at a level which meets the UK threshold standard for the qualification concerned. It is aimed at academic and administrative staff and those at Collaborating Institutions. A separate document has been produced by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor covering the financial arrangement for collaborative provision, copies of which can be obtained from Registry and Academic Development.

**School Reviews**

The evaluation of the strategic direction and performance of Schools within the University and the audit of the operation of their quality assurance and enhancement arrangements along with an examination of its assessment, teaching and learning and research strategies is undertaken through mechanisms including Quality Appraisals, Subject Review, PSRB Reviews, OfS and UNIAC audits and most regularly through the mechanism of the Annual Planning Round. External scrutiny to the process is provided through the periodic audits of OfS and PSRBs to which all Schools are exposed.

**Service Reviews**

The evaluation of the strategic direction and performance of the services within the University and the audit of the operation of its quality assurance and enhancement arrangements is undertaken through mechanisms including Quality Appraisals, UNIAC audits and most regularly through the mechanism of the Annual Planning Round.

**Emergency Procedures**

There may be times, because of exceptional circumstances beyond our reasonable control, when the University is unable to apply the approved Quality Assurance Procedures. In these circumstances, emergency procedures may be approved by the University Teaching & Learning Committee for a duration as determined by the Vice Chancellor (or nominee).

Variations to the procedures may involve alteration of processes or the use of measures designed to support virtual or online processes in instances where it may not be possible to hold face-to-face events. Once approved, any emergency procedures will be circulated to stakeholders as appropriate and will be made available on the Registry and Academic Development website.

**Further Information**

Users of the handbook who require further information on any point should consult the Head of Quality Assurance or staff in the Registry and Academic Development in the first instance. Further information is also available from the Registry and Academic Development website at: <http://www.hud.ac.uk/registry/>

Throughout this handbook the Pro Vice-Chancellor with responsibility for curriculum delivery, and quality assurance and enhancement is referred to as the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning). The Pro Vice-Chancellor with responsibility for Research Awards is referred to as the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise).

The changes included in the August 2025 edition can be found on the next page.

Changes for the August 2025 edition

The changes include:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Changes** |
| **Throughout Document** | * Updating references to Registry to “Registry & Academic Development”
* Removal of reference to School Board
* Removal of superfluous references to School Validation panel and replacing with Tier 1 panel
 |
| **Section A** | * Removal of School Board
* Removal of School Board Terms of Reference
* Removal of Appendix -- Guidelines for the operation of school boards
 |
| **Section B** | * Removal of Key Details Form and replacing with “Outline Proposal”
* Adding the requirement that all courses delivered at Queensgate should not include more than 20% on-line delivery.
* Clarification of requirement for EE approval of changes to existing courses.
* Clarification of role of Course Lifecycle team in setting agendas for validation events.
 |
| **Section D** | * Removal of Key Details Form and replacing with “Outline Proposal”
 |
| **Section K** | * Removal of Compliance Exercise
* Update to documentation required for Subject reviews
 |
| **Section M** | * Noting that Annual Evaluation for taught provision is undertaken as a continuous cycle across the academic year.
 |
| **Appendix A** | * Update to Validation Timeline
 |
| **Appendix** | * Removal of Appendix Compliance Exercise Guidance
 |

Section A: Committee structure, terms of reference and responsibilities

**A1. The Senate**

The Articles of Government of the University state that the Senate is responsible for:

1. The consideration of the academic plan of the University and its associated academic activities and the resources needed to support them and for advising the Vice-Chancellor and the University Council thereon.
2. The maintenance of academic standards guided by the Quality Assurance Agency UK Quality Code for Higher Education.
3. Making regulations for the admission of students.
4. Making regulations for the examination and assessment of the academic attainment of students.
5. Regulating research degrees and postgraduate studies.
6. The curricula and Teaching and Learning strategies.
7. The suspension and expulsion of students from the University.
8. The appointment, removal and regulation of external examiners and assessors.
9. Making regulations for and the conferring of academic qualifications and academic distinctions of the University.
10. Making recommendations to appropriate bodies for the award of academic qualifications, scholarships, bursaries, prizes and other distinctions.
11. Making regulations and recommendations for the award of honorary academic qualifications and titles.
12. Such other matters as the University Council or the Vice-Chancellor may assign to it.

**A2. The University’s Teaching and Learning Committee**

The Committee is responsible to the Senate for overseeing all matters relating to the development and delivery of taught courses of study and for ensuring the maintenance of appropriate academic standards.

**Terms of Reference**

1. To determine on behalf of the Senate the quality and standards of teaching provision.
2. To determine on behalf of the Senate the standards of conduct expected of students.
3. To determine on behalf of the Senate the regulations and procedures governing the conduct of students.
4. To determine on behalf of the Senate the standards of attainment associated with different courses and awards.
5. To approve all courses of study leading to the University’s awards.
6. To develop and ensure the implementation of a university strategy for teaching and learning.
7. To establish and oversee procedures for the validation, approval and annual evaluation of all courses of study leading to the University’s awards, including franchised or collaborative courses, and for the assurance of the quality of those awards in line with Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) guidance.
8. To approve the appointment of external examiners for courses of study leading to the University’s awards.
9. To establish and oversee procedures for the review of the University’s Schools and Services.
10. To determine on behalf of the Senate the academic structures\* through which the University’s courses of study should be delivered.
11. To determine on behalf of the Senate the academic regulations governing courses of study leading to the University’s awards.
12. To determine on behalf of the Senate the development and promotion of lifelong learning within the University.
13. To promote innovation, creativity and inspiration in teaching, learning and assessment.
14. To promote the continuing professional development of staff within the University.

\* The term academic structures in term of reference 10) includes the academic management substructure underpinning courses as well as the academic courses per se.

To assist it in discharging its responsibilities the Committee will establish panels whose membership may contain persons who are not themselves members of the Committee. Such panels shall include the Standing Committee for Collaborative Provision (SCCP), the Standing Committee for Apprenticeships (SCA) and *ad hoc* panels for validation and review.

**A3. The University’s Research Committee**

The University Research Committee (URC) is responsible to the Senate for progress towards the strategic objectives and targets set by the University in research and enterprise.

**Terms of Reference**

1. To determine the University vision and strategy for research, research degree education and business enterprise engagement, along with appropriate targets and performance indicators.
2. To oversee the development and management of research activity, research degree education, the development and implementation of mechanisms and initiatives to improve the research and enterprise performance of the University and its participation in external reviews.
3. To maintain oversight of performance in research and research degree education, responding appropriately as necessary.
4. To interact closely with the University Teaching & Learning Committee and with the major administrative directorates including Human Resources, Student Services, Marketing, Communications and Student Recruitment, International, Computing and Library Services, Finance and Estates.
5. To provide informal and flexible for the active management and co-ordination of research, research degree education and business development in liaison with the University Research Group (URG), the Graduate Board (GB) and the Business Development and Commercial Group (BDCG).

**A4. Validation Panels**

Validation panels are appointed under procedures determined by the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee and report to it. They are normally empowered to act on behalf of the Committee, subject to the requirement to report back. They are primarily concerned with assessing the academic validity of courses and modules in the context of their aims and learning outcomes, of the expertise of the staff, and of the resources available to them.

**A5. Review Panels**

The panels which conduct subject and thematic reviews are appointed under procedures determined by the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee/University Research Committee and report to the Senate. They are primarily concerned with reviewing and assessing both the quality of teaching and research in the University and the provision of academic support services.

**A6. Roles of Senior Staff**

**Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)**

Has overall executive responsibility for the business of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee.

**Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise)**

Has overall executive responsibility for the business of the University’s Research Committee.

**Director of Registry and Academic Development**

Is secretary to the Senate and has overall responsibility for the administrative procedures which underpin the validation of courses and modules and the review of Schools and Services.

**Head of Quality Assurance**

The Head of Quality Assurance will have overall responsibility for the development of the programme of validation and review for approval by the University's Teaching and Learning Committee/University’s Research Committee. They or their nominee are also responsible for approving the draft membership of each panel on behalf of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee**/**University’s Research Committee.

**Head of Student Regulations & Casework**

The Head of Student Regulations & Casework will be secretary to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee.

**Deans of School**

Deans have overall responsibility for ensuring that Schools properly fulfil the role which is given to them by the Senate under four main headings:

* The annual evaluation of courses of study.
* The approval of documentation prepared by Course Committees, Course Leaders and Module Leaders in connection with validation.
* The preparation of documentation for periodic reviews – such as subject or thematic reviews.
* Any actions which may be necessary to satisfy conditions laid down by a validation or review panel.

**Dean of Graduate School**

Has overall responsibility to lead on the development and implementation of University policy on postgraduate research programmes, and is responsible for the business of the University’s Graduate Board.

**Directors of Graduate Education**

Have responsibility for the School-level implementation and delivery of University policy and strategy for all matters relating to postgraduate research education.

**Module Leaders**

Module Leaders are responsible for providing information for inclusion in validation and course annual evaluation reports and for the follow-up of issues which are referred back from the validation or evaluation process. They are expected to:

* Agree and adhere to a timetable of activities.
* Prepare and present documentation in the required form, including the use of virtual module boxes in the University records management system.
* Develop a response to any recommendations or conditions which emerge from an evaluation event.
* Produce a definitive module specification document at the end of the validation process.
* Update the module specification document when any changes to it have been authorised.
* Ensure the definitive module specification document and any subsequent amendments to it are saved in the University Records Management system.
* Scrutinise all examination papers and substantive assessment briefs before they are sent to the external examiner for approval in advance of their release to students.
* Conduct an annual evaluation by students of modules under their responsibility, including module evaluation surveys with students and the production of a Module Leader report for inclusion in module boxes.

**Course Leaders**

Course Leaders are responsible for the initiation and supervision of the Course Committee's preparations for initial validation, revalidation, course developments, and annual evaluation of the course(s) under its control and for the follow-up of issues which are referred back from either validation, revalidation or annual evaluation.

They are expected to:

* Agree and adhere to a timetable of activities.
* Prepare and present documentation in an appropriate form, which will normally include the programme specification document(s) and appendices, specifications for validated modules available on the course(s) and specifications for new modules available on the course(s).
* Lodge validation, revalidation and annual evaluation papers with the secretary of the relevant panel or committee on time.
* Develop with the Course Committee a response to any recommendations or conditions which emerge from a validation or evaluation event.
* Produce a definitive programme specification and appendices at the end of an initial validation or revalidation event.
* Update the programme specification document and any appendices when any changes have been authorised.
* Ensure the definitive programme specification and appendices and any subsequent amendments to it are saved in the University Records Management system.
* Conduct an annual evaluation by students of the course(s) under their responsibility, including course evaluation surveys with students.
* Scrutinise all examination papers and substantive assessment briefs before they are sent to the external examiner for approval in advance of their release to students.

**A7. Role of the School Executive Support Team**

**General**

Members of the School Executive Support Team are expected to have a basic working knowledge of:

* University regulations and procedures including the Regulations for Awards and the Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards in order to provide operational support for activities covered by the regulations.

**Standard University Templates**

The School Executive Support Team shall be responsible for ensuring the most up to date formats and templates (available from University Records Management System) are used for the following:

* Student Panel agenda;
* Student Panel rolling record;
* Course Committee agenda;
* Course assessment meeting agenda/minutes;
* Generic minutes template where there is no specified alternative.
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Section B: Validation

**B1. The validation of courses**

Validation is the process by which a proposed course of study is approved as an award of the University. This includes short courses or modules as well as degree courses and might range from a proposal requiring the validation of a range of new modules to a relatively minor variant of an already validated course. Minor changes, such as a change to an existing module, are considered in the broader context of the course/s to which they contribute. Validation at the University of Huddersfield takes a risk-based approach.

A flowchart illustrating the University’s validation process and a summary of the validation timeline and its relationship to the marketing and recruitment cycle, can be found in Appendix B and Appendix C.

**B2. Title of a Course of Study**

The validation process will assess the suitability of the proposed course title. Where the title of a course of study is to appear on the award certificate, that title must be approved as part of the validation process and cannot be changed without reference to UTLC on behalf of Senate.

Single subject titles may only be used where subsidiary studies are not substantial enough to merit special mention; however, if the main subject forms too small a proportion of the course to justify a single subject title, the formula ‘Subject A and/with Combined Studies’ may be used.

Where Schools are considering the validation of courses with more than one subject in the title, Section C of this Quality Assurance Procedures should be read in conjunction with this section.

**B3. Proposing a course or module development**

In order to progress a proposal for an amended or new module, route or course, the proposal, in most cases, will need to be added to the Validation Schedule. Schools should notify Registry and Academic Development of proposed course developments by submitting:

* An outline proposal to Registry and Academic Development
* For new courses only **(not applicable for amendments to existing courses or new routes through existing courses):**
	1. A supporting statement from the Director of Marketing, Communications and Student Recruitment confirming the course has been appropriately researched and does not adversely affect the University's funding position.
	2. A statement from the International Office’s Immigration and Compliance Manager to confirm that the proposal meets current visa requirements.
	3. Confirmation from the Timetabling Manager that the Confirmation from the Timetabling Manager that the proposal is feasible/acceptable given available timetabling resources.
* Registry and Academic Development will determine the level of event assigned to the proposal.

**B4. Types of Validation events**

There are four types of validation event:

* Schools’ event (Tier 1 Validation and Accreditation Panel),
* Schools’ event which has been enhanced by a representative of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee or an additional external panel member (Enhanced Tier 1 VAP),
* Fast-track event (Fast-track Tier 2 VAP)
* University event (Tier 2 VAP)

The type of validation event held is determined by a number of factors:

* The level of the course.
* The structure.
* Whether the proposal represents a new Subject area for the University.
* The amount of new or substantially revised material to be considered (one third or more of the credits for the course would normally require a University event).
* The level of risk associated with the proposed development.
* The validation history of the course and experience of the team.
* The professional context of the course and team.
* The degree of novelty and innovation in the proposed changes. The experience of the school/subject/team.
* The impact of the change on the overall course structure across all levels.
* The extent of shared or cross-disciplinary delivery.

Further guidance on the validation process, can be found on the QA [validation and guidance web pages](https://www.hud.ac.uk/registry/qualityassurance/validations/guidance/)

**B5. Documents required for validation.**

Documentation should be submitted to Registry and Academic Development for distribution to the validation panel a minimum of three weeks before the date of a University validation event. A summary of the minimum documentation required for the validation of a new course or route for both School and University level events is provided below. Please use the [Validation Checklist](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/ValidationChecklist.docx) for full details and guidance.

Planning and resource approval documentation, including:

* + A statement from the Dean confirming that the new course/route has been costed and agreed by the Director of Estates and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor.
	+ A statement from the Director of Computing and Library Services confirming all necessary computing and library facilities and resources are available.
	+ Course management and staffing structure, including staff CVs (or a link to a staff profile that includes all the necessary information) for the course leader and all staff involved in delivery.
	+ **For new courses and course name changes only**: A supporting statement from the Director of Marketing, Communications and Student Recruitment confirming the course has been appropriately researched, does not adversely affect the University's funding position and where relevant meets current visa requirements (**this is not required for requests to amend existing courses or for proposed routes through an existing course)**.
	+ **For non-standard courses only** (e.g. Short Courses, CPD Provision developed with employers or Degree Apprenticeships). Confirmation of consultation with Disability Services regarding available support or additional funding requirements to provide support for the provision.

The Validation Rationale Template including:

* An explanation of how the course fits into the existing portfolio of courses, how it will support the strategic plan for School and University, and clear evidence of viability.

Course Specification Document (including those for any suspended courses) with the following appendices:

* + Demonstration of how course learning outcomes map onto all modules.
	+ Demonstration of how course learning outcomes map onto the relevant Subject Benchmark Statements (or QAA Characteristic Statement)
	+ Demonstration of how personal development planning (PDP) maps onto modules and is progressed through the course.
	+ Demonstration of how the modules map to the University Graduate Attributes (HGAs).
	+ Demonstration of how course learning outcomes map onto any external Regulatory and/or Professional Body requirements (where appropriate).
	+ Outline assessment schedule showing the nature of the assessments, their week of submission, clearly identifying the final assessment submission for the course.
	+ For each intake, a delivery schedule for all modules (core, compulsory and optional) identifying the terms of delivery.
	+ Confirmation of the weeks of the Main Course assessment meetings for each intake and identification of the relevant CAM model in line with the [CAM Model guidance](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/TaughtCourseAssessmentBoardExampleStructures.docx).

In addition:

* **All** module specification documents (MSDs) that contribute to the course/s.
* A full report of the School event and confirmation from the Chair of the School panel that any conditions have been met.
* A completed [Inclusive Design Checklist for Learning, Teaching and Assessment](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/InclusiveDesignChecklist.docx) (to be completed during the early stages of course design and in accordance with the guidance under the University’s [**Inclusivity framework**](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/Inclusivityframeworkforcoursedesign.docx.pdf)
* Confirmation of support from the external examiner in consideration of a new course/route development or amendment to an existing course (Tier 1 or Tier 1+ event only).
* A draft copy of the course handbook.
* A copy of the relevant Course Finder entry with any potential amendments marked-up to confirm of the identification of areas which have been impacted by Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) implications (course amendments only).

Following validation, the course and module specification/s must be published on the University curriculum management system.

**Validation of Cross-School Provision**

Where courses are being developed across more than one School, the PVC (T&L) may allow a single School-level event to be held with Tier 1 representation from all schools involved in the development. The report from this event will be submitted to the Tier 1 of each school for approval.

**B6. Preparing documentation for validation**

**Role of the Dean**

The Dean has oversight of validation documentation prepared by Course Committees, Course Leaders and Module Leaders to ensure it meets the defined requirements and standards necessary for review by a validation panel. The Dean must also be satisfied that the design and delivery of proposed courses are compatible with the Teaching and Learning Strategy and any other relevant institutional policy and take an inclusive approach, consulting with Disability Services and utilising current equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) guidance as appropriate.

**Role of the School Validation Panel prior to a University Validation**

Documentation to be submitted for a University validation should first be subject to scrutiny by a Tier 1 panel independent of the proposing team, and a written report of this should be made available to the University validation panel. If any conditions have been set, there should also be written confirmation that the Chair of the Tier 1 event has seen and approved the revised documentation prior to its submission to the University event.

**B7. Appointment of validation panels**

University validation panels are appointed by Registry and Academic Development on behalf of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee and include members with relevant expertise from both within and outside the University.

University validation panels will normally comprise 50% internal and 50% external members, excluding the Chair, who is an internal appointee, and the Registry and Academic Development representative. Internal membership comprises a School representative (normally the Chair of the Tier 1 event or appropriate Tier 1 nominee) (but who will not have had any previous involvement with the course) and a representative from another School to be appointed by Registry and Academic Development. External membership normally comprises two external members: one from industry, commerce, public service or the professions; and one from the higher education sector. CVs for the proposed external panel members must be approved by Registry and Academic Development on behalf of the PVC (T&L) in advance of a formal invitation being extended.

The external panel member from the higher education sector should not only be academically qualified and experienced in a field directly related to the course under consideration but should also have knowledge of current trends and practices within quality assurance in UK HE. Qualifications would normally be expected to be a minimum of one FHEQ level above the level of the proposed course. They should not have had any involvement with the University of Huddersfield for at least the preceding three years or any connection that may compromise impartiality. The general principles under [Section P.3 Conflicts of Interest](https://www.hud.ac.uk/policies/registry/qa-procedures/section-m/) for External Examiners apply (except where specified otherwise in this section).

The external panel member from industry should be employed at a middle or senior manager level within a sector directly related to the course under consideration. They should be able to evaluate the module and course learning outcomes in terms of the employability of successful graduates from the course in their own sector. Where they feel reasonable adjustments to the course would improve the employment prospects of graduates, they should be able to give constructive feedback to the panel. They should not have had any involvement with the University of Huddersfield for at least the preceding three years or any connection that may compromise impartiality.

It is the responsibility of the Registry and Academic Development to ensure that nominated external panel members have not had any connection with the University that could potentially compromise impartiality.

Enhanced school validation panels include a member of academic staff from another School acting on behalf of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee. The Pro Vice- Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) or nominee on behalf of the Committee appoints the UTLC representative.

**B8. Validation panel discussions and schedule**

Validation panels are composed of experienced members of University staff and relevant external members who must be allowed to exercise their professional judgement as to matters which should be the subject of discussion during a validation event. The University expects, however, that panels will take note as a matter of course of:

* The relevance of course aims, learning outcomes, structure, and assessment,
* The relevance of module aims, learning outcomes, content, and assessment (including confirmation appropriate consultation with Disability Services has taken place),
* The outcome and delivery of the course and modules, including the use of C&IT, including the requirement that all courses delivered at Queensgate should not include more than 20% on-line delivery.
* The inclusion and progression of PDP through the course and modules,
* The relationship of staff expertise (research, consultancy/teaching) and staff development to the course under consideration,
* The physical resources available to the course,
* The alignment of the course with the University Teaching and Learning and Assessment and feedback strategies,
* Inclusivity as identified by the University’s [Inclusivity Framework for Course Design](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/Inclusivityframeworkforcoursedesign.pdf).

The [validation checklist](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/ValidationChecklistSeptember20209.docx) provides further details for panel members on the points above.

Panels are encouraged to identify strengths as well as areas for development in the course(s) and modules under consideration.

Panels will be advised of any general institutional regulations or policies affecting the design and delivery courses and modules and will be asked to ensure compliance with those regulations or policies.

Panel members shall be provided with, and will be expected to familiarise themselves with:

* The validation sections of the [Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards](https://www.hud.ac.uk/policies/registry/qa-procedures/),
* The University [Teaching & Learning and Assessment & Feedback Strategies](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/regulationsandpolicies/policiesandguidance/Assessment-and-Feedback-Strategy-2016.docx),
* Validation documentation as identified in the [validation checklist](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/ValidationChecklistSeptember20209.docx),
* The draft programme and administrative arrangements,
* Any other relevant documentation that has been supplied.

It is the responsibility of Registry and Academic Development to ensure that external members have an accurate understanding of the University's procedures in relation to validation.

It is the responsibility of the Registry and Academic Development representative on the panel to draft a schedule for the University validation event, in consultation with the proposing team and panel Chair.

It is the responsibility of the Course Lifecycle team to draft a schedule for the enhanced event, in consultation with the panel Chair and UTLC representative.

In drawing up an agenda for discussion on the day, panels shall indicate any issues which require the attention of members of the senior management or colleagues responsible for central services.

Where panels are required to separate to conduct concurrent discussions it shall normally be the case that at least two members will be involved in any one area of discussion.

Where matters arise which relate to named postholders it is expected that panels will involve such postholders in discussions.

If panel members are requested to provide specialist reports as appendices, they should be notified in advance of an event and be asked to endeavour to return such reports within 28 days of an event. Such reports will normally be the responsibility of more than one member of a panel.

While oral reports on events may be made by the Chair of a panel to representatives of course committees, the definitive report is as presented to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee.

The reports which panels produce must provide an indication of the nature of the discussions and of the views of the panel on issues relating to the course(s). Where the panel stipulates conditions which must be complied with and/or recommendations which must be carefully considered, these must be clearly defined in the report.

**B9. Approving and responding to validation reports**

The following procedure applies to university validation events:

* The draft report is written and circulated to panel members for confirmation or amendment,
* The draft report is circulated to the Dean or nominee so that any factual inaccuracies can be addressed,
* The University’s Teaching and Learning Committee will receive and note the report as approved by panel members,
* The report outcomes will be considered by the relevant Course Committee/s and a response to any recommendations or conditions will be prepared where appropriate. These should inform the response of the course team to the event outcomes,
* The response will be presented to the Chair of the validation panel for approval on behalf of the panel,
* The Dean will be responsible for ensuring that matters raised in a report are followed up, and for reporting to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee when any problems arise,
* It is expected that the implementation of any conditions and recommendations will feature in the subsequent annual evaluation reports of the Course Committee.

The following procedure applies to new courses/routes validated at Tier 1 validation events and all enhanced Tier 1 validation events:

* The Dean will ensure that an approved report in the standard format is presented to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee,
* A signed statement from the Chair of the Tier 1 panel will be sent to the Registry and Academic Development to confirm that any conditions set have been met.

The following procedure applies when notifying changes approved at a school validation event to:

* course/route title,
* mode of delivery or attendance,
* new campus delivery location.

A signed statement from the Chair of the Tier 1 panel will be sent to the Registry and Academic Development to confirm that any conditions set have been met.

**B10. Appealing against the outcome of a validation event**

If the School believes there is cause for appeal against the outcome of a validation event, it may appeal, via the Dean, to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee clearly stating the grounds for appeal. The Committee will establish a small group of different composition to the original panel to consider the matter.

**B11. Changes to validated courses and modules**

**Changes to course documents**

Course teams may find it desirable or necessary to make changes to programme specifications. The University’s Teaching and Learning Committee has empowered Tier 1 panels to approve minor changes to existing courses (please see [Validation Principles and Guidance](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/ValidationPrinciplesandGuidelines_Jan2020.docx) for more details on the different levels of changes). Confirmation of consideration of changes at course committee and by the external examiner must be included in the documentation submitted for approval.

In line with University [guidance on the application of consumer law for students](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/cma-guidance.docx), where a proposed change would constitute a material change, the following must be submitted with the documentation:

* Confirmation of consultation with current students and a brief summary of how that consultation was undertaken,
* Confirmation of the receipt of 100% positive affirmation from all current students impacted by the proposed change.

If, following a reasonable consultation period and reasonable efforts to obtain positive affirmation, there have been no material objections from the students, but it has not been possible to obtain 100% positive affirmation from all affected students, then the proposed change may still be approved, providing that the documentation includes a completed CMA Risk Assessment.

The Chair of the Tier 1 is responsible for confirming that changes to existing courses do not raise issues which require escalation to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee. In addition, the Chair of the Tier 1 is responsible for confirming that resources (including C&LS resources) are in place for the proposed courses.

**Changes to module documents**

Tier 1 Panels can act on behalf of Schools to review and approve changes to modules or proposed new modules for use within validated courses. An outline proposal should be completed and the validation event level reviewed in the normal way if there are any implications for course documentation (in keeping with the [Validation Principles and Guidance](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/ValidationPrinciplesandGuidelines_Jan2020.docx)). All changes to modules should be considered within the broader context of the courses to which they contribute both operationally and pedagogically.

New modules contributing to a course that is being reviewed at a University validation event will be considered for approval by the University validation panel.

Confirmation of consideration of changes to modules at course committee and support from the external examiner must be included in the documentation submitted for approval.

In line with University [guidance on the application of consumer law for students](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/cma-guidance.docx), where a proposed change would constitute a material change, the following must be submitted with the documentation:

* Confirmation of consultation with current students and a brief summary of how that consultation was undertaken,
* Confirmation of the receipt of 100% positive affirmation from all current students impacted by the proposed change.

If following a reasonable consultation period and reasonable efforts to obtain positive affirmation, there have been no material objections from the students but it has not been possible to obtain 100% positive affirmation from all affected students, then the proposed change may still be approved, providing that the documentation includes a completed CMA Risk Assessment.

The Chair of the Tier 1 event is responsible for confirming the changes to existing modules do not raise issues which require escalation to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee. In addition, the Chair of the Tier 1 event is responsible for confirming that resources (including C&LS resources) are in place for the proposed courses.

**B12. Periodic review of validation activity**

Registry and Academic Development will conduct an annual quality appraisal of Tier 1 activity for reporting to the University Teaching and Learning Committee. Schools should draw up an action plan in response to the review report. The review report and School action plan should be considered and discussed at the second Tier 1 meeting of each academic session or as near as possible to this meeting.

**B13. Termination of courses**

Where courses are to be discontinued an exit strategy should be drawn up by the course team, which identifies all relevant information relating to the course closure. The exit strategy should be approved by the School's Management / Executive Committee and monitored via the Registry and Academic Development/University Teaching and Learning Committee. For more information please see our guidance on [exit strategies for terminating courses](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/universityofhuddersfield/content/documents/registry/Exitstrategyforterminatingcourses04.06.15.doc).

Section C: Guidelines for the validation of joint honours or major with minor subject courses

**C1. Introduction**

Specific arrangements apply to courses who deliver and identify in the course title more than one subject. This can be either as a ‘Joint Honours award’ (for example ‘Business **and** Finance’, or ‘Business, Finance **and** Politics’) or a major subject in combination with a minor subject, for example, ‘Business **with** Finance’.

In relation to major and minor subject combinations, both subject areas must already be validated single-subject courses.

**C2. Naming Conventions for the title of joint honours or major with minor combinations**

Where students study more than one subject, up to three separate fields of study which make a significant contribution to the course may be identified in the title with or without the addition of ‘combined studies’. Subjects given equal weight in the course will appear in the form ‘Subject A and Subject B’, while major/minor combinations will be indicated by ‘Subject A with Subject B’, or ‘Subject A with Subject B and Subject C’ or ‘Subject A and Subject B with Subject C’.

**C3. Proposals for courses using major with minor subjects**

A proposal for an **undergraduate** course that uses a ‘Major with Minor’ subject course title, for subject areas which are **already validated as single honours degrees,** must first be sent to the Head of Quality Assurance. Following approval from the Head of Quality Assurance, such courses will be validated by Tier 1. Joint courses which do not fall within the identified parameters below or include any subject areas not yet validated as a single honours degree should be notified to Registry and Academic Development who will determine the nature of the event in accordance with Section B3.

**C4. Requirements for major/minor combinations**

Major with minor undergraduate courses must conform to the following requirements:

| **Course structure** | **Major Subject** | **Minor Subject** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Total credits at foundation level | 80 | 40 |
| Total credits at post-foundation level | 160 | 80 |
| Minimum core credits | 200 | 100 |
| Maximum optional credits to be taken | 40 | 20 |

Once a **named** major or minor subject has been approved it must use the same set of modules in all pairings.

**C5. Validation**

The procedures for validating a Joint or Major/Minor combination proposal will be the same as for a University validation for a course delivered at the University (see Section B of the Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards), with the following additions:

**Title**

The joint, major and minor subjects named in the course title should normally be the same as those of the pre-existing single-subject courses; explanations for any discrepancies should be provided.

**Rationale, aims and learning outcomes**

These should be described for each named subject component with an emphasis on the rationale for the combination of modules, the aims of the components and the learning outcomes to be achieved.

**Entry qualifications**

Regulations for admission will be in accordance with the [Regulations for Awards](https://www.hud.ac.uk/policies/registry/awards-taught/). Additional regulations for admission should be in line with the pre-existing single-subject course documents.

**Structure**

The core, compulsory and optional modules for each named subject should be identified in the Course Specification Document and MSD.

Opportunities for transfer into or out of the joint or major/minor subject should be described where these are available.

**Assessment**

The general principles and regulations governing assessment shall be in accordance with the University [Regulations for Awards](https://www.hud.ac.uk/policies/registry/awards-taught/). Where appropriate, these should be supplemented by the assessment regulations prescribed in the course documents for the major combination included in the award. Any specific regulations not included in these documents should be specified at the validation stage.

**C6. Responsibilities**

**Staffing and management**

The School providing tuition in the major discipline will be responsible for the admission of students. Where a joint honours is delivered by more than one School, a lead School should be identified as part of the validation process.

Responsibility for the teaching assessment and quality assurance of the course will be shared appropriately between the Schools/Departments responsible for the joint, major/minor disciplines involved.

Annual evaluation will be undertaken in association with that of the parent single-subject courses.

Each School will designate a ‘major/minor subject leader’ for each subject area where applicable, who will be responsible to the Dean of the School for the recruitment, admission, teaching assessment and pastoral care of the students.

**Course Assessment Meetings (CAMs)**

Decisions about the award of credit for modules, student progression, condonement, extenuating circumstances and the classification of awards will be made by the Course assessment meeting for the course from which the major combination is drawn. Membership of the Board should include at least one representative from each minor subject.

Where a joint honours is delivered by more than one School, a lead School should be identified as part of the validation process. Decisions about the award of credit for modules, student progression, condonement, extenuating circumstances and the classification of joint honours awards will be made by the Course assessment meeting of the lead School. Membership of the Board should include at least one representative from the other School.

**Guidance and counselling**

The School providing the major course will allocate each student to a personal academic tutor and be responsible for the pastoral care of students. Where a joint honours is delivered by more than one School, the lead School identified as part of the validation process will be responsible for these processes.

Section D: The validation of distance learning proposals

**D1. Introduction**

This section describes both the validation of Distance Learning (DL) proposals for courses delivered entirely by distance learning (D4), and the validation of a specific module delivered by distance learning (D7).

DL is a mode of delivery where all teaching content, assessment, support and all other functions are provided for students who study (usually part-time) at locations remote from the University; teaching staff and students do not ever meet in the same physical location but may meet and interact 'virtually'. Courses where students and teaching staff meet for the purposes of an induction only and all other aspects of the course are delivered as described above will be classed as DL for the purposes of validation and reporting. Distance Learning differs from Collaborative Learning in that there is no element of collaboration with another institution for the provision of local support.

**D2. Responsibilities and requirements**

Following consultation with the Distance Learning Unit, all staff responsible for both designing and delivering on-line materials must first meet the University's Digital Literacy training requirement – for details of the training requirements please go to the University’s [Teaching and Learning Innovation Park](https://ipark.hud.ac.uk/content/odl). It is the responsibility of schools via Tier 1 to maintain records of staff who meet the training requirements and to check and confirm that all relevant staff meet the training requirements before validation.

These procedures ensure:

* That full consideration is given to the mechanisms and resources required for delivery of the courses, their academic content and to student support.
* That both the University and the staff team are provided with an opportunity to evaluate and develop the course in light of experience and in line with developments in the sector to assure the highest quality standards.

**D3. Validation proposals for DL courses**

The initiative to consider the validation of a DL course must be taken by the School responsible for that subject area following consultation with the Distance Learning Unit. The proposed financial and resource arrangements must be approved by the Dean of the School. Schools should include the DL Unit in discussions when seeking approval from Marketing.

Courses, including a new mode of delivery, must be validated before recruitment can commence.

**D4. The validation process for DL courses**

All new distance learning proposals will need to be added to the Validation Schedule. Schools should ask the Distance Learning Unit to progress a proposal for an amended or new module, route or course. Schools should notify Registry and Academic Development of proposed course developments by submitting:

* An outline proposal to Registry and Academic Development
* For new courses only **(not applicable for amendments to existing courses or new routes through existing courses):**
	1. A supporting statement from the Director of Marketing, Communications and Student Recruitment confirming the course has been appropriately researched, does not adversely affect the University's funding position
	2. A statement from the International Office’s Immigration and Compliance Manager to confirm that the proposal meets current visa requirements
	3. Confirmation from the Timetabling Manager that the Confirmation from the Timetabling Manager that the proposal is feasible/acceptable given available timetabling resources.

Registry and Academic Development will determine the level of event assigned to the proposal.

The procedures for validating a Distance Learning proposal are the same as a University validation for a course delivered at the University (see [Section B](https://www.hud.ac.uk/policies/registry/qa-procedures/section-b/)) with the exception the requirements outlined below. Schools should draft these sections in consultation with the DL Unit.

The School must evidence to the validation panel that the proposed course can be delivered in a Distance Learning environment, and that it has the resources and expertise to support the course and the students enrolled on the course.

The composition of the validation panel will be as detailed in section B; in addition, the subject specialist external panel member must have experience of distance learning.

In addition to the documentation listed in section B, the course documentation should include:

**Rationale for the course**

* A clear rationale for the proposed distance learning course. This should include, where applicable, a clear explanation of any differences between the proposed course and that of other courses within the Department and the School.
* In the rationale, how the proposed course relates to the University's Teaching and Learning Strategy, clearly identifying the responsibilities of each category of staff.
* If the course is also delivered in a conventional face-to-face mode, why is it considered important to also deliver the course by distance learning, and, why have the specific delivery methods proposed (e.g. internet or hard copy) been selected.

**Admissions policy**

* In the Course Specification Document, details of any variations to University-based admission requirements or of any specific mechanisms used to identify applicants where Distance Learning may be appropriate. This may include minimum levels of C&IT proficiency and English language competence.

**Delivery and support of the course**

* A description of the student materials being provided, whether they are being developed in-house or bought in, how they will be updated and of the legal issues (in particular those of copyright) which have been considered.
* A detailed description of the means of delivery of the teaching and library materials, and, any implications for potential students in terms of requirements for access to IT equipment, specific software or other resources or facilities. This must also include any proposed arrangements for access to library material through other institutions. Where relevant, the implications of delivering teaching materials and assessment across time zones should be considered and evidenced.
* Detail of the arrangements for providing students with feedback, including through what medium (e.g. online, e-mail) and arrangements for follow-up support.
* Clearly defined arrangements by which students will be able to communicate with University staff.
* If student collaborative learning will be a feature of the course, a statement on how it will be achieved, including a description of facilities such as electronic discussion groups, live chat rooms and group work.
* Details on the specific technical support proposed for staff and/or students. If no technical support will be provided for students then this must be made clear, especially if the course is being delivered online.
* With the CVs of academic staff members involved in the delivery, confirmation from the School that staff meet the University’s training requirements (see D2) and include details of any proposed staff development in relation to developing distance learning materials or systems
* In the resource statement, details of the anticipated time academic staff are likely to need to support delivery of the course and develop course materials. This may include any explanations on why academic members of staff will have their timetables credited with teaching hours.
* Details of any Departmental/School requirements for hardware and software.
* A statement of the requirement for technical and administrative support staff to be involved in the course.
* A draft student handbook, which should include detailed explanations of what students can expect from the course, what support they will receive, and of progression and assessment criteria. If the course or aspects of the course are being delivered online, the draft handbook should state the minimum hardware and software requirements that students will need. If the course is only delivered online, then guidance must also be provided on what to do if internet access is lost.
* A draft induction programme.

**Assessment and quality assurance**

* Clearly defined arrangements for quality assurance and external examiners.
* A description of the means of assessment where these might be different from an onsite course, and any specific arrangements which are proposed because of the distance learning delivery.
* The monitoring mechanisms proposed that ensure the expected level of student support is being provided.
* The monitoring mechanisms proposed to record students' progress and identify students experiencing difficulties, including the arrangements for gathering student feedback on their learning experience.

The initial approval for a distance learning course shall be for a maximum period of five years.

**D5. Annual evaluation**

The annual evaluation report should conform to the standard University template and include discussion of any issues arising from distance learning delivery. The report will be considered by the School delivering the course at its annual evaluation meeting.

**D6. Revalidation**

Revalidation is a mechanism used by the Senate to review and assess the quality of University courses. The University’s Teaching and Learning Committee is responsible for ensuring that each approved distance learning course is subject to re-validation at least once every five years.

The course team will submit documentation to be scrutinised at a revalidation event held at the University which will be organised by the Registry and Academic Development on behalf of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee. The membership of the approval panel will be as defined in Section B.

Revalidation of distance learning courses will concentrate on the following:

* Evidence of continuing demand.
* Appropriateness of delivery medium and learning resources.
* Feedback from students.
* Consideration of annual evaluation reports.
* Student progression and achievement statistics.
* Procedures for quality assurance.
* Rationale for the School’s continuing involvement.

The documentation submitted to the panel should focus on issues listed above and should incorporate critical appraisal where appropriate.

The revalidation event will consist of discussions between the panel and representatives of the course team.

The Head of Quality Assurance or nominee will prepare a report of the event. The report will be noted by the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee.

**D7. Validation of individual modules to be delivered on a distance learning basis**

The School must secure confirmation from the Director of Registry and Academic Development or their nominee that the extent of distance learning delivery proposed does not require the course in its entirety to be subject to a full distance learning validation event.

The School must appoint an independent external reviewer (subject to the requirements on conflicts of interest outlined in Section B) with appropriate subject expertise and experience in distance learning models to look at the module, its learning materials and its assessment. The nomination of the reviewer must be approved by the Director of Registry and Academic Development or their nominee in advance of any involvement in the validation.

The reviewer should submit a written report on the proposal for consideration by the Tier 1 validation panel. The report should cover:

* Is the module coherent in terms of its content and aims?
* Do the proposed e-learning processes/arrangements comply with the QAA Code of Practice and University regulations?
* Is the proposed assessment appropriate, inclusive, and secure?
* Are the mechanisms for students to express their views and share experiences with others sufficient and accessible?

The written report and the full set of learning and assessment materials must be submitted for approval by Tier 1.

It is the responsibility of Tier 1 to check and confirm that staff designing or delivering modules meet the training requirements of the Digital Literacies for Staff grid.

Section E: The validation of non-credit bearing courses

**E1. Validation of courses**

This section relates to the validation of courses (normally short courses) which do not lead to the award of University Credit (i.e. are outside of the CATS framework).

Requests for the approval of non-credit bearing courses should be submitted to Registry and Academic Development on an outline proposal. Requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis and a proportionate event type will be assigned based on the level of risk presented by the proposal.

**E2. Documentation required for validation**

The following is the minimum documentation required for a course to be validated:

**Context of the course**

* Introduction and rationale (including institutional policies and plans).
* Statement on resources (signed by the Dean of the School).
* Curricula vitae of the course team, and research and staff development activities relevant to the course.
* A signed resource statement from Computing and Library Services.
* Confirmation of consultation with Disability Services regarding available support or additional funding requirements to provide support the provision.

**Definitive course document**

* Aims and objectives of the course.
* Regulations for admission, assessment, progression and award.
* Course structure and rationale, syllabuses and teaching methods.
* Course management.
* Where applicable, full report of the School event and confirmation from the Chair of the School panel that any conditions have been met.

**E3. Validation procedures**

The validation procedures will normally be in accordance with those specified in sections B3 to B8; however, where delivery involves distance learning, guidance contained within Section D of these regulations will be followed. In cases where the course is also subject to external validation the procedures may be modified to take account of the requirements of the external body and to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

**E4. Monitoring, annual evaluation, minor changes and revalidation**

Schools will keep a schedule of its portfolio of non-credit bearing courses and will submit a copy to Registry and Academic Development at the start of the academic year.

Non-credit bearing courses will follow the standard University procedures for annual evaluation, the approval of minor changes to courses and the revalidation of courses as specified in sections L, B and G of this handbook.

#

Section F: The Validation of Joint Awards

**F1. General considerations**

A joint award is a single course or research programme devised and delivered jointly between two or more institutions and leading to the conferment of a single award in the name of all partners.

The University may grant an award jointly with another institution provided that the proposed partner institution is also legally empowered to do so.

In order to ensure the integrity of such arrangements the University must satisfy itself that appropriate and clear arrangements are in place to ensure the standard and quality of the award, identifying appropriate channels of communication, authority, accountability and executive action.

All marketing and publicity information pertaining to the award will require the specific prior approval of the relevant School on behalf of the University.

**F2. Administrative procedures for collaborative validation**

The initiative to consider the validation of a joint award is taken by the School responsible for that subject area. The proposed financial and resource arrangements must be approved by the Dean of the School and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor must confirm that the proposal satisfies the University’s requirements for progressing a new collaborative arrangement.

The Dean will submit a business case on the University’s template to the Standing Committee for Collaborative Provision (SCCP) and Graduate Board in the case of postgraduate research provision. The business case will include:

* A brief description of the nature of and rationale for the proposal.
* The general proposals for its costing and resourcing, including the costs of validation and revalidation in addition to any standard annual costs that may apply.
* An initial financial statement indicating the costs/charges to be borne by each partner signed by the Dean and an appropriate representative from the external institution.
* Signed supporting statements from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), the Director of Registry and Academic Development, the Director of Finance and, where appropriate, the Director of Marketing.
* Where the University has no existing links with the external institution, the case should include explicit references to the institution’s mission, existing provision and strategic aims.
* Mechanisms for determining responsibility for the central administration and regulatory framework for the course.
* Evidence that the proposed partner is legally empowered to grant an award jointly with another institution.

Following approval by SCCP and Graduate Board if applicable, a Co-operation Agreement shall be drawn up by the Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee signed by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (T&L)/(R&E) and the relevant signatory of the external institution.

The course will be scrutinised by means of a validation event which will be organised by the School in conjunction with the proposed partner institution. If the delivery of the course is proposed on a multi-campus basis, the process of validation must include a full evaluation of each campus at which it is proposed that the course will be offered.

The membership of the validation panel must include:

* Chair representing UTLC/URC who will not be drawn from the proposing School,
* two or more academic subject specialists,
* a representative of Computing and Library Services (if applicable),
* at least one external member who is a subject specialist. CVs for the proposed external panel member(s) must be approved on behalf of the PVC (T&L)/(R&E) in advance of a formal invitation being extended,
* the Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee.

It is the responsibility of the Dean to ensure that any external member has not had any close involvement with the external institution or the University in the previous five years.

**F3. The collaborative validation process**

The event will assess whether the course is of an appropriate standard for the award of the University to which it is intended to lead, that the requisite teaching experience and expertise is available, that the physical resources are appropriate and sufficient for the anticipated number of students, that the support services are able to meet the needs of the course and that the environment in which the course is delivered is appropriate to HE provision.

The team seeking validation of a course of study must prepare documentation as follows:

**1. A Course specification**

Supplemented by the following (compulsory) appendices:

* course context (an introduction and rationale for the course),
* staffing and management,
* demonstration of how course learning outcomes map onto modules,
* demonstration of how course learning outcomes map onto the relevant benchmark statement (where appropriate),
* outline assessment schedule.

**2. Module specification documents**

Which should clearly differentiate by means of colour coding new modules, existing modules which have proposed amendments and existing modules for which no amendments are proposed.

**3. A support document**

Offering an overview of the relationship between the institutions involved in the delivery of the course:

* Rationale for the proposal,
* History of the relationship between the institutions (if any),
* Rationale for the proposed course of study, including anticipated demand,
* statement on resources,
* Curricula vitae of the programme team, indicating research interests and professional development activities relevant to the course,
* Proposals for delivery of the course,
* Student support arrangements,
* Proposals for maintenance of student records,
* Procedures for the management of the course and its regulations as well as details of the quality assurance interface with the University (at the School and University level) including external examining arrangements, annual evaluation and revalidation,
* Other relevant information.

The validation panel will discuss the submission with representatives of the institutions, including key members of the senior management team and the proposed teaching team. The panel will require to be shown the physical and learning resources that will be made available to the course.

The Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee will prepare both a report on the event and, if validation is recommended, a Contract of Collaboration detailing the academic and administrative arrangements for the course. The report will be submitted to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee and SCCP for approval as well as Graduate Board and URC where applicable.

Following validation of the course, the Contract of Collaboration will be signed by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (T&L)/(R&E) and the relevant signatory from the partner institution. The Contract of Collaboration will be valid for the period of validation only and will be re-issued at each re-validation point.

The financial arrangements will be the subject of a formal financial schedule, an annual agreement between the School and the partner institution, and a copy will be lodged with the Registry and Academic Development as an appendix to the Contract of Collaboration. The financial schedule must be approved by the Director of Finance (or nominee) before being issued.

**F4. Financial arrangements**

The financial arrangements are negotiated between the School and the partner institution and must cover both the School’s costs and the University’s central costs, although the School must consult with the Director of Finance to ensure that the proposed arrangements are acceptable to the University.

**F5. Annual Evaluation**

**Timetable for Annual Evaluation**

Annual Evaluation will follow the processes established in Section M of the Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses & Research Awards.

The Dean of the School (or nominee) will ensure that a copy of the report is submitted to the Director of Registry and Academic Development (or nominee).

**F6. Collaborative revalidation**

**The function of collaborative revalidation**

Revalidation is the mechanism through which the Senate reviews and assesses the quality of its academic provision. The University’s Teaching and Learning Committee is responsible for ensuring that each collaborative arrangement is subject to revalidation at least once every five years.

**Collaborative revalidation process**

The revalidation will be undertaken by means of an event organised by the School. The membership of the panel must include:

* A representative of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee who acts as Chair and who will not be drawn from the proposing School.
* Two or more academic subject specialists (who also acts on behalf of Computing and Library Services).
* An external member who is a subject specialist. CVs for the proposed external panel member(s) must be approved on behalf of the PVC (T&L)/(R&E) in advance of a formal invitation being extended.
* The Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee.

**Issues considered at collaborative revalidation**

Revalidation of a course of study jointly designed and delivered with an external institution will concentrate on the following:

* The success of the relationship between the partners.
* The appropriateness and achievement of the general and specific aims and the objectives of the course.
* The structure of the course, its progression, balance and coherence.
* Strategies for teaching and for assessment.
* Evidence of sustainable demand for the course.
* Resources available for the course, both human and physical (including curricula vitae of the programme team, indicating research interests and professional development activities relevant to the course).
* Staff development.
* Procedures for management of the course and for quality assurance, including involvement of external examiners and evidence of effective student representation arrangements.
* A review of the financial aspects of the provision.

**Documentation required for collaborative revalidation**

The documentation submitted to the panel should focus on the issues listed above and should incorporate critical appraisal where appropriate. The programme specification and module specification documents should also be reproduced with proposed changes or additions highlighted.

**Conduct of the collaborative revalidation event**

The programme for revalidation is determined in consultation between members of the panel after receipt of documentation. The programme should normally include two or more meetings with the teaching team, including representatives from the senior management and a meeting with students.

**F7. Report of panels**

The Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee will prepare a report on the event for the approval of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee and SCCP as well as Graduate Board and URC where applicable.

**F8. Termination of agreement**

Decisions to terminate agreements may be initiated either by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), as a result of strategic decisions about the future of the collaborative provision or as a result of concerns expressed about its operation, or by the Dean of the School identified as having responsibility for the course in the Memorandum of Co-operation in consultation with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (T&L)/(R&E).

A decision to terminate must be approved by either the Pro Vice-Chancellor (T&L)/(R&E) or by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor in consultation with SCCP and Graduate Board where applicable.

An exit strategy outlining arrangements for supporting students who have yet to complete their studies will be submitted to SCCP/Graduate Board for approval.

Section G The Validation of Short Courses (Credit Bearing)

**G1. Validation of short courses**

The University defines a short course as a programme of study which does not lead to an award of the university and has a maximum credit size of 60 credits. Courses with a credit value of more than 60 credits should be approved in accordance with Section B. Schools may incorporate existing modules within short courses.

Schools should notify Registry and Academic Development of proposed course developments by submitting:

* An outline proposal to Registry and Academic Development
* For new courses only **(not applicable for amendments to existing courses or new routes through existing courses):**
	1. A supporting statement from the Director of Marketing, Communications and Student Recruitment confirming the course has been appropriately researched, does not adversely affect the University's funding position
	2. A statement from the International Office’s Immigration and Compliance Manager to confirm that the proposal meets current visa requirements
	3. Confirmation from the Timetabling Manager that the Confirmation from the Timetabling Manager that the proposal is feasible/acceptable given available timetabling resources.

Requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis and a proportionate event type (as defined in Section B) will be assigned based on the level of risk presented by the proposal.

Where delivery or development involves a partner or organisation external to the university, Schools should contact the QA team in Registry and Academic Development for guidance.

**G2. Documentation required for validation**

The following is the minimum documentation required for a short course to be validated:

**Context of the course**

* Introduction and rationale including an explanation of how the course fits into the existing portfolio of courses, how it will support the strategic plan for School and University, and clear evidence of viability.
* Statement on resources (signed by the Dean of the School).
* Course management and staffing structure, including staff CVs (or a link to a staff profile that includes all the necessary information) for the course leader and all staff involved in delivery.
* A signed resource statement from Computing and Library Services.
* Confirmation of consultation with Disability Services regarding available support or additional funding requirements to provide support the provision.

**Definitive course document**

Programme specification (Course Specification Document) with the following appendices:

* + Demonstration of how course learning outcomes map onto all modules.
	+ Demonstration of how course learning outcomes map onto the relevant Subject Benchmark Statements (or QAA Characteristic Statement).
	+ Demonstration of how course learning outcomes map onto any external regulatory and/or professional body requirements (where appropriate).
	+ Outline assessment schedule showing the nature of the assessments, their week of submission, clearly identifying the final assessment submission for the course.
	+ For each intake, a delivery schedule for all modules (core, compulsory and optional) identifying the terms of delivery.
	+ Confirmation of the weeks of the Main Course assessment meetings for each intake and identification of the relevant CAM model in line with the [CAM Model guidance](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/TaughtCourseAssessmentBoardExampleStructures.docx).

In addition:

* All module specification documents (MSDs) that contribute to the course/s.
* A completed [Inclusive Design Checklist for Learning, Teaching and Assessment](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/InclusiveDesignChecklist.docx) (to be completed during the early stages of course design and in accordance with the guidance under the University’s [**Inclusivity framework**](https://www.hud.ac.uk/media/assets/document/registry/validationprocess/Inclusivityframeworkforcoursedesign.docx.pdf)**.**
* A draft copy of the course handbook.
* Where applicable, full report of the School event and confirmation from the Chair of the School panel that any conditions have been met.

Following validation, the programme and module specification/s must be published on the University records management system and declared as a record.

**G3. Validation procedures**

The validation procedures will normally be in accordance with those specified in Section B; however, other Sections may be used where, for example, delivery involves Distance Learning or CP. In cases where the course is also subject to external validation the procedures may be modified to take account of the requirements of the external body and to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

**G4. Monitoring, Annual evaluation, minor changes and revalidation**

Short courses will follow the standard University procedures for annual evaluation, the approval of minor changes to courses and the revalidation of courses as specified in sections L, B and G of this handbook.

Schools will keep a schedule of its portfolio of short courses and will submit a copy to Registry and Academic Development at the start of the academic year.

**G5. Validation of Cross-School Provision**

Where courses are being developed across more than one School, the PVC (T&L) may allow a single School-level event to be held with Tier 1 representation from all schools involved in the development. The report from this event will be submitted to the Tier 1 of each school for approval.

Section H: The Validation of Apprenticeships

**H1. General considerations**

This section describes the processes involved in the validation of Higher and Degree Apprenticeship proposals. Higher and Degree Apprenticeships combine work with study and include a work-based, academic or combined academic and professional qualification relevant to a specific job role. Apprentices spend most of their time at work but must spend at least 20% of the time in ‘off the job’ study or training.

Apprenticeships including a Higher Education (HE) qualification are either:

* Higher Apprenticeships at Levels 4 or 5 (i.e. a Diploma of Higher Education or a Foundation Degree).
* Degree Apprenticeships at Levels 6 or 7 (i.e. a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree).

These procedures have been devised to ensure:

* + - the course meets the apprenticeship standard and adequately prepares the apprentice for End Point Assessment (EPA) and is compliant with the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) Funding Rules.
		- that both the University and the staff are provided with an opportunity to evaluate and develop the course in the light of experience so as to assure the highest quality standards.

**H2. Administrative procedures for validation**

Apprenticeships must be validated before recruitment can commence.

To be included on the validation schedule, Schools must notify Registry and Academic Development of the proposed course developments by submitting the Apprenticeship Validation Proforma. Proposals should be consistent with the School’s strategic development plans for apprenticeships and have assessed the financial, resource and market viability.

The procedures for validating an apprenticeship proposal will be the same as for a University validation for a course delivered at the University (see Section B. of the University’s Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards), except where noted below.

**H3. The validation process**

The purpose of the validation event will be to establish that the proposed course aligns to the QA framework, relevant Apprenticeship Standard and associated EPA Plan allowing apprentices to demonstrate the required knowledge, skills and behaviours for the apprenticeship in order for them to achieve both the HE qualification and the apprenticeship itself.

The composition of the validation panel will be as detailed in Section B of this Handbook with at least one of the external members having experience in apprenticeships. Validation Panels normally require two external members; one from industry or profession and one from the higher education sector. Where these two external panel members do not have apprenticeship experience a third external panel member will be required. The Chair and Internal Panel members will normally have degree apprenticeship experience.

In addition to the content specified in Section B ‘Documents Required for Validation’, the course documentation must address the following issues:

**Rationale and Development**

* + A clear rationale for the proposed apprenticeship should be provided and be consistent with the School’s strategic development plans for apprenticeships and have assessed the financial, resource and market viability.
	+ The rationale should consider how the course will enable employers to support and develop capacity and capability within their workforce.
	+ Learning Outcomes need to be mapped to the skills, knowledge and behaviours specified in the Apprenticeship Standard, at course or module level as appropriate. **(This is in addition to the mapping of outcomes against QAA requirements in Section B.)**
	+ Schools should consider the range of working contexts and variety of employment settings and work patterns within which the apprenticeship might be taken to ensure there is an appropriate work/ study/ life balance for apprentices.
	+ There may be cases specific to apprenticeships not identified in the University’s regulations. These may include redundancy or change of employer and ESFA’s Funding Rules should be referred to for guidance.
	+ Further situations, such as employer requirements that mean the University’s standard term dates and assessment periods cannot be adhered to, would require exemption approval from the Pro Vice Chancellor: Teaching and Learning.

**Admissions and Recruitment**

Variations to standard admission requirements should be detailed in the documentation with consideration to:

* Initial Needs Assessment (INA) of the apprentice’s abilities must be carried out in line with the proposed apprenticeship using the University standard INA template prior to enrolment.
* Commitment Statements summarising the schedule, roles and responsibilities that supports the successful completion of the apprenticeship using the University standard template prior to enrolment.
* Apprentices must be assessed as eligible for apprenticeship funding.

**Delivery and support of the course**

* + The arrangements by which students are supported whilst in the workplace by University staff and organisation of tripartite reviews.
	+ Confirmation of the provision of any additional resource (academic, technical and/or administrative) required to support apprentices.
	+ A draft ‘Learner Handbook’ including detailed explanations of what learners can expect from the course, what support they will receive from the University and their employer.
	+ A draft programme plan showing what elements of the course count towards the 20% ‘of the job training’ and where apprentices can take annual leave.
	+ Confirmation of how apprentices’ evidence their learning throughout the apprenticeship reflecting on experiences and progress towards the skills, knowledge and behaviours outlined in the standard.

The approval for an apprenticeship course shall be for a maximum period of five years or, if applicable, the ‘review period’ stated in the Apprenticeship Standard if this is less than five years.

**H4. Annual evaluation**

The standard annual evaluation cycle should be followed, and the report should include consideration of any issues arising specific to apprenticeship delivery. The report will be considered by the School delivering the course at its annual evaluation meeting and will also be noted at the Standing Committee for Apprenticeships.

**H5. Subject review**

Apprenticeship courses are expected to align to the University’s Subject Review Cycle and will be included in the assessment of the courses within the relevant subject area.

Section I: Validation of Postgraduate Research Provision

In order to progress a proposal for new or amended PGR provision, the proposal, in most cases, will need to be added to the Validation Schedule. Schools should notify the Registry and Academic Development QA team of proposed developments by submitting, via the Graduate School’s QA contact:

* An outline proposal to Registry and Academic Development
* For new courses only **(not applicable for amendments to existing courses or new routes through existing courses):**
	1. A supporting statement from the Director of Marketing, Communications and Student Recruitment confirming the course has been appropriately researched and does not adversely affect the University's funding position
	2. A statement from the International Office’s Immigration and Compliance Manager to confirm that the proposal meets current visa requirements

Registry and Academic Development will record the details on the Validation Schedule and, in conjunction with the Dean of the Graduate School and VCO, determine the level of scrutiny to apply. Where proposals contain taught elements (e.g. professional doctorates, the taught stages will require assessing by the standard University processes for the QA of taught provision as well as this process). The schedule of PGR validation events will be noted by the University Research Committee.

**I1. Validation events and Panel Membership**

Once a validation event type has been assigned, Registry and Academic Development will organise a validation event planning meeting with the proposing School.

PGR Validation events will be conducted by Graduate Board and the panel will comprise of its membership (excluding those representing the School from which the proposal originates). The panel may include a member external to the University. The involvement of an external member will be determined by Registry and Academic Development in consultation with the Dean of the Graduate School and VCO.

The external panel member from the higher education sector should not only be academically qualified and experienced in a field directly related to the provision under consideration but should also have knowledge of current trends and practices within quality assurance in UK HE. They should not have had any involvement with the University of Huddersfield for at least the preceding three years or any connection that may compromise impartiality. The general principles under Section P.3 Conflicts of Interest for External Examiners apply (except where specified otherwise in this section).

It is the responsibility of Registry and Academic Development to ensure that nominated external panel members have not had any connection with the University that could potentially compromise impartiality.

**I2. Validation Discussions**

The University expects that panels will take note as a matter of course of:

* The relevance of programme aims, learning outcomes, structure, and assessment,
* If applicable, the relevance of module aims, learning outcomes, content, and assessment (including confirmation appropriate consultation with Disability Services has taken place),
* The outcome and delivery of the provision including the use of C&IT,
* The relationship of staff expertise (research, consultancy/teaching) and staff development to the provision under consideration,
* The physical resources available to the provision,
* The alignment of the provision with the University and School Strategies,
* Inclusivity as identified by the University’s Inclusivity Framework.

Panels are encouraged to identify strengths as well as areas for development in the provision under consideration.

Panel members shall be provided with, and will be expected to familiarise themselves with:

* The relevant sections of the Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards,
* Relevant University strategy documents,
* Validation documentation as identified in the validation checklist for PGR,
* The draft programme and administrative arrangements,
* Any other relevant documentation that has been supplied.

It is the responsibility of Registry and Academic Development to ensure that external members have an accurate understanding of the University's procedures in relation to validation.

In drawing up an agenda for discussion on the day, panels shall indicate any issues which require the attention of members of the senior management or colleagues responsible for central services.

Where matters arise which relate to named postholders it is expected that panels will involve such postholders in discussions.

If panel members are requested to provide specialist reports as appendices, they should be notified in advance of an event and be asked to endeavour to return such reports within 28 days of an event. Such reports will normally be the responsibility of more than one member of a panel.

Report of validation discussions will be drafted by a member of Registry and Academic Development and will provide an indication of the nature of the discussions and of the views of the panel on issues relating to the provision under consideration. Where the panel stipulates conditions which must be complied with and/or recommendations which must be carefully considered, these must be clearly defined in the report.

**I3. Approving and responding to PGR validation reports**

The following procedure applies:

* The draft report is written and circulated to panel members for confirmation or amendment,
* The draft report is circulated to the School proposing the provision so that any factual inaccuracies can be addressed,
* The University’s Research Committee will receive and note the report as approved by panel members,
* The report outcomes will be considered by the relevant School in conjunction with the delivery team and a response to any recommendations or conditions will be prepared where appropriate,
* The response will be presented to the Chair of Graduate Board for approval,
* The Dean will be responsible for ensuring that matters raised in a report are followed up, and reported to the University’s Research Committee when any problems arise,
* It is expected that the implementation of any conditions and recommendations will feature in the subsequent annual evaluation reports for the provision.

A signed statement from the Chair of Graduate Board will be sent to the Registry and Academic Development to confirm that any conditions set have been met.

**I4. Documents required for validation**

Documentation should be submitted to Registry and Academic Development for distribution to the validation panel a minimum of three weeks before the date of the validation event. A summary of the minimum documentation required for the validation of new PGR provision is provided below.

Planning and resource approval documentation, including:

* + A statement from the Dean confirming that the new provision has been costed and agreed by the Director of Estates and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor;
	+ A statement from the Director of Computing and Library Services confirming all necessary computing and library facilities and resources are available;
	+ Management and staffing structure, including staff CVs (or a link to a staff profile that includes all the necessary information) for those involved in delivery.

An introduction and rationale for the provision, including:

* An explanation of how the provision fits into the existing portfolio, how it will support the strategic plan for School and University, and clear evidence of viability.

Completed Course Specification Document for PGR including its Appendices.

In addition:

* All Module Specification Documents (MSDs) that contribute to the provision (where there are taught elements only).
* Where applicable, a copy of the report of any related events under the Taught processes as well as confirmation that any conditions have been met (where there are taught elements only).
* Confirmation that the provision has been considered in accordance with the guidance under the University’s Inclusivity framework.
* A copy of the relevant Course Finder entry with any potential amendments marked-up to confirm of the identification of areas which have been impacted by Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) implications (amendments to existing provision only).

Following validation, the programme and module specification/s must be published on the University records management system and declared as a record.

**Role of the Dean**

The Dean has oversight of validation documentation prepared within Schools to ensure it meets the defined requirements and standards necessary for review by a validation panel. The Dean must also be satisfied that the design and delivery of proposed provision is compatible with the School and University strategies as well as any other relevant institutional policy and take an inclusive approach, consulting with Disability Services and utilising current equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) guidance as appropriate.

**I5. Appealing against the outcome of a validation event**

If the School believes there is cause for appeal against the outcome of a validation event, it may appeal, via the Dean, to the University’s Research Committee clearly stating the grounds for appeal. The Committee will establish a small group of different composition to the original panel to consider the matter.

**I6. Changes to validated provision**

Schools may find it desirable or necessary to make changes to programme specifications. Proposed changes should be submitted to Registry and Academic Development using the Validation Proposal Form.

In line with University guidance on the application of consumer law for students, where a proposed change would constitute a material change, Schools must provide evidence that the University’s CMA processes have been followed as part of the approval process.

**I7. Termination of Provision**

Where provision is to be discontinued an exit strategy should be drawn up by the School, which identifies all relevant information relating to the closure. The exit strategy should be approved by the School's Management/ Executive Committee and monitored via the School’s Director of Graduate Education.

Appendix A: Flow chart indicating validation of courses



Appendix B: Validation timelines

**Guide validation timescales**

From School consideration to Panel Chair sign off normally a minimum of 8 weeks:

* 2 weeks for amendments & sign off from Tier 1 event
* 3 weeks for panel to read papers
* 4 weeks for receipt of validation report
* 3-6 weeks for amendments & sign off from university event

 + add time for development

 + add time for Panel Chair review and sign off

Schools making proposals at a later stage should also be mindful of the potential impact on the recruitment cycle and student numbers on the initial intake:

**Recruitment cycle**

*The UK Uni recruitment fairs typically run from September to November*

****

| **Month** | **Time before course start date** | **Marketing/Recruitment Cycle** | **Validation Cycle** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| September  | 24 months | Work begins on prospectus and Course Finder. Schools to provide updates to prospectus informationUCAS applications open for entry the following year | Validation events |
| October | 23 months |  | Validation events. |
| November | 22 months |  | Validation events.Deadline for approval of courses for inclusion in the next year’s undergraduate prospectus. |
| December | 21 months | UG prospectus goes to print for entry in 2 years’ time and no further additions can be made. | Validation events.Registry and Academic Development request from schools’ information on new courses and course amendments for the following year’s validation schedule.Schools begin to confirm courses for inclusion in the validation schedule. |
| January | 20 months | UCAS Applications deadline 25 January annually for majority of undergraduate courses commencing in September of that same yearCourse Finder is locked and any further amendments will need CMA approval. | Validation events.Schools confirm courses for inclusion in the validation schedule. |
| February | 19 months | UCAS recruitment cycle for 2025/26 entry begins – national recruitment fairs run from February to July(UCAS is not open for applications until September)Changes will be reflected on Course Finder, subject area pages on the University website (which link the prospectus and Course Finder and are also used for advertising campaigns) and UCAS website. | Validation events. |
| March | 18 months |  | Validation events.Schools continue to confirm courses to be added as part of a rolling validation schedule |
| April | 17 months |  | Validation events. |
| May  | 16 months |  | Schools continue to confirm courses to be added as part of a rolling validation schedule |
| June | 15 months | End of UCAS UG application cycle before Clearing begins. | Validation events. |
| July | 14 months |  | Validation events. |
| September | 12 months | UCAS applications open for entry in the following year.Work begins on UG prospectus and Course Finder for entry in 2 years’ time | Validation events.  |
| October | 11 months |  | Validation events. |
| November | 10 months |  | Validation events.Deadline for approval of courses for inclusion in the 2024/25 entry undergraduate prospectus. |
| January | 8 months | UCAS application deadline. | Validation events.Schools confirm courses for inclusion in the validation schedule. |
| February | 7 months |  | Validation events. |
| March | 6 months |  | Validation events.Schools continue to confirm courses to be added as part of a rolling validation schedule |
| April | 5 months |  | Validation events. |
| May | 4 months |  | Schools continue to confirm courses to be added as part of a rolling validation schedule |
| June | 3 months | Joining information is made available. | Final Validation events – no UVP events will take place during July and AugustSchools to submit all CMA Requests by 6 June |
| September | 0 months | Course start dates. |  |

Appendix C: Research Degree by DL Approval Proforma

This form enables Schools to outline how they will oversee the management of Research Studies by Distance Learning (DL). The School must evidence that the proposal can be delivered in a Distance Learning environment, and that it has the resources and expertise to support the course and the students enrolled on the course.

Before submitting this form, Schools should familiarise themselves with the following documents:

* Research Degrees by DL – Guidance Document.
* The Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards.
* The Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees).

Once completed the form should be submitted to Graduate Board together with the following supporting documents:

* Confirmation from the Director of Marketing that there is a market for the proposed provision.
* Confirmation from the Dean that there are adequate human resources (academic & professional services) in place to support the proposed delivery and that School resources are in place for supervisors adequately to conduct online meetings.
* Confirmation from the Head of CLS that there are resources in place including software licences to access to the University’s learning resources/journals etc.
* Confirmation from the Head of Researcher Environment that there are adequate resources and capacity to provide core training and development opportunities at a distance; and/or for any campus-based delivery planned as part of the attendance requirements.

All staff responsible for both designing and delivering DL provision must first meet the University's training requirement defined by Graduate Board. It is the School’s responsibility to maintain records of staff who have met the training requirements. The Director of Graduate Education should check and confirm that all relevant staff meet the training requirements.

No offers to study can be made until there is an established Supervisory Team in place.

| **Pro Forma** | **Research Degree by DL**  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Name of School:** |
| **2** | **Name and role of the member of staff submitting the proposal:** |
| **3** | **Subject Area and Qualification:** |
| **4** | **Will the course be available to Full-time and/or Part-time Applicants?** |
|  | **Rationale for the Proposal** |
| **5** | **Rationale for the Proposal*** *A clear rationale for the proposed distance learning delivery including how the proposal supports the relevant School and University Strategies.*
* *An outline of why it is considered important to provide the opportunity to study via DL.*
 |
|  |  |
| **6** | **Target Market*** *Proposed Student Numbers.*
* *Provide a description of the target market for the course, including the location of the students and the plans for promoting the award.*
 |
|  | **Research Environment, Delivery and Support Mechanisms** |
| **7** | **Attendance at Queensgate*** *What periods and stages of attendance at Queensgate will be required (taking into account the minimum face to face attendance requirements in the Regulations)?*
* *Has the School contacted the International Office regarding the visa implications for international research students who may be offered a place?*
* *How will the School ensure that research students have access to appropriate workspace and equipment during their time at Queensgate?*
 |
|  |  |
| **8** | **Facilities***How will the School determine what facilities are required by the research student, and how will it ensure these are provided?* |
|  |  |
| **9** | **Research Environment*** *How will the School ensure that a research student by DL will receive a comparable experience to Queensgate based students?*
* *How will the School ensure that a robust and suitable research environment will be made available, including opportunities to interact with, and discuss research with, their peers?*
 |
|  |  |
| **10** | **Supervision*** *What is the estimated additional workload for supervisors involved in the provision and how will this be considered for individual supervisors?*
* *What methods will be used for supervision and informal progress monitoring, and how will the mode/type of interaction and the frequency of interactions be determined?*
 |
|  |  |
| **11** | **Monitoring and Review*** *How will research student progress be monitored, both formally and informally?*
* *How will the School ensure that formal progress reviews take place at the agreed intervals and that the research student attends Huddersfield for progression monitoring whenever possible?*
 |
|  |  |
| **12** | **Additional Information** |
|  |  |
| **DoGE signature:** |  |
| **Date:** |  |

| **Graduate Board Comments/Approval** |
| --- |
| *Please use this space to provide any comments relating to the committee’s discussion of the request, or any additional conditions that the School meet as part of the approval.*  |
| **Deadline for Conditions to be met by (if applicable):** |
| **Approved by:** |
| **Date of meeting:** |
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Section J: Quality appraisals and internal quality audits (IQAs)

**J1. Quality appraisals introduction**

Quality appraisals are an audit of existing practice in a small defined area which is reported to the University Teaching and Learning Committee. The purpose of quality appraisals is to provide evidence to assist the University in ensuring that its policies and procedures operate effectively and are being implemented consistently across the Institution.

**J2. Types of quality appraisal**

Quality appraisals may cover a wide range of topics related, but not limited to:

* the operation of formal academic committees
* course documentation
* course/module evaluation and review mechanisms
* implementation of teaching and learning strategies
* regulatory compliance
* the student learning experience

Service quality appraisals will cover activities which support the student learning experience. This may include the processes for supporting centrally serviced committees, such as UTLC or URC (and any other committees outside of Registry and Academic Development).

**J3. Evidence Required for quality appraisals**

The Terms of Reference outlining the evidence required for each quality appraisal will normally be circulated at least 1 month in advance of the Quality Appraisal.

Schools/Services being appraised are responsible for ensuring that documentation is prepared in an appropriate format for the quality appraisal.

**J4. Appointment of quality appraisal panels**

Panels will normally comprise a minimum of 2 members of staff not associated with the School/Service where the quality appraisal is taking place (usually 2 members of Registry and Academic Development staff. Where appropriate, panel membership may include a member of the Students’ Union Executive. The panel may include any member of staff, independent from the School/Service being appraised in accordance with criteria defined by UTLC / Graduate Board.

**J5. Conduct of quality appraisals**

The schedule of quality appraisals for each academic year will be determined by UTLC or Graduate Board, on behalf of UTLC/URC, and incorporated into the annual review schedule.

Quality appraisals are normally desk-based activities; however, they may include meeting(s) with relevant members of staff and students.

**J6. Reports of Quality Appraisals**

A report of the appraisal will be prepared by the panel and circulated to the School/Service being appraised to allow them to identify and confirm actions to be taken following the appraisal. Where the appraisal is across multiple Schools/Services a summary report will also be prepared and circulated.

All reports will detail the conduct observed, draw conclusions and make recommendations.

The Dean/Director or Head of Service, or nominee, will receive the final report and will draw up a formal response and action plan to be presented for consideration by UTLC/URC.

**J7. Internal Quality Audits (IQA)**

The role of an IQA is to scrutinise areas of rapid change and development or to determine the nature of problems and to report on action and support required where issues of concern have been raised.

The need for an IQA may be raised via the annual evaluation process or other review mechanism (e.g. an external examiner report, DALO report, PSRB engagement or an Audit report).

An IQA can take place in relation to provision delivered either on campus or at a Partner Institution.

**J8. Conduct of an IQA**

The precise terms of reference, model of audit, panel membership and means by which the report of the audit will be considered will be agreed with the PVC (T&L)/PVC (R&E) in advance of commencing the Internal Quality Audit. In view of this an IQA may take the form of a desk-based exercise or a more detailed engagement which may involve meetings with members of Staff within the School(s) or Partner Institution concerned.

**J9. Reports of IQAs**

Reports and Actions following an IQA will be considered by the body approved within the IQA’s Terms of Reference. Precise outcomes available will be contained within the Terms of Reference and may include (but is not limited to) agreeing:

* No further action is necessary.
* A monitoring period.
* An improvement plan.
* That a Collaborative Partnership be terminated.

Section K: Subject review

**K1. The function of subject review**

A subject review is the holistic consideration of the curriculum of the suite of taught courses which comprise that subject area and its postgraduate research activities with a view to:

* Discuss issues relevant to and generated by the subject area team under review.
* Consider curriculum development plans and broad proposals, which subsequently feed into the standard validation process as necessary.
* Promote the discussion of quality enhancement and innovation in course delivery within the subject area.
* Identify and address any employability issues.
* Evaluate the operation of the subject area against the University regulations and quality procedures.
* Consider how research within the subject area informs the taught portfolio.

The review is a helpful, consultative and supportive mechanism and includes internal, student and external academic and professional input.

Where there are no planned changes to taught courses, approval will be reconfirmed for the courses within the subject area as part of the subject review event.

Where there are planned changes to the taught courses the subject review discussions will inform the detailed development of course changes, which will be considered in accordance with the processes contained within Section B of the Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards. Where necessary further comments would be sought from the external panel members involved in the subject review event.

Subject areas are determined by the Schools and are notionally based on HECoS subject classifications and will be reviewed at least once every five years in accordance with a schedule confirmed by UTLC. The URC will be notified of the review schedule once confirmed by UTLC.

**K2. The process**

Subject Reviews should normally:

* Be no longer than a day long and timed to ensure that teams are in a position to review their curriculum at a time that is sensible for course development and can be revalidated before the end of the academic year concerned.
* Have external involvement: a panel member from outside the School, an external academic and an external representative from industry/the profession (to be approved by the PVC (Teaching and Learning)/ (Research and Enterprise) or nominee); and student representative. External members will have not had a close involvement with the University in the last three years.
* Have been preceded by a meeting with students (taught & research) from across the Subject Area
* Include meetings with staff from across the range of provision.

**K3. Documentation required for reviews**

Registry and Academic Development compile an evidence base for the Subject area, comprising of External Examiner reports, Annual Evaluation Documentation, Student Panel rolling logs, Module and Course specifications, minutes from relevant committee meetings and reports from any accreditation activity that has taken place for the reporting period. The evidence base is shared with the subject team to support the drafting of the Self Evaluation Document and is also shared with the panel to support the review process.

A self-evaluation document (SED) on the university’s template and supporting documentation should be submitted to Registry and Academic Development for distribution to the panel three weeks before the date of the review. The SED should provide:

* An overview of curriculum developments and improvements and their drivers.
* An identification of the key issues the team wants to explore as part of the review.
* Provide a self-evaluation of the:
	+ quality of the student learning experience
	+ the level of student achievement
	+ the current position of the subject area within the institution and the wider higher education sector

Evidence should be drawn from Student Panels, module evaluation, external examiner reports, peer observation of teaching, the Data Analysis meeting with CES and annual evaluation.

The self-evaluation document should be supported by:

* The Evidence Base compiled by Registry and Academic Development Full set of Programme and Module Specification Documentation for the current courses delivered in the subject area.
* Documentation following the Employability Data Review meeting.
* Staff CVs for the subject area leader, course leaders, module leaders, all permanent teaching staff, professoriate and where relevant and possible all part- time hourly paid teaching staff.
* The most recent annual evaluation reports (taught and research), including associated external examiner reports for taught provision and feedback forms for courses in the subject area.
* Results of the most recent course evaluation exercises - plus the latest NSS and PRES results.
* A summary of the most recent PSRB reports/engagements where relevant.
* A sample course (taught and research provision) and module handbook.

**K4. Reports of Subject Reviews**

Following the review, Registry and Academic Development will normally produce a draft report for approval by the review panel which will be passed to the School within 4 weeks of the event.

The subject area team will draw up a formal response (with clear actions) to the report and arrange for both to be considered by the next available Course Committee and approved by the Dean. The report and School’s response should then be submitted to UTLC/URC.

Course teams should include specific proposals for the extent and timing of subsequent course or module changes as part of the formal response so that decisions regarding the nature of the event(s) can be determined.

Feedback on the review and action plan should be reported as part of the next annual evaluation cycle.

Section L: Thematic Reviews

**L1. The function of thematic reviews**

Thematic Reviews are an open review to enhance practice across the Institution in a strategic area. They evaluate the strategic direction and performance of the theme across the University, to assess the area of work and its operation and to ensure appropriate quality assurance and enhancement arrangements are in place. The review will be concerned with both ‘fitness *of* purpose’ and ‘fitness *for* purpose’. Thematic reviews will normally take place once per year and the programme of themes for review will be determined by UTLC/URC.

**L2. The content of thematic reviews**

Thematic reviews allow close scrutiny of key areas and their operation across the University to allow attention to detail, and to links between different units, that other quality assurance processes may not produce. The aim of thematic reviews is to evaluate the area under consideration in relationship to university, service and School mission statements, aims and objectives, strategic plans and the external environment.

Thematic reviews will focus on an area’s relationship, as appropriate to the theme being reviewed, with:

* quality assurance, management and enhancement issues,
* teaching and learning, and assessment,
* C&IT strategies,
* University’s strategic plans,
* student retention, progression and achievement,
* research and scholarly activity,
* policies for staff development,
* the articulation and assurance of standards,
* external reports and annual evaluation,
* links with professional bodies, employers, and other external organisations,
* links between Schools and Services in the University,
* customer care,
* cost effectiveness.

**L3. Documentation required for thematic reviews**

The documentation submitted to thematic review panels should utilise existing documents wherever possible but should include the following:

* Self-evaluation reports (not exceeding 4-6 sides of A4) from applicable services, highlighting current perceived strengths and achievements, matters requiring and receiving attention and focusing on the relevant issues listed in paragraph 2 above.
* Self-evaluation reports from Schools (not exceeding 4-6 sides of A4) highlighting current perceived strengths and achievements, matters requiring and receiving attention and focusing on the issues listed in L2. above.
* An append document of appropriate supporting information such as relevant regulations, procedures and policies relating to the theme.

**L4. Appointment of thematic review panels**

Thematic review panels are appointed to act on behalf of the Senate and report to it. The chair of the panel will normally be a senior academic member of staff. Full panel membership will be established by the Head of Quality Assurance, in consultation with the panel chair and will be approved by the PVC (Teaching and Learning)/ (Research & Enterprise). External membership of the panel will reflect the nature of the theme under consideration.

In addition to the chair, panels must normally comprise at least:

* one senior member from a School in the University,
* a senior member from a Service in the University,
* a member of a major University Committee,
* two external members who are recognised as having relevant expertise and who have not had a close association with the University over the previous three years,
* a representative from the Students’ Union.

**L5. Conduct of thematic reviews**

The Head of Quality Assurance will circulate the documentation for consideration by the panel. The panel may hold a pre-meetingto draw up a list of issues for consideration during the thematic review, a draft programme and allocation of responsibilities.

The programme for each review is determined by the chair of the panel and the Head of Quality Assurance in consultation with members of the panel and will normally include:

* a meeting with key users/stakeholders,
* a meeting with representatives of formally established committees or groups,
* meeting(s) with a sample group of staff involved in the area,
* meeting(s) with relevant support staff,
* meeting(s) with a range of students undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research students and recent graduates (if appropriate),
* inspection of facilities (if appropriate).

**L6. Reports of thematic reviews**

A detailed report of the event containing conclusions and recommendations will be produced and approved by the panel. The final report and its recommendations will be submitted to UTLC/URC for consideration and further action if necessary.

**L7. Response by Schools or Services**

In addition to recommendations made by the report. Schools or Services may be requested to prepare a report on the actions taken in response to the findings of the review. Responses must be submitted to UTLC/URC within one calendar year of the review.

Section M: Annual Evaluation

**M1. Role and timing**

Annual Evaluation is the internal process by which the University critically appraises the operation of courses, ensuring that appropriate standards are maintained.

Annual Evaluation takes place at course and module level to reflect on the key successes/issues from the last academic session and to identify actions required.

Annual Evaluation for taught provision is undertaken as a continuous cycle across the academic year and is considered by the appropriate Course Committee or Annual Evaluation Committee.

For Postgraduate Research provision, Annual evaluation takes place as part of the PGR Annual Lifecycle Meeting with completed report templates being submitted to the meeting for consideration.

**M2. Contents of Annual Evaluation Reports**

Annual Evaluation Reports focus on agreed indicators, e.g. external examiners’ comments, course statistics, student evaluation and feedback, responses to reviews and identification of best practice. PGR reports will include reflection on statistical data and indicators agreed by Graduate Board. All Annual Evaluation Reports should contain a brief summary by the course leader/DoGE including commentary on any issues raised in the previous year’s exercise and actions in the coming year.

Annual Evaluation Reports for taught provision should be submitted via SharePoint.

**M3. Lines of report from Annual Evaluation (Taught Provision)**

Schools may refer unresolved problems to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee and, if necessary, to Senate. It is the Deans’ responsibility to monitor any requirements identified during the evaluation process.

**M4. Lines of report from PGR Annual Lifecycle Meeting (PGR Provision)**

The Annual Lifecycle meeting may refer unresolved problems to the University’s Research Committee and, if necessary, to Senate. It is the Deans’ responsibility to monitor any requirements identified during the evaluation process.

Appendix D: Module Evaluation Policy

**Responsibility**

The Dean has final responsibility for ensuring a valid return rate of at least 70%. The operational requirements for the selection of module questions, issue, collection of data and circulation of results may be delegated to a named responsible person. The responsible person will ensure that the School has a system which:

* ensures module evaluation is undertaken, either electronically or in paper form, during a timetabled class session,
* ensures robust processes for identifying well in advance which timetabled session will include the module evaluation completion,
* ensures robust, auditable processes for the collation and dissemination of module evaluation outcomes,
* ensures all questionnaires are completed anonymously by students. Staff should be mindful of student privacy whilst the forms are being completed and that students have the right to refuse to complete module evaluations,
* ensures the results of all module evaluations and clear, time limited systems for producing action plans in response to module evaluations where any question receives a score below 4.00 are presented to:
	+ Course and module teams
	+ School SMTs
	+ Student representatives (for example, through course committees, or by publishing outcomes on the student panel log).

**Timing of module evaluation**

Module evaluation must be run annually. Schools may run timetabled sessions as they choose and should take into account the nature of module delivery.

**Content of module evaluation questionnaire**

The module evaluation questionnaire (below) will include no more than 10 questions, plus a general satisfaction question. Schools may vary the questions under the general headings but should not expand the survey overall. Schools may use the list below to vary the questions for placement purposes only.

**The Process**

School policy should be clear that module evaluations may be conducted via a paper version or electronic version of the module evaluation questionnaire or a mixture of both where different departments or courses have different preferences.

Schools may run the timetabled session which includes the module evaluation as they choose. The evaluation may be done as a stand-alone part of the session and the rest of the session taught as normal, or it may be part of a wider qualitative evaluation session in which students and staff participate in focus groups or other forms of discussion about the module.

Where this activity has been delegated to a responsible person, s/he should confirm to the Dean:

* all module evaluation activity for that academic year has been completed,
* the overall percentage return rate.

**Module Questionnaire**

**Main Questions**

**Teaching Methods**

**The teaching methods used in this module helped me to learn.**

**This module has improved my knowledge and understanding of the subject.**

**The module is intellectually stimulating.**

**I have had the right opportunities to work with other students as part of the module.**

**Assessment**

**The criteria used in marking have been made clear in advance.**

**The workload, including assessment, is appropriate.**

**Feedback on my work, in relation to this module, has been useful and timely.**

 **Facilities**

**The rooms for teaching and learning for this module are of a suitable quality.**

**Brightspace has made a valuable contribution to my learning on this module.**

**I have been able to access module specific resources (e.g. equipment, facilities, software, collections) when I needed to.**

**I am satisfied with the overall quality of this module.**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Placement specific**

**There are sufficient opportunities for students wishing to undertake a placement year.**

**The availability and quality of support in relation to this placement has been good.**

**I was made fully aware of the placement support offered in the School.**

**I was supported by my academic tutors / placement supervisor.**

**I was supported by my host organisation/manager whilst on placement.**

**The module has been relevant to my course/pathway.**

**The placement gave me the opportunity to apply previous course based learning.**

**The assessment criteria specified for the placement module were clear.**

**Brightspace worked effectively to support my learning and engagement whilst on placement.**

**This module helped me gain professional experience.**

**This module has helped influence my career decisions and future aspirations.**

**The placement gave me the opportunity to acquire and further develop skills and attributes to enhance my employability.**

Appendix E: Dean’s Confirmation of Completion of Key Quality Activities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School**  |   | **Academic Year**  |   |

This form should be completed by the Dean at the end of each academic year to confirm that the following groups of activities (including those applicable to CP arrangements) have been completed for that academic year. Where it has been indicated that an activity remains on-going, an action plan (including target completion dates) should be submitted with this document.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Records Activities**  | Yes  | No  |
| APL for all students (including January starters) have been approved and recorded on ASIS  |    |    |
| All students were registered for the full number of credits (including any trails)  |    |    |
| Suspended students were contacted to determine their intentions for return in the next academic year.  |    |    |
| Students identified on the Debtor List from the Student Finance Office were notified of their withdrawal by the published deadline.  |    |    |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality Matters**  | Yes  | No  |
| The validation schedule has been reviewed to ensure it contains all the School’s requirements for the forthcoming academic year.  |    |    |
| Any actions from the Annual Evaluation round have been completed and the outcomes reported back to the Course Committee  |    |    |
| Course and module evaluation surveys have been completed  |    |    |
| Two Student Panel and Course Committee meetings have been held  |    |    |
| Visits to students on placement have been undertaken  |    |    |
| The responses to last year’s External Examiner report have been completed and sent to the EE ahead of their approval of the document at the Summer CAMs |    |    |
| External Examiner appointments have been reviewed to ensure that tenure will still be current in the forthcoming academic session (any replacement EEs or requests for extension of tenure were initiated through the Course Committee)  |    |    |
| Course and Module handbooks have been reviewed and updated in advance of the forthcoming academic session.  |    |    |
| Module Leader reports have been completed  |    |    |
| Suitable administrative support resources remain in place for all new and existing Degree Apprenticeships  |    |    |
| Suitable administrative support resources remain in place for all new and existing Taught Provision  |    |    |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Matters**  | Yes  | No  |
| All assessment briefs were signed off by the EE prior to release to the students  |    |    |
| Assessment schedules and criteria were made available to students  |    |    |
| Schedules for moderation of assessment were finalised  |    |    |
| A rota indicating staff availability for results queries was established  |    |    |
| All known academic misconduct cases have been progressed promptly  |    |    |

As Dean, I confirm that these activities have been completed for the above academic year. Where it has been indicated that an activity remains on-going, an action plan has been submitted with this document.

Signature:

Date:

**Please return the completed document to** **jason.smith@hud.ac.uk** **no later than 15 September each year.**

**.**
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Section N: Collaborative Provision

**N1. Introduction**

Courses leading to the University’s awards may be devised and delivered in collaboration with another institution. Alternatively, arrangements may be made under which a course already approved by the University is delivered either partly or wholly by another institution.

The University adopts a risk-based approach to the development of Collaborative Provision (CP). The University must maintain the standard and quality of its awards. The University will retain control of the arrangements for validation, approval and evaluation of the course and for the assessment of students and requires that the delivery environment is appropriate to higher education.

The University must assure itself that any new CP arrangement is both viable, fits with the strategic direction of the University and will not cause harm to its reputation. With the exception of the consortium, initial proposals will be considered by Enterprise and Collaborative Provision Strategy Group (ECPSG) to assess ethical and financial viability, and if approved, the proposal will progress to SCCP for consideration of the QA and validation processes.

**N2. General considerations**

This section describes the processes and procedures involved in the validation of CP for the delivery of University credit by an approved partner institution under the categories of CP contained within section 2 (below). Guidance in relation to work-based learning, placements, and study abroad arrangements will be as defined in the Managed Work Placement guidance document.

CP arrangements may need to reflect a diversity of local circumstances and must establish a framework of principles and procedures which define and protect the interests of the institutions involved. Such procedures are the principal means by which the University can assure the quality of the courses delivered by external institutions on its behalf and the learning experience of University students studying these courses.

To ensure the integrity of CP agreements the partner institutions must maintain procedures for quality assurance and control, identifying appropriate channels of communication, authority, accountability, and executive action.

All CP arrangements with other institutions will be the subject of a formal agreement.

Onward or subsequent contracting of any University award to a third party (sometimes referred to as serial franchising) is not permitted.

In the case of Degree Apprenticeships only, where specialist skill or knowledge does not exist within the University, but this knowledge is required for Apprentices to succeed on the course (such as functional skills provision), the University uses subcontractors. The existing CP approvals process is used for selecting and approving subcontractors.

All marketing and publicity information produced by the partner about the collaboration must be approved by the University in advance of publication.

**N3. Categories of collaborative provision**

The University operates the following categories of collaborative provision:

**Franchise**

A franchise describes the arrangement whereby the whole, part of (for example one year of a two year course), or discrete parts (such as individual modules) of a course are delivered in an institution other than the University by academic staff not employed by the University.

**Designed and delivered**

Designed and delivered describes the arrangement whereby a programme of study is developed by an external institution and presented for validation by the University as an award of the University. Once validated, the delivery of the award is undertaken by the external institution.

**Off-campus delivery of University provision led by University staff (ODUPLUS)**

This describes an arrangement whereby a course validated by the University and taught by University staff is delivered at an off-campus location. It is the role of the partner institution to support student learning through provision of an appropriate range of learning resources, including library and computing facilities, and administrative, promotional and marketing services. The proportion of teaching by University staff must constitute at least one third of the total taught delivery for each module. All learning materials must be produced by the University of Huddersfield.

**Flying faculty**

This describes an arrangement where a course validated by the University is taught and supported wholly by University staff but is delivered at an off-campus location. The partner will not be involved in the support of student learning or its administration. Normally these courses are associated with the partner’s CPD processes. Flying Faculty may be deemed to be lower risk provision if the course is a closed course (i.e. it is not available for open recruitment beyond students from a particular known partner) and is a once-only delivery.

**Cotutelle (Single Award)**

An agreement on joint supervision at doctoral degree level, leading to a single award from the University.

**Cotutelle (Dual Award)**

An agreement on joint supervision at doctoral degree level, leading to an award being issued from each University involved in the supervision.

**Joint awards**

A joint award is a single course devised and delivered jointly between two or more institutions and leading to the conferment of a single award in the name of all partners. Arrangements for the validation of joint awards are detailed separately in this Handbook.

**Articulation**

An articulation arrangement describes the situation whereby the University and an external institution enter into a formal joint agreement to confirm that the learning outcomes and standards required for the award of University credit can be satisfactorily demonstrated through successful completion of the external institution’s own award or credit. Such an agreement would allow entry to an identified University award with advanced standing. Arrangements for the validation of articulation arrangements are detailed separately in this Handbook.

**Dual Awards**

The University may collaborate with another higher education institution in devising a course of studies leading to an award from each institution. The arrangements for the validation and evaluation of such courses will be subject to the approval of the Senate and must be designed to safeguard the standards of the University’s awards.

**N4. Administrative procedures for the validation of collaborative provision activity**

Registry and Academic Development will clarify which elements require completion depending on the type of proposal and whether a link exists with the proposed partner. Registry and Academic Development will confirm which level of business case is needed.

**N5. Indicative approval**

The initiative to enter into a collaborative arrangement with another institution is taken by the School owning the course. The proposed financial and resource arrangements must be approved by the Dean of the School. Curriculum or academic matters in relation to collaborative provision must be approved by Tier 1 Panel (where separately constituted). Where the course includes modules delivered by another School on a servicing basis, the prior written agreement of that School must also be obtained.

The proposal must receive written confirmation from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) in order to draft a business case.

**N6. Business case**

There are two forms of Business Case Templates based on the level of perceived risk. At the point of indicative approval, the DVC/PVC (T&L) will confirm which Business Case Template should be submitted.

The School will submit the business case template to the University’s Standing Committee for Collaborative Provision (SCCP) giving a brief description of the nature of and rationale for the proposal, detailing the general proposals for its costing and resourcing, including the costs of validation and revalidation in addition to any standard annual costs that may apply. Where the University has no existing links with an external institution, the business case should include explicit references to the institution’s mission, existing provision and strategic aims.

A financial statement agreed by Financial Services indicating the costs/charges to be borne by each partner must be included.

Normally the Business Case must be supported by signed statements from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), the Director of Registry and Academic Development, the Director of Finance and, where the external institution is overseas, the International Office.

For overseas institutions, any local or in-country government approvals must be identified as part of the Business Case presentation with an indication of likely timescales and processes. This must be presented as part of the validation report received by SCCP.

The University reserves the right to require a visit by a representative of its Computing and Library Services at any point if deemed necessary.

**N7. Institutional approval**

Where the University has no previous relationship with the proposed partner institution, an Institutional Approval event shall be organised to establish that the educational objectives and methods of the proposed partner are compatible with the University’s strategy and objectives.

Information in support of Institutional Approval should refer to the following, paying particular attention to strategy and management. Include any particular strengths of the partner institution which do not fall into the categories below:

* general introduction to the partner institution,
* the institutional setting, namely range of provision, size, and management structure, and if overseas, its position within the local higher education system,
* history of relationship with the University (if any) and/or other experience of HE provision,
* organisation and management of the partner institution,
* approaches to academic management and development,
* teaching, learning and assessment strategies,
* procedures for resource allocation and monitoring,
* management of standards,
* quality assurance processes,
* approaches to quality enhancement.

The documentation should include copies of relevant internal policies, procedures and plans.

The proposed arrangements will normally be scrutinised by means of an approval event at the institution concerned, which will be organised by Registry and Academic Development. The process of approval must include consideration of the facilities and resources which will be accessed by the proposed collaboration.

The approval process is undertaken by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) (or nominee) and the Director of Registry and Academic Development (or nominee). The SCCP has the authority to request additional members (such as a representative of Computing and Library Services) as necessary.

The Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee will prepare a report on the event for approval at SCCP. The report will indicate whether or not the approval is to be supported, any recommendations to be considered in the development of the relationship and any specific issues to be addressed by subsequent course validations.

Institutional Approval will usually be a separate event completed in advance of any course validation. In exceptional circumstances, it may be the first part of a combined event looking at both Institutional Approval and course validation. This largely (but not exclusively) depends on the scale of collaboration with the partner institution and the logistics of organisation. Where a joint event is arranged, the documentation for Institutional Approval and course validation may be submitted as a joint document.

Institutional Approval is normally granted for a period of five years.

Institutional Re-approval will normally follow the process set out for Institutional Approval, unless otherwise agreed by the Pro-Vice Chancellor for Teaching and Learning.

**N8. Course validation documentation**

This is to allow the validation panel to establish whether the proposed course is of an appropriate standard for the award of the University to which it is intended to lead.

The programme of study must be a validated course of the University. For courses proposed for franchised and ODUPLUS delivery, it is likely that this exercise will already have been undertaken to allow delivery of the course at the University. A validation exercise will have considered and approved the academic standards and structure of the course. Where this has happened, the documentation submitted as part of the validation process shall include the validated programme specification and module documentation.

Where course validation has not been previously addressed and confirmed (for example, in the case of a Designed and Delivered proposal), the approval event shall include the submission of the programme specification document and related appendices (as outlined in section B of this Handbook) by the partner institution.

Where the proposed collaborative provision includes modules delivered by another School or deemed to be part of a subject area owned by another School, the agreement of that School must also be obtained.

**N9. Rationale document**

The validation event shall include consideration of documentation and discussion to indicate that the:

* Requisite teaching experience and expertise is available.
* Physical resources are appropriate and sufficient for the anticipated number of students.
* Support services are able to meet the needs of the course.
* Learning opportunities offered to students and the environment in which the course is delivered is appropriate to HE provision.

The external institution or (in the case of ODUPLUS) the team seeking the collaboration must prepare a written submission providing information under the following headings:

* The institutional setting name range of provision, size, and management structure, and if overseas, its position within the local higher education system.
* The history of the relationship with the University (if any) and/or other experience of HE provision.
* The rationale for the proposal.
* The anticipated demand for the course.
* Statements on resources available for the course, both human and physical (including curricula vitae of the programme team, indicating research interests and professional development activities relevant to the course).
* Proposals for delivery of the course including student support arrangements.
* Procedures for the management of the course and details of the quality assurance interface with the University (at the School and University level) including external examining arrangements, annual evaluation and revalidation.
* Other information relevant to the provision.

**N10. Delivery Mechanism**

The validation of previously approved courses already being delivered at the University will have been completed on the basis of a stated delivery mechanism - usually a weekly class contact. Explicit approval is required for the delivery of a previously validated course in a format other than the one described at validation.

The School seeking validation for the delivery of a course overseas must prepare documentation to support an alternative delivery mechanism as follows:

* Appropriateness of course for the proposed method of delivery.
* Details of the delivery at the University (if delivered at the University).
* Details and breakdown of the delivery at the host institution, including details of the proposed pattern of delivery.
* Details of staff allocation to modules and tutorial support (both University and partner staff as relevant).
* Key features of the validated course.
* Any changes required to accommodate the local context.
* Signed statement from the Director of Computing and Library Services to confirm that any demand on this Service has been fully costed and approved.
* Mechanisms for communication, student support (including pastoral care) and administrative support.

**N11. Staff involved in academic support, course delivery and summative assessment**

Collaborative proposals may include an element of support from academic staff who are not employed by the University. Explicit approval is required for all staff involved in the delivery, support or assessment of the proposed provision who are not employed by the University.

Documentation to support the inclusion of non-University staff in the delivery, support or assessment of provision must be submitted as part of the validation event and shall include the CVs of the proposed team, indicating research interests and professional development activities relevant to the course. The documentation shall clarify the roles and responsibilities of all staff from the partner institution involved in the course including administrative and pastoral functions.

The CVs of staff not employed by the University who are subsequently appointed to the delivery team shall be approved by the School via a Tier 1 Panel before they participate in the course.

**N12. Location and premises of delivery**

The location and premises for the delivery of courses have to be explicitly confirmed as appropriate for the operation of HE provision.

Documentation describing the physical environment and resources available for learning shall be submitted as part of the validation event and include details of any specialised facilities or equipment.

A tour of the facilities available to the course and the students shall be included as part of the panel’s validation schedule. Where this is not possible as part of the event, a member of the panel or nominated member of the university must visit the location and prepare a report for the consideration of SCCP in advance of delivery commencing.

Where a change of location or premises occurs following the completion of an event, the Designated Academic Liaison Officer (DALO) must undertake a site visit and submit a separate report and recommendation regarding the continuation of the collaboration to the SCCP.

**N13. Collaborative provision validation event**

The proposed arrangements will be scrutinised by means of a validation event conducted either virtually or at the institution concerned, which will be organised by Registry and Academic Development in consultation with the School. If the delivery of the course is proposed at a multi-campus institution, the process of validation must include a full evaluation of each campus where the course will be offered.

The validation panel will discuss the submission with representatives of the institution, including the senior management and key members of the proposed teaching team. No more than one member of staff from the University should be present in support of the local teaching team (normally the University’s DALO). The panel must be shown the physical and learning resources used by the course. Where possible the panel should meet potential students or students from existing related programmes already in operation at the institution.

The membership of the validation panel must include:

* a representative of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee who will act as chair of the event and who will not be drawn from the proposing School,
* one or more academic subject specialists,
* a representative of Computing and Library Services (Computing and Library Service reserve the right to request one of the academic subject specialists to act on behalf of the Service),
* at least one member who is an external subject specialist. CVs for the proposed external panel member(s) must be approved on behalf of the Pro Vice- Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) in advance of a formal invitation being extended,
* the Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee.

Panel members shall be provided with, and will be expected to familiarise themselves with:

* the Handbook for Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards,
* the proposed or validated programme and module documentation,
* the rationale document outlining the specifics of the proposed collaboration,
* the report of any previous stage of the validation process (such as the Institutional Approval report),
* the report of any other previous event relevant to the course(s) or modules,
* the draft programme and administrative arrangements,
* any other relevant documentation that has been supplied.

Normally the validation event will be held virtually but, in some circumstances, it may be necessary for some panel members to attend the institution concerned.

Panels are encouraged to identify strengths as well as weaknesses in the course(s) and modules under consideration.

While oral reports on events may be made by the chair of a panel to representatives present at an event, the definitive report is as presented to the University’s SCCP.

The Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee will prepare a report on the event for submission for approval by the SCCP. The report must indicate the nature of the discussions and the views of the panel on issues relating to the proposal. Where the panel stipulates conditions which must be complied with and/or recommendations which must be carefully considered, these must be clearly defined in the report.

**N14. Contract of collaboration and financial schedule**

Once a collaborative proposal has been approved, the Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee will prepare a Contract of Collaboration detailing the academic and administrative arrangements for the course.

The Contract of Collaboration will be signed by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) and the Principal (or equivalent) of the external institution. The original documents will be held by Registry and Academic Development. The Contract of Collaboration will be valid for the period of validation only and will be re-issued at each re-validation point.

The financial arrangements will be the subject of a formal financial schedule as an appendix to the Contract of Collaboration, an annual agreement between the School and the collaborating institution, and a copy will be lodged with Finance. The financial schedule must be approved by the Director of Finance (or nominee) before being issued.

**N15. Financial arrangements**

The financial arrangements for each collaborative activity are negotiated between the School and the external institution, although the School must consult with the Director of Finance to ensure that the proposed arrangements are acceptable to the University. The financial arrangements must cover academic teaching staff costs and professional services costs as well as other considerations such as travel arrangements where applicable.

The cost of the validation is borne by the collaborating institution and the current scale of charges can be obtained from Registry and Academic Development. Financial Services are responsible for the collection of the validation fee and its disbursement as appropriate, and all incidental expenses.

**N16. Annual evaluation**

Evaluation reports on collaborative courses will be prepared by the collaborating institution and will normally be submitted to the University via its Annual Evaluation System for inclusion in the Annual Evaluation process. For ODUPLUS courses, it is likely that the majority, if not all, of the report will be written by the University-based team. The Dean of the School (or nominee) will ensure that a copy of the report is submitted to the Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee.

**N17. Contents of annual evaluation reports**

A report including information as specified in Section M.2 of the University’s Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards should be produced for each course. A report written by the University’s DALO must be appended, detailing:

* the number of visits undertaken by staff at the University to the partner institution in the period covered by the report,
* the number of visits undertaken by staff at the partner institution to the University in the period covered by the report,
* the nature of contact between the two institutions,
* a summary of any issues raised and dealt with – or any issues that remain outstanding,
* confirmation that all publicity has been seen and approved,
* a critical evaluation of the activities that formed part of the annual evaluation visit.

**N18. Monitoring visits**

A DALO will visit the external institution at least once a year until the first cohort has graduated and at least every two years thereafter.

**N19. Mid-term review**

Mid-term review is the mechanism through which the University reviews the compliance of an individual collaborative arrangement with the requirements of the quality assurance framework. The SCCP is responsible for ensuring that that each collaborative arrangement is normally subject to a mid-term review in the third year of the five-year approval period.

**Mid-term review process**

Mid-term review will be undertaken via an event at the University, which will be organised by Registry and Academic Development and undertaken by a representative of the SCCP and a member(s) of Registry and Academic Development. The event will examine the standard documentation which supports the quality assurance framework - such as:

* records of Student Panel meetings,
* Course Committee minutes,
* external examiner reports and responses,
* annual evaluation reports,
* approval of additional staff from the partner institution teaching on the provision,
* minutes of DALO visits,
* Annual Executive meetings.

A member of Registry and Academic Development will prepare a report on the event first forwarding any issues to be resolved by academic staff and submitting the report and response. The report will be submitted to the School for comment and the both the report and the School’s commentary will be submitted for approval by the SCCP.

**N20. Collaborative revalidation**

Revalidation is the mechanism through which the Senate reviews and assesses the quality of its academic provision and, as part of this, the revalidation event will consider the appropriateness and achievement of the general and specific aims and the objectives of the course. The University’s Teaching and Learning Committee is responsible for ensuring that each collaborative arrangement normally is subject to revalidation at least once every five years.

**Collaborative revalidation process**

Revalidation will normally be undertaken via a virtual event, which will be organised by Registry and Academic Development and will mirror the procedures, panel membership, documentation and the issues identified for initial approval with the additional requirement that a critical appraisal will be submitted by the delivery team analysing the performance of the course and the experience of the students in the validation period. The programme specification and module specification documents should also be reproduced - with proposed changes or additions highlighted where these documents are written by the partner institution.

As part of the revalidation event the panel shall meet students currently registered on the course or recently graduated from it. This should usually take place ahead of the revalidation in order for the panel to consider the student comments as part of the revalidation.

Normally the revalidation event will be held virtually but in some cases panel members may be required to visit the institution. This will be discussed as part of the planning meeting.

The Director of Registry and Academic Development or nominee will prepare a report on the event. The report will be submitted for approval by the SCCP.

**N21. Termination of agreement**

Decisions to terminate agreements may be initiated either by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), as a result of strategic decisions about the future of the collaborative provision or as a result of concerns expressed about its operation, or by the Dean of the School identified as having responsibility for the course in the Contract of Collaboration in consultation with the Pro Vice Chancellor (Teaching and Learning).

A decision to terminate must be approved by either the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor in consultation with SCCP.

An exit strategy outlining arrangements for the support of students who have yet to complete an award will be submitted to the SCCP for approval and subsequent monitoring.

Section O: Articulation Arrangements

**O1. General considerations**

An articulation arrangement is where the University and an external institution enter into a formal agreement confirming that the learning outcomes and standards achieved as part of a University award can be demonstrated satisfactorily through successful completion of the external institution’s own award (or award of credit). Such an agreement would promote entry to an identified University award with advanced standing as a natural progression route for a successful student from the external institution.

Progression to a course at the University through an articulation route will still require the submission of an application by the student. The University will reserve the right to refuse admission.

Applications to the University submitted independently by potential students who wish to claim APL for prior study and tariffs established by Schools for commonly held qualifications which allow advanced entry do not fall into this category and should be treated as part of the admissions procedure. Similarly, applications to top-up degrees do not fall into this category and should be treated as part of the admissions procedure.

**O2. Administrative procedures for approval of articulation agreements**

The initiative to enter into an articulation arrangement with another institution is taken by the School owning the course. Curriculum or academic matters in relation to articulation arrangements must be approved by a Tier 1 Panel.

A formal case outlining the nature and rationale of the proposed articulation should be submitted to a Tier 1 Panel. The case must be signed by the Dean (or nominee) and an appropriate representative from the external institution and should include explicit references to the institution’s mission, existing provision and strategic aims.

Following approval of the arrangements*,* the Memorandum of Understanding will be signed by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) and the Principal of the collaborating institution. The original documents will be held on central file by the VCO.

Schools are required to establish mechanisms for the review of articulation agreements to ensure their continued currency.

Section P: External Examiners for Taught Provision

External Examiners are appointed to ensure that all students are treated fairly and equitably, that appropriate standards of assessment are maintained, and that assessments are conducted in accordance with approved regulations.

**P1. The appointment of external examiners**

All External Examiner appointments must be approved by the University Teaching and Learning Committee

Course Teams must normally submit External Examiner nominations for approval at least six months before the date of the first assessments with which the proposed appointee is to be associated.

New External Examiners should take up their appointments 3 months before the retirement of their predecessors. They should remain available 3 months after the last assessments with which they are to be associated in order to deal with any subsequent reviews of decisions and provide support and mentoring to the incoming External Examiner.

Normally, appointments will run from the September before the first assessments to the December after the last assessments. The usual term of office will allow the External Examiner to assess four successive cohorts of students and 3 months to support the incoming External Examiner. This will normally mean four calendar years and 3 months but may be longer where, for example, in the case of a new course, the first output will not occur in the first year of appointment.

External Examiners should not normally hold more than the equivalent of two substantial undergraduate appointments at the same time.

In approving the appointment of External Examiners, the University will be seeking to ensure that they will be competent and impartial.

New External Examiners must be briefed on their task as soon as possible after appointment and must complete the University’s External Examiner Induction and undergo a formal introduction to their course team who will confirm course assessment meeting dates and invite the External Examiner to visit campus. Inductions will include the dates of meetings, their role in relation to the examining team as a whole, the learning outcomes of the course, the module specifications including the methods of assessment and marking scheme, the regulations for the course, and the University’s assessment regulations and Regulations for Awards.

**P2. Criteria for appointment of external examiners**

The following criteria and notes for guidance, reflecting the QAA’s UK National Criteria for appointment of External Examiners, originally approved by the University Teaching and Learning Committee on 3 July 2012.

* An External Examiner should be qualified to PhD level.
* External examiners should be fluent in English.
* An External Examiner should, where appropriate, be able and willing to receive samples of work electronically rather than as paper-based material.
* An External Examiner should have appropriate and current standing, expertise and experience to maintain comparability of standards across the Higher Education sector.

Standing, expertise and breadth of experience may be indicated by:

* The present post and place of work.
* Exceptionally, an External Examiner may have retired from full or part-time employment but must demonstrate continuing relevant involvement in Higher Education or the professions.
* The range and scope of experience across Higher Education/the professions.
* Current recent active involvement in research/scholarly/professional activities in the field of study concerned.
* Awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula.
* Competence and experience relating to designing and operating a variety of assessment tasks appropriate to the subject and operating assessment procedures.
* Competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience.
* Knowledge and understanding of the UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and the assurance and enhancement of quality.

In circumstances where a proposed external examiner is drawn from outside of a Higher Education environment (e.g. from business, industry, the professions), and does not possess formal qualifications and/or experience of assessment or quality assurance practices, the University Teaching and Learning Committee may consider these proposals as exceptions to the criteria.

An External Examiner should have enough recent external examining or comparable related experience, at an appropriate level, to indicate competence in assessing students in the Subject Area.

If the proposed External Examiner has no previous external examining experience at the appropriate level, the application should be supported by either:

* other external examining experience,
* extensive internal examining experience,
* other relevant and recent (i.e. normally within the previous three years) experience likely to support the external examiner role.

Proposed External Examiners without experience as Externals must join an experienced team of External Examiners and must not be the sole External Examiner.

External Examiners should not be over-extended by their external examining duties. The External Examiner should normally hold no more than two External Examiner appointments for taught courses/modules at any point in time.

There should be an appropriate balance and expertise in the team of External Examiners and the proposed External Examiner should complement the external examining team in terms of expertise and examining experience.

The range of academic perspectives necessary to the course should be represented in the external examining team.

If the course is associated with or may lead to a professional award, at least one practitioner with appropriate experience should be in the team (where a PSRB has express requirements in relation to the appointment of external examiners, the course team must ensure that these are met).

The external examining experience in the team as a whole must be sufficient and wide-ranging.

**P3. Conflicts of interest**

External Examiners should be drawn from a wide variety of institutional/professional contexts and traditions in order that the module/course benefits from wide-ranging external scrutiny. The following arrangements are not permissible:

* More than one External Examiner from the same institution in the team of External Examiners.
* Reciprocal external examining of modules/courses between the University of Huddersfield and any external institution.
* Replacement of an External Examiner by an individual from the same institution.
* An External Examiner from an institution which has been the source of examiners for similar subject areas in the preceding five years.
* Where there is a single External Examiner for a course, that Examiner must be from an academic, rather than practice-based context.
* No School should, at any given time, have more than six External Examiners employed by the same Institution.

External Examiners must be impartial in judgement and must not have previous close involvement with the institution which might compromise objectivity. Over the previous five years, the proposed External Examiner should not have been:

* A member of staff, governor or student of the University of Huddersfield or one of its collaborative partners or be a near relative of a member of staff of the University in relation to the course.
* An examiner in a cognate course in the institution.
* Involved as an External Examiner for the course when it was approved by another validating body.
* An External Examiner for PGR provision within the institution.

The following are recognised conflicts of interest which will normally disqualify and an External Examiner as the proposed External Examiner should not be:

* Personally associated with the sponsorship of students.
* Required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the course.
* In a position, or knows they will be in a position, to significantly influence the future employment of students on the course.
* Significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the of the course(s) or modules in question.
* Anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the course.
* Likely to be involved with student placements or training in the examiner’s organisation.

**P4. External examiner terms of office**

External Examiners will be appointed for an initial term of office of up to four years and 3 months. Under certain exceptional circumstances, the University Teaching and Learning Committee may sanction a once-only extension of an External Examiner’s term of office by 9 months (with 3 months mentoring the new external examiner), up to a maximum term of office of five years. Multiple extensions of an External Examiner’s term of office are not permitted.

The exceptional circumstances in which the University Teaching and Learning Committee may sanction a once-only extension of an External Examiner’s term of office by 9 months will include the following:

* In the event of an unplanned vacancy arising from the loss of an External Examiner who had not reached the end of their term of office.
* If the subject is highly specialised, with a known shortage of expertise.
* If there is a specific and pressing operational or academic need. This circumstance should be described in detail on the application form.
* If the course had only run sporadically during the retiring External Examiner’s term of office.

**P5. Termination of an external examiner’s contract**

An External Examiner’s contract may only be terminated prematurely in exceptional circumstances, through the following procedure:

Any decision to terminate an appointment prematurely must be referred by the Dean of School to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) in writing giving reasons for the request. The grounds for premature termination will be limited to the following areas:

* Failure to submit an annual report.
* Failure to participate in Course assessment meetings.
* Serious transgression of the University’s regulations and policies.
* If a conflict of interest arises which cannot be satisfactorily resolved.

If the request is approved, Registry and Academic Development will inform the External Examiner.

**P6. The rights and responsibilities of external examiners in relation to modules**

The role of the External Examiner(s) is to advise onthe standards and fairness of assessment and, when appropriate, to consider the results of individual students in the context of the University’s Regulations for Awards. In addition, External Examiners may be consulted with regarding the outcome of Module Assessment Meetings.

In order to carry out these responsibilities, the External Examiner(s) will:

* Complete the University External Examiner’s Induction briefing prior to or following appointment. Where this is not possible, a signed acknowledgement for receipt of the induction pack must be supplied.
* Offer advice impartially without being influenced by previous association with the staff or any of the students.
* Compare and comment on the standard of assessments with that of similar modules in higher education elsewhere.
* Comment on the set of assessment activities for any particular module,in the light of the need to ensure that all students are assessed fairly in relation to the module specifications,
* Where necessary, be provided with outcomes of Module Assessment Meetings.
* Scrutinise all examination papers and substantive assessment briefs before they are released to students.
* Have the right to inspect all forms of assessed work in line with the Regulations for Awards.
* See the work of all students proposed for failure, and samples of the work of students proposed to each other grade, in order to ensure that each student is placed fairly in relation to the rest of the cohort. In cases where 5 or fewer students are proposed for the highest grade, the work for all of the students in that grade must be included in the sample sent.
* Have the right to make recommendations with regard to the moderation of marks/grades awarded by internal examiners.
* Comment on the way assessments are conducted and share in developmental discussions with module teams where appropriate.
* In line with the Regulations for Awards, approve assessment briefs in advance of the academic year.
* Complete the external examiner’s report in full within 4 weeks of the main course assessment meeting.
* Maintain confidentiality of all course materials and student results.
* Report to the Chair of the University Teaching and Learning Committee on any matters of serious concern arising from the assessments, which put at risk academic standards.

To carry out these responsibilities the External Examiner(s) will be:

* Expert in the field of study concerned.
* Competent in assessing students’ knowledge and skills at higher education level.
* Impartial in judgement.
* Fully briefed on their role, in line with the University’s procedures having completed the University’s External Examiner Induction Programme.

**P7. The rights and responsibilities of external examiners in relation to courses**

The role of the External Examiner(s) is to advise the Course assessment meeting with regard to standards and fairness of assessment and, when appropriate, to consider the results of individual students in the context of the University’s Regulations for Awards.

In order to carry out these responsibilities, the External Examiner(s) will:

* Complete the University External Examiner’s Induction briefing prior to or following appointment.
* Offer advice impartially without being influenced by previous association with the course, the staff, or any of the students.
* Compare in overall terms the performance of students with that of their peers on similar courses of higher education elsewhere.
* Scrutinise all examination papers and substantive assessment briefs before they are released to students.
* Be consulted and will respond about any proposed changes to the approved Course assessment regulations which will directly affect students currently on the Course(s).
* Offer advice on progression and awards based on the agreed module grades and in the light of discussion at the Course assessment meeting.
* Attend the Course assessment meeting at which decisions on recommendations for award are made and ensure that those recommendations have been reached in line with the University’s regulations and normal practice in higher education.
* Participate as required in any reviews of decisions about individual students’ results during the examiner’s period of office.
* Complete the external examiner’s report in full within 4 weeks of the main course assessment meeting.
* Maintain confidentiality of all course materials and student results.
* Report to the chair of the University Teaching and Learning Committee on any matters of serious concern arising from the assessments, which put at risk the standard of the award.
* Make reference to benchmark standards (subject benchmark statements or professional benchmark statements) in their evaluation of student work.

To carry out these responsibilities the External Examiner(s) will be:

* Expert in one of the fields of study associated with the course.
* Competent in assessing students’ knowledge and skills at higher education level.
* Impartial in judgement.
* Briefed on their role, in line with the University’s procedures; having completed the University’s External Examiner Induction Programme.
* An External Examiner for a group of modules involved in the Course.

All recommendations for the conferment of awards must be signed by the Chair of the Course assessment meeting and all External Examiner(s) present at the meeting.

**P8. Courses which lie outside the CATS framework**

The Senate may exceptionally give approval for the design of courses of study leading to awards of the University which lie outside the CATS framework. In such cases an External Examiner(s) will be appointed and the functions of the Course assessment meeting will be discharged by a Board of Examiners for the course.

**P9. External examiner reports**

External Examiners are required to submit their reports within four weeks of the main Course assessment meeting. The reports will cover the conduct of the assessments and on issues related to assessment, including:

* The overall performance of the students in relation to their peers on similar courses/modules.
* The quality of knowledge and skills (both general and subject specific) demonstrated by the students.
* The overall standard of assessments.
* The overall approach to teaching, learning and assessment as indicated by student performance.
* Any other recommendations arising from the assessment.

Reports will be submitted on the External Examiners’ Report Template, which is available from the Registry and Academic Development External Examiner Brightspace site Reports should be returned to Registry and Academic Development, preferably in electronic format, within four weeks of the main Course assessment meeting. Registry and Academic Development will forward copies of the report to the Dean and appropriate academic school staff.

The purpose of the report is to enable the University to judge whether the course is meeting its stated learning outcomes and to make any necessary improvements, whether immediately or at the next review as appropriate.

External Examiners have authority to report direct to the chair of the Senate if they are concerned about standards of assessment and performance, particularly where they consider that assessments are being conducted in a way that jeopardises either the fair treatment of students or the standard of awards.

In the event that an External Examiner’s concern is related to a systemic (i.e. not a one-off case of ineffective practice); the external examiner can raise the matter externally with the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA).

**P10. Feedback and response to external examiner reports**

Course teams will provide external examiners with responses to reports on the EE Report proforma normally within one month of receipt of the external examiner report and in time for the annual evaluation process.

The Action Plan will include:

* Actions in response to issues identified for consideration or areas for improvement.
* A reply to any issue which the External Examiner has requested a response to in their report.
* Examples of good practice together with proposals for the dissemination of these within the institution.

External Examiners are expected to comment on and approve the response by emailing Registry and Academic Development. External Examiners will then be asked to confirm at the next scheduled CAM that the any actions have been satisfactorily completed.

The External Examiners’ Report and Response will be considered by:

* the Course Committee,
* the Annual Evaluation process,
* future Subject Review events.

The External Examiners’ Report and response should be completed in full and approved by the Course Committee within six months of receipt of the External Examiner’s report or following consideration at annual evaluation. The statement of action outcomes should inform the completion of the subsequent year’s annual evaluation report.

Section Q: Criteria for the Selection and Appointment of Research Degree External Examiners

## Q1. Standing, expertise and experience

All examiners should:

* Have expertise in the area of research to be examined.
* Be experienced in research.
* Have published in a relevant area.
* Normally be able to demonstrate appropriate prior experience in the examination procedure, at least equivalent in level to the award being examined.
* Understand the regulations and procedures that operate within the University of Huddersfield and have a clear sense of the expectations and standards associated with a successful research award.
* Where one of the examiners is new to the process, the other examiner(s) should have sufficient experience to ensure academic rigour: the examination team as a whole must be able to demonstrate appropriate prior experience in the examination procedure and will have examined at least three research degrees equivalent in level to the award being examined.
* Hold a research degree at least equivalent to the level of the award being examined or have at least national standing in the subject area.

## Q2. Close involvement

No-one in the following circumstances or categories should be appointed as an examiner:

* Anyone who has been a member of the student’s supervisory team or been directly involved in the research of the candidate.
* The supervisor’s former supervisees who have graduated in the last 5 years.
* Anyone who has, within the last 5 years, provided doctoral supervision to the candidate’s supervisor.
* Anyone with a contractual or personal relationship with either the candidate or his / her supervisor(s), or who has a financial interest in the candidate’s research. Relationships in this category will be on a spectrum such that appointing bodies may exercise an element of discretion and consider carefully whether the relationship presents a potential risk of perceived or actual bias – particularly in the case of research contracts. “Personal” here is taken to mean social and/or family connection.

In addition, no one in the following circumstances or categories should be appointed as an external examiner:

* Anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive research activities with the candidate, examiners or supervisors. Recent will normally mean within the last 5 years. Examples of substantive research activities include co-authorship of papers, acting as co-investigators on research projects of having acted as co-supervisors for other research candidates.
* Co-authorship will not include those who have not liaised with each other directly.
* A member of a governing body or committee of the University or a current employee of the University.
* Former staff or students of the University unless a period of two years has elapsed since their departure.

## Q3. External Examiner – Term of Office

Careful consideration should be given to whether the same external examiner should be appointed for successive candidates of the same supervisor.

An external examiner for a doctoral thesis should not normally be appointed more than three times in any two-year period for each new candidate. Such examiners may also be appointed to examine master’s theses in the same period – eligibility to examine for doctoral degrees and master’s awards will be considered independently.

For Master’s by Research examinations only, an examiner may be appointed for a three-year period, and in that time may examine an unlimited number of master’s theses, as long as they meet the criteria for expertise and experience above. Following the three-year tenure, an examiner may not act as a research degree examiner for a five-year period. Individuals who have been, or are currently acting as, the external examiner for a University of Huddersfield taught course may also be appointed as an external examiner for a research degree candidate.

## Q4. Exceptions

In cases where the appointment would be an exception to the above criteria, the Director of Graduate Education may appoint an independent chair or seek to ensure that other examiners on the team compensate for standing, expertise and experience.

All exceptions must be agreed by the Head of Quality Assurance

## Q5. Termination of an examiner’s appointment

An examiner’s appointment may only be terminated prematurely in exceptional circumstances.

Any decision to terminate an appointment prematurely must be referred by the School’s Director of Graduate Education and to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) in writing, giving reasons for the request. The grounds for premature termination may include the following:

* Failure to participate in the examination without due reason.
* Failure to submit a report without due reason.
* Failure to comply with all of the procedures of the examination process or the University’s regulations and policies more generally.

Upon approval from the Director of Graduate Education and the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Enterprise to terminate the appointment, the School should follow the Guidance on how to proceed when a change of examiner is required.

Section R: Delivery of Research Degrees by Distance Learning (DL)

This framework is to be used when Schools are proposing a new research degree for delivery by DL or in instances where, in the absence of a validated DL route, Schools wish to transfer a student to a DL mode of study.

The framework will apply in instances where no 3rd party is involved in the delivery (e.g., not a joint/dual award). The School will maintain full responsibility for all aspects of delivery and support for students undertaking a Research Degree by DL and the standard regulations in relation to Research Degrees at the University of Huddersfield will apply. The School will be expected to monitor the success of the delivery method as part of normal University processes.

To ensure that PGR DL students receive a comparable research student experience to those studying on campus, Schools will need to demonstrate the following:

* There is a market for the provision (confirmation provided by Marketing).
* There are adequate human resources (academic & professional services) in place to support this delivery (Confirmed by the Dean); this should include workload allocation implications for staff involved in DL delivery.
* There are CLS resources in place including access to the University’s learning resources/journals etc., (Confirmed by CLS).
* School resources are in place for supervisors adequately to conduct online meetings.

Directors of Graduate Education will be required to submit a proforma signed off by the Dean of their School to request for approval by the Graduate School and University Research Committee outlining the proposals for delivery and support for students together with methods for monitoring the delivery by DL. This document will include:

* A brief rationale for delivery by DL.
* Confirmation that offers of study will only be made when Supervisory team members have been established.
* Proposed DL student numbers.
* Consideration of workload issues in relation to the supervisory team and the impact that providing support to DL students may have on this.
* Arrangements for supervision and support including skills training, progression, and the examination process.
* Confirmation of arrangements for maintaining a suitable research environment including when students are at Queensgate.
* Ongoing Pastoral Support.
* Attendance/Engagement monitoring.
* Arrangements for the Student Voice/representation.

The *Research Degree by DL Approval Proforma*, together with the supporting documentation will need to be completed by the Director of Graduate Education proposing the DL provision and it must be signed by the Dean of the School. Once completed, the form should be forwarded to Graduate Board for formal approval. Both the Director of Graduate Education and Graduate Board reserve the right to refer the document back to the School for additional clarification as well as to outline conditions of approval (where necessary).

Once approved the School may request course codes from the Course Data team and commence the marketing and recruitment process.

Section S: PGR Partnership Activities

**S1. Approval of PGR Partnership Activity**

These processes apply in instances where a 3rd party is involved in the delivery of PGR provision. The University operates a risk-based approach to the approval of partnerships and the type of arrangements normally include:

| **Type of Arrangement**  | **Level of Risk** |
| --- | --- |
| **Individual Cotutelle (Single Award)** (i.e. joint supervision between the University and a member of staff from another organisation who is not acting as external supervisor) | Low |
| **Multiple Candidate Cotutelles** either in single or multiple cohorts | Medium |
| **Individual Cotutelle (Dual Award)** (i.e. joint supervision between the University and a member of staff from another organisation leading to two separate awards)  | Medium to High |
| **Off Campus Delivery of PGR provision** by members of University staff at a location other than Queensgate. | Medium to High |
| **Dual Awards\*** where the University may collaborate with another higher education institution in devising a course of studies leading to an award from each institution. | High to Very High |
| **Joint Awards\*** where a single course devised and delivered jointly between two or more institutions and leading to the conferment of a single award in the name of all partners. | Very High |

**\*** Due to the high level of risk associated with Dual and Joint awards, Senate approval is required to progress with developments of these nature. Dual and Joint Awards are normally limited to arrangements of strategic importance to the University and, as such, separate processes are in existence for the validation of these, which will be based in part on the nature of the proposal itself. Schools should obtain advice from Registry and Academic Development before considering such developments.

**S2. Campus Attendance**

Under cotutelle arrangements there remains a requirement for the students to normally attend campus for at least the minimum number of days as defined in the PGR Regulations (including progression monitoring meetings). In relation to Off-Campus, Dual and Joint Awards, attendance on campus may vary according to the operational arrangements with the partner contained within the partner contract.

**S3. General Considerations:**

To ensure that students receive a comparable research student experience to those studying on campus, Schools will need to include the following supporting documentation with all requests to for partnership approval:

* Confirmation from the Dean that there are adequate human resources (academic & professional services) in place to support the proposed arrangement and that School resources are in place for supervisors adequately to conduct online meetings where necessary.
* Confirmation from the Head of CLS that there are resources in place including software licences to access to the University’s learning resources/journals etc.
* Confirmation from the Head of Researcher Environment that there are adequate resources and capacity to provide core training and development opportunities at a distance; and/or for any campus based delivery planned as part of the attendance requirements.

Schools will be expected to monitor the success of all delivery methods as part of normal University processes. In the case of Off-Campus, Dual and Joint Awards these processes will include the procedures defined within Section Q and Section F of this handbook.

Students undertaking Cotutelle, Off-Campus PGR provision or Dual Awards will be bound by the PGR Awards Regulations. Joint Awards will normally involve bespoke regulations which will be agreed as part of the development and approval process.

**S4. Initial Requests**

Schools should notify the Quality Assurance team in Registry and Academic Development of potential arrangements. Registry and Academic Development will log the requests and notify the Chairs of Graduate Board and SCCP. Where requests are considered to have increased risk factors, additional advice and guidance will be provided to Schools at this stage.

Partnership arrangements will require a written agreement or contract; however, the type of document used and its content will vary depending on the nature of the proposal. An indication of the type of document needed will be provided by Registry and Academic Development which may involve consultation between the School and the University Legal Officer.

**S5. Approval of Individual Cotutelle arrangements:**

To request approval, Directors of Graduate Education will be required to submit a *PGR Cotutelle Proforma* signed off by the Dean of their School. The proforma will outline the proposals for delivery and support for students together with methods for monitoring the arrangement. This document will include:

* A brief rationale for the arrangement together with an overview of the organisation involved in the delivery.
* Confirmation that offers of study will only be made when Supervisory team members have been established.
* Confirmation that external supervisors are qualified to undertake PGR supervision.
* Programme Specification Document.
* Proposed Duration
* Consideration of workload issues in relation to the supervisory team and the impact that providing support to students may have on this.
* Arrangements for supervision and support including skills training, progression, and the examination process.
* Confirmation of arrangements for maintaining a suitable research environment including when students are at Queensgate.
* Ongoing Pastoral Support.
* Attendance/Engagement monitoring.
* Arrangements for the Student Voice/representation.

The Cotutelle *Proforma*, together with the supporting documentation will need to be completed by the Director of Graduate Education from the School proposing the arrangement and it must be signed by the Dean of the School. Once completed, the form should be forwarded to Graduate Board for formal approval. Both the Director of Graduate Education and Graduate Board reserve the right to refer the document back to the School for additional clarification as well as to outline conditions of approval (where necessary).

Once approved the confirmation of the arrangement will be noted by the University’s Standing Committee for Collaborative Provision (SCCP).

**S6. Approval of Multiple Candidate Cotutelles:**

In addition to the Cotutelle *Proforma* and supporting documentation outlined above, Schools will also be required to submit the following:

* Proposed Student numbers,
* Outline financial arrangements including, fee arrangements and anticipated income,
* International office commentary on the proposals (where the partner is located overseas).

Requests for approval and supporting documentation will be considered by both Graduate Board and SCCP, however, this may take place concurrently if practical. Both Graduate Board and SCCP reserve the right to refer the document back to the School for additional clarification as well as to outline conditions of approval (where necessary). These conditions may include the requirement of a site approval visit, which will take place at the School’s expense. The composition of the approval panel will be confirmed by SCCP and Graduate Board in consultation with Registry and Academic Development and VCO.

Approval will be granted for a period of up to 5 years at which point the arrangement will require reapproval.

**S7. Approval of Off-Campus Delivery of PGR provision, Dual Awards and Joint Awards**

Due to the level of risk associated with these types of arrangement, Schools wishing to proceed with these partnerships will be required to Submit a Business Case for consideration by SCCP and Graduate Board. Registry and Academic Development will confirm which level of business case is needed as this will depend on the type of proposal and whether a link exists with the proposed partner. Registry and Academic Development will also confirm whether Senate approval is required.

Indicative approval

The initiative to enter into a partnership arrangement with another institution is taken by the School owning the provision. The proposed financial and resource arrangements must be approved by the Dean of the School. Curriculum or academic matters in relation to collaborative provision must be approved by the Dean and confirmed via the validation process. The proposal must receive written confirmation from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Pro Vice-Chancellors (Teaching & Learning) and (Research & Enterprise) in order to draft a business case.

Business case

The School will submit the business case template to the University’s Standing Committee for Collaborative Provision (SCCP) and Graduate Board, giving a brief description of the nature of and rationale for the proposal, detailing the general proposals for its costing and resourcing, including the costs of validation and revalidation in addition to any standard annual costs that may apply.

The Business Case will include:

* Confirmation from the Dean that there are adequate human resources (academic & professional services) in place to support the proposed arrangement and that School resources are in place for supervisors adequately to conduct online meetings where necessary.
* Confirmation from the Head of CLS that there are resources in place including software licences to access to the University’s learning resources/journals etc.
* Confirmation from the Head of Researcher Environment that there are adequate resources and capacity to provide core training and development opportunities at a distance; and/or for any campus based delivery planned as part of the attendance requirements.
* A brief rationale for the arrangement together with an overview of the organisation involved in the delivery.
* Where the University has no existing links with an external institution, the business case should include explicit references to the institution’s mission, existing provision, and strategic aims.
* Where applicable, confirmation that external supervisors are qualified to undertake PGR supervision.
* Consideration of workload issues in relation to the supervisory team and the impact that providing support to students may have on this.
* Arrangements for supervision and support including skills training, progression, and the examination process.
* Ongoing Pastoral Support.
* Attendance/Engagement monitoring.
* Arrangements for the Student Voice/representation.

Where the approval relates to Dual or Joint Awards, the Business Case must be accompanied with confirmation that the proposed partner is legally entitled to award research degrees.

Business Cases should be supported by the following documentation:

* A financial statement agreed by Financial Services indicating the costs/charges to be borne by each partner must be included.
* Normally the Business Case must be supported by signed statements from the Pro Vice-Chancellors (Teaching and Learning)/ (Research & Enterprise), the Director of Registry and Academic Development, the Director of Finance and, where the external institution is overseas, the International Office.
* For overseas institutions, any local or in-country government approvals must be identified as part of the Business Case presentation with an indication of likely timescales and processes. This must be presented as part of the validation report received by SCCP and Graduate Board.

The University reserves the right to require a visit by a representative of its Computing and Library Services at any point if deemed necessary.

Institutional Approval and Validation

Where the University has no previous relationship with the proposed partner institution, an institutional approval event shall be organised to establish that the educational objectives and methods of the proposed partner are compatible with the University’s strategy and objectives. Full details of the Institutional Approval process are contained in Section N of this handbook.

A proportionate validation event will be arranged based on the risk factors of the proposal. The arrangements for validation events are contained within Section N and, in the case of Joint Awards, **Section F** of this handbook.

**S8. Approval of Dual Award Cotutelle arrangements (Individual and Multiple Candidate):**

To request approval, Directors of Graduate Education will be required to submit a *Dual Award Cotutelle Request Proforma* signed off by the Dean of their School. The proforma will outline the proposals for delivery and support for students together with methods for monitoring the arrangement. This document will include the following information:

* A brief rationale for the arrangement together with an overview of the organisation involved in the delivery.
* Confirmation that external supervisors are qualified to undertake PGR supervision.
* Proposed duration.
* Consideration of workload issues in relation to the supervisory team and the impact that providing support to students may have on this.
* Arrangements for supervision and support including skills training, progression, and the examination process.
* Confirmation of arrangements for maintaining a suitable research environment including when students are at Queensgate.
* Ongoing Pastoral Support.
* Attendance/Engagement monitoring.
* Arrangements for the Student Voice/representation.

The School will include the following supporting documents:

* Confirmation of Senate Approval to Proceed with the Dual Degree.
* Confirmation of approval from PVCs T&L/R&E and DVC to proceed with the initiative.
* Confirmation from the Dean.
* Confirmation from the Director of Marketing that there is a market for the proposed provision (where necessary).
* Confirmation that the proposed partner is legally entitled to award Dual Research Degrees.
* Confirmation from the Dean that there are adequate human resources (academic and professional services) in place to support the proposed delivery.
* Confirmation from the Head of CLS that there are resources in place including (in the case of overseas arrangements) software licences to provide access to the University’s learning resources/journals etc.
* Confirmation from the Head of Researcher Environment that there are adequate resources and capacity to provide core training and development opportunities for the proposed activity; and/or for any campus based delivery planned as part of the attendance requirements.
* Confirmation that offers of study will only be made when Supervisory team members have been established.
* Confirmation of supervisory arrangements for the UoH element of the award including, if applicable, that external supervisors are qualified to undertake PGR supervision.
* Programme Specification Document.
* A financial statement agreed by Financial Services indicating the costs/charges to be borne by each partner must be included.
* For overseas institutions, any local or in-country government approvals must be identified as part of the Business Case presentation with an indication of likely timescales and processes.

The Cotutelle *Proforma*, together with the supporting documentation will need to be completed by the Director of Graduate Education from the School proposing the arrangement and it must be signed by the Dean of the School. Once completed, the form should be forwarded to Graduate Board for formal approval. Both the Director of Graduate Education and Graduate Board reserve the right to refer the document back to the School for additional clarification as well as to outline conditions of approval (where necessary).

Once approved the confirmation of the arrangement will be noted by the University’s Standing Committee for Collaborative Provision (SCCP).

Appendix F Dual Award Cotutelle Request Proforma

This proforma enables Schools to outline how they will oversee the management of Research Studies by Cotutelle arrangement which leads to a dual award. This form should be used by Schools arranging both:

* Individual Cotutelles (Dual Award), and
* Multiple-Candidate Dual Award Cotutelles.

Before submitting this form, Schools should read the following documents:

* The Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards.
* The Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees).

After you have completed the Cotutelle Request Proforma, submit the form first to Graduate Board and then to SCCP supplying the following supporting documents:

* Confirmation of Senate Approval to Proceed with the Dual Degree.
* Confirmation of approval from PVCs T&L/R&E and DVC to proceed with the initiative.
* Confirmation from the Dean.
* Confirmation from the Director of Marketing that there is a market for the proposed provision (where necessary).
* Confirmation that the proposed partner is legally entitled to award Dual Research Degrees.
* Confirmation from the Dean that there are adequate human resources (academic and professional services) in place to support the proposed delivery.
* Confirmation from the Head of CLS that there are resources in place including (in the case of overseas arrangements) software licences to access to the University’s learning resources/journals etc.
* Confirmation from the Head of Researcher Environment that there are adequate resources and capacity to provide core training and development opportunities for the proposed activity; and/or for any campus based delivery planned as part of the attendance requirements.
* Confirmation that offers of study will only be made when Supervisory team members have been established.
* Confirmation of supervisory arrangements for the UoH element of the award including, if applicable, that external supervisors are qualified to undertake PGR supervision.
* Programme Specification Document.
* A financial statement agreed by Financial Services indicating the costs/charges to be borne by each partner must be included.
* For overseas institutions, any local or in-country government approvals must be identified together with an indication of likely timescales and processes.

| **Dual award Cotutelle Request Proforma:Graduate Board and SCCP Approval** |
| --- |
| **School** | Choose an item. |
| **Name and role of staff member submitting proposal** | [Insert name and role] |
| **Subject area and Qualification** | [Insert the subject area and qualification of the proposed cotutelle] |
| **Full time or part time?** | Choose an item. |
| **Proposed duration and number of intakes** |  |
| **Name and address of proposed partner institution.** |  |
| **Name, email, and role of staff member leading the proposal at the partner** |  |
| **Overview of the proposed partner institution.** |  |
| **Rationale for the proposal** | [Insert:* The rationale for proposed cotutelle arrangement including how it supports the relevant school and university strategies
* An outline of the importance of study via cotutelle arrangements]
 |
| **Target Market for course** | [Include a description of the target market including the location of the students and promotion plans for the award] |
| ***Proposed student numbers (for Multiple Candidate Cotutelles only)*** | [Insert proposed student numbers here **or N/A for Individual Cotutelles (Dual Award)]** |
| ***Financial arrangements (for Multiple Candidate Cotutelles only)*** | [Insert fee arrangements and anticipated income **or N/A for Individual Cotutelles (Dual Award)]** |
| ***International office commentary (for Multiple Candidate Cotutelles only)*** | [Provide key information concerning cotutelle arrangement after contacting the international office regarding the overseas location **or N/A for Individual Cotutelles (Dual Award)**] |
| ***Local Government Approval (international institutions only)*** | [Insert details of any local or in-country government approvals must be identified together with an indication of likely timescales and processes] |
| **Research Environment, delivery and support mechanisms** |
| **Queensgate attendance** | [Insert details of attendance at Queensgate – see minimum face to face requirements in Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees)] |
| **Visa implications** | [Insert details of any visa implications for international research students] |
| **Queensgate workspace and equipment arrangements** | [Provide details about:* How the school will ensure research students access appropriate equipment at Queensgate
* What periods and stages of attendance at Queensgate will be required (taking into account the minimum face to face attendance requirements in the Regulations)?
* How will the School ensure that research students have access to appropriate workspace and equipment during their time at Queensgate?]
 |
| **Facility requirements** | [Outline how the School will find out about and provide facilities required by research students] |
| **Cotutelle research environment** | [Outline how the school will ensure a cotutelle research student receives an equitable experience to a Queensgate based student] |
| **Research environment with peer contact details** | [Outline School plans for ensuring a robust and suitable research environment will be made available, including opportunities for peer discussion and interaction] |
| **Estimated additional workload for cotutelle supervisors** | [Insert details of workload issues in relation to the supervisory team and the impact that providing support to students may have on this] |
| **Supervision and informal progress monitoring methods** | [Insert details of the mode of interactions] |
| **Frequency of interactions** | [Insert details of the frequency of interactions] |
| **Cotutelle progress monitoring: both institutions** | [insert details of how research student progress will be monitored, both formally and informally **at both institutions**] |
| **Engagement, Support and Representation** | [Insert arrangements for Ongoing Pastoral Support; Attendance/Engagement monitoring and arrangements for the Student Voice/representation. |
| **Formal progress reviews and progression monitoring details** | [Insert details of School plans:* to make sure formal progress reviews take place at the agreed intervals
* to make sure the research student attends Progression monitoring at Huddersfield whenever possible]
 |
| **Viva Arrangements** | [Insert details of the arrangements for the examination process including how the award of both qualifications will be managed.] |
| **Additional information** | [Insert any other details or N/A] |
| **DoGE signature** | [Insert signature] |
| **Date** | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| **Graduate Board Consideration** |
| **Graduate Board comments** | [Insert any comments or conditions relating to the committee’s discussion of the request]. |
| **Approved by** | [Insert chair’s signature] |
| **Date of meeting** | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| **SCCP Consideration** |
| **SCCP comments** | [Insert any comments or conditions relating to SCCP’s discussion of the request] |
| **Approved by** | [Insert SCCP Chair’s signature] |
| **Date of meeting** | Click or tap to enter a date. |

Appendix G: Cotutelle Flow Chart (Dual Award)



Appendix H: Single Award Cotutelle Request Proforma

The Cotutelle Request Proforma enables Schools to outline how they will oversee the management of Research Studies by Cotutelle arrangement. This form should be used by Schools arranging both:

* Individual Cotutelles (Single Award), and
* Multiple-Candidate Cotutelles.

Before submitting this form, Schools should read the following documents:

* The Quality Assurance Procedures for Taught Courses and Research Awards.
* The Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees).

After you have completed the Cotutelle Request Proforma, submit the form first to Graduate Board and then to SCCP supplying the following supporting documents:

* A brief rationale for the arrangement together with an overview of the organisation involved in the delivery.
* Confirmation that offers of study will only be made when Supervisory team members have been established.
* Confirmation that external supervisors are qualified to undertake PGR supervision.
* Programme Specification Document.
* Proposed Duration
* Consideration of workload issues in relation to the supervisory team and the impact that providing support to students may have on this.
* Arrangements for supervision and support including skills training, progression, and the examination process.
* Confirmation of arrangements for maintaining a suitable research environment including when students are at Queensgate.
* Ongoing Pastoral Support.
* Attendance/Engagement monitoring.
* Arrangements for the Student Voice/representation.

| **Cotutelle Request Proforma:Graduate Board and SCCP Approval** |
| --- |
| **School** | Choose an item. |
| **Name and role of staff member submitting proposal** | [Insert name and role] |
| **Subject area and Qualification** | [Insert the subject area and qualification of the proposed cotutelle] |
| **Full time or part time?** | Choose an item. |
| **Rationale for the proposal** | [Insert:* The rationale for proposed cotutelle arrangement including how it supports the relevant school and university strategies
* An outline of the importance of study via cotutelle arrangements]
 |
| **Target Market for course** | [Include a description of the target market including the location of the students and promotion plans for the award] |
| ***Proposed student numbers (for Multiple Candidate Cotutelles only)*** | [Insert proposed student numbers here **or N/A for Individual Cotutelles (Single Award)]** |
| ***Financial arrangements (for Multiple Candidate Cotutelles only)*** | [Insert fee arrangements and anticipated income **or N/A for Individual Cotutelles (Single Award)]** |
| ***International office commentary (for Multiple Candidate Cotutelles only)*** | [Provide key information concerning cotutelle arrangement after contacting the international office regarding the overseas location **or N/A for Individual Cotutelles (Single Award)**] |
| **Research Environment, delivery and support mechanisms** |
| **Queensgate attendance** | [Insert details of attendance at Queensgate – see minimum face to face requirements in Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees)] |
| **Visa implications** | [Insert details of any visa implications for international research students] |
| **Queensgate workspace and equipment arrangements** | [Provide details about how the school will ensure research students access appropriate equipment at Queensgate] |
| **Facility requirements** | [Outline how the School will find out about and provide facilities required by research students] |
| **Cotutelle research environment** | [Outline how the school will ensure a cotutelle research student receives an equitable experience to a Queensgate based student] |
| **Research environment with peer contact details** | [Outline School plans for ensuring a robust and suitable research environment will be made available, including opportunities for peer discussion and interaction] |
| **Estimated additional workload for cotutelle supervisors** | [Insert details of supervisor workload] |
| **Supervision and informal progress monitoring methods** | [Insert details of the mode of interactions] |
| **Frequency of interactions** | [Insert details of the frequency of interactions] |
| **Cotutelle progress monitoring: both institutions** | [insert details of how research student progress will be monitored, both formally and informally **at both institutions**] |
| **Formal progress reviews and progression monitoring details** | [Insert details of School plans:* to make sure formal progress reviews take place at the agreed intervals
* to make sure the research student attends Progression monitoring at Huddersfield whenever possible]
 |
| **Additional information** | [Insert any other details or N/A] |
| **DoGE signature** | [Insert signature] |
| **Date** | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| **Graduate Board Consideration** |
| **Graduate Board comments** | [Insert any comments or conditions relating to the committee’s discussion of the request]. |
| **Approved by** | [Insert chair’s signature] |
| **Date of meeting** | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| **SCCP Consideration** |
| **SCCP comments** | [Insert any comments or conditions relating to SCCP’s discussion of the request] |
| **Approved by** | [Insert SCCP Chair’s signature] |
| **Date of meeting** | Click or tap to enter a date. |

Appendix I: Mapping to OfS Quality and Standards Condition B1: Academic experience

OfS Condition B1 Applies to the Quality of HE provided in any form – including via collaborative methods (B1.1) and states that providers must ensure that the students registered on each higher education course receive a “**high quality academic experience**” (B1.2). Courses are defined as undergraduate and postgraduate provision, including research, individual modules or any provision that leads to the award of university credit.

B1.3 outlines that in order to provide a **“high quality academic experience”** HEIs must ensure that each higher education course:

Is **up-to-date**

Provides **educational challenge**

Is **coherent**

Is **effectively delivered**

As appropriate to the subject matter of the course, requires students to develop **relevant skills**.

The following table outlines how the university ensures that students receive a high quality academic experience” as contained within B1.3 via its Quality Assurance processes.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **B1.3 Definitions** | **Examples** | **Relevant University Quality Process** |
| “**up-to-date**” means representative of current thinking and practices in the subject matter to which the higher education courserelates, including being **appropriately informed** by recent:1. subject matter developments;
2. research, industrial and professional developments; and
3. developments in teaching and learning, including learning resources.
 | Courses are informed by current practice via the use of the QAA Framework and UK Quality Code with reference to subject benchmarks. Course Content and Teaching, Learning and Assessment Methods are reviewed and updated on a cyclical basis and in consultation with external stakeholders.External input is sought from employers, academics and where relevant PSRBs.Course content is expected to be delivered via research informed teaching drawing on current practices and our own academic research areas.Pedagogic developments are disseminated via the Strategic Teaching and Learning TeamVLE content and reading lists are updated at least annually.Course team have opportunity to share good practice and innovation in delivery methods. | ValidationCP ValidationSubject ReviewAnnual EvaluationExternal Examiner ReportsQuality Appraisals |
| “**educational challenge**” means a challenge that is no less than the minimum level of rigour and difficulty reasonably expected of the higher education course, in the context of the subject matter and level of the course. | Courses are approved and monitored with using relevant Benchmark Statements as a starting point for course content. Content is enhanced via external reference points and internal review.Course content is expected to be delivered via research informed teaching drawing on current practices and our own academic research areas.External input is sought from employers, academics and where relevant PSRBs | ValidationSubject ReviewAnnual EvaluationExternal Examiner Reports |
| **“coherent**” means a higher education course which ensures:1. there is an appropriate balance between breadth and depth of content;
2. subjects and skills are taught in an appropriate order and, where necessary, build on each other throughout the course; and
3. key concepts are introduced at the appropriate point in the course content.
 | Academic progression through courses is assessed as part of the approval and review process to ensure that students can develop level appropriate knowledge in a timely and rigorous manner.Courses are approved and monitored with using relevant Benchmark Statements as a starting point for course content. Content is enhanced via external reference points and internal review.Teaching, Learning & Assessments are designed to challenge and develop student knowledge as they progress, and Students are assessed in line with school assessment tariffs.  | ValidationSubject ReviewAnnual EvaluationExternal Examiner ReportsQuality Appraisals |
| **“effectively delivered**,” in relation to a higher education course, means the manner in which it is taught, supervised and assessed (both in person and remotely) including, but not limited to, ensuring:1. an appropriate balance between delivery methods, and
2. an appropriate balance between directed and independent study or research, as relevant to the level of the course.
 | Courses are delivered by suitably qualified, research active staff, staff who are encouraged to engage with the wider HE sector.Courses are informed by current practice via the use of the QAA Framework and UK Quality Code with reference to subject benchmarks. Course Content and Teaching, Learning and Assessment Methods are reviewed and updated on a cyclical basis and in consultation with external stakeholders. | ValidationSubject ReviewAnnual EvaluationExternal Examiner ReportsQuality Appraisals |
| **“relevant skills”** means:1. knowledge and understanding relevant to the subject matter and level of the higher education course; and
2. other skills relevant to the subject matter and level of the higher education course including, but not limited to, cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills and professional competences.
 | Courses are informed by current practice via the use of the QAA Framework and UK Quality Code with reference to subject benchmarks. Course Content and Teaching, Learning and Assessment Methods are reviewed and updated on a cyclical basis and in consultation with external stakeholders.External input is sought from employers, academics and where relevant PSRBs.Course content is expected to be delivered via research informed teaching drawing on current practices and our own academic research areas.Teaching, Learning & Assessment methods are revised as part of the approval and monitoring process and must align to the university’s definitions and guidance. | ValidationSubject ReviewAnnual EvaluationExternal Examiner ReportsQuality Appraisals |
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