Programme Development Update

This paper provides information on a number of programme development matters including:

- University Programme Approval Committee meeting dates for 2015-16
- Provisional list of proposals identified for approval in 2015-16
- Summary of and reflections on programme approval activity in 2014-15

This is supported by the following papers available online:

- Stage 1 and Stage 2 reports
- Report on conditions arising from Programme Approvals

Recommended actions

Education and Student Committee is asked to **note** the recommendations arising from the reflections on Programme Approval in 2014-15

Associate Deans (Education) are asked to circulate the dates of University Programme Approval Committees to Programme Directors and Teams wishing to develop new or significantly amended programmes in 2015-16 and consider these in relation to the setting of PARC dates.

Programme Development and Review

1. Programme Approval dates 2015-16

Stage 1

Stage 1 University Programme Approval Committee	Deadline for Papers (2 weeks before the meeting)
Wednesday 28th October 2015	Wednesday 14th October 2015
Wednesday 2nd December 2015	Wednesday 18th November 2015
Wednesday 3rd February 2016	Wednesday 20th January 2016
Wednesday 2nd March 2016 (meeting intended for programmes to commence in 2017/8)	Wednesday 17th February 2016
Tuesday 7th June 2016 (meeting intended for programmes to commence in 2017/8)	Tuesday 24th May 2016

Stage 2

Stage 2 University Programme Approval Committee	Deadline for Papers (3 weeks before the meeting)
Wednesday 7th October 2015	Wednesday 16th September 2015
Tuesday 15th December 2015	Tuesday 24th November 2015
Wednesday 17th February 2016	Wednesday 27th January 2016
Wednesday 16th March 2016	Wednesday 24th February 2016
Wednesday 13th April 2016	Wednesday 23rd March 2016
Wednesday 22nd June 2016 (meeting intended for programmes to commence in 2017/8)	Wednesday 1st June 2016

Six Stage 2 meetings have been scheduled for 2015/16, which is the same number as 2014/15 in response to School feedback.

2. Planned programme development for 2015/16

The following proposals have been identified as likely to come forward for approval in 2015 - 16. Some of these completed Stage 1 of the approval process during 2014-15. This list will be checked against School plans when these are received from the Strategy and Planning Unit.

Programme	School	Type
BA English (Stage 2)	SASS	New Programme
BSc Politics (Stage 2)	SASS	New Programme
BSc Psychology and Criminology	SASS	New Programme
BSc Public Policy	SASS	New Programme
BA Human Geography	SASS	New Programme
MSc Research Methods (Stage 2)	SASS	New Programme

PhD Sociology-Joint programme with Sapienza University (Rome)	SASS	New Programme
LLB Legal Practice/CILEx (online) (Stage 2)	Law	New Programme
MSc Global Finance (online) (Stage 2)	Cass	New Programme
MSc Financial Engineering (online)	Cass	New Programme
Foundation Year (Currently with Westminster Kingsway)	Cass	Major Amendment
BSc Business Studies UG Partnership/Dual degree with IE Business School	Cass	New Programme
Global MBA product	Cass	New Programme
Certificate in Financial Crime (partnership)	Cass	New Programme
BSc/PG Diploma/ MSc Public Health (District Nursing, School Nursing and Health Visiting)	SHS	Major Amendment
PG Diploma/MSc Primary Care (Stage 2)	SHS	Major Amendment
BSc Health and Social Care	SHS	New Programme
BSc Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging) BSc Radiography (Therapy)	SHS	Major Amendment
MSc Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration) MSc Therapeutic Radiography (pre-registration) (Stage 2)	SHS	New Programme
MSc Dysphagia	SHS	New Programme
Two MSc Mental Health programmes	SHS	New Programme
MSc Long Term Care and Long Term Conditions	SHS	Major Amendment
MSc Health Services Research	SHS	Major Amendment

This indicates a substantial level of development and as such, careful planning will need to be undertaken by Schools in liaison with Student and Academic Services to ensure that proposals have sufficient time for consideration and development.

Associate Deans and Schools are asked to continue to liaise with Student and Academic Services to ensure that appropriate support can be provided to staff developing new or significantly amended provision. Where additional new programmes or developments are identified, these should also be flagged up to Student and Academic Services.

3. Stage 1 & 2 Programme Approval reports

Reports from Stage 1 and Stage 2 University Programme Approval Committees (UPAC) can be found on the web at the following link: http://webapps.city.ac.uk/adu/university_governance/new/pac/pac.html

4. Board of Studies (BoS) amendments

The report detailing BoS amendments during 2014-15 has been submitted to this meeting as Paper 16 (iii)

An internally-accessible record of amendments to track cumulative changes has continued to be implemented throughout the year in response to the QAA recommendation that the University "revise its process for the management of amendments to programmes at School and University levels by March 2013, to provide greater clarity in the definitions and ensure that Education and Student Committee is fully informed of such changes to ensure effective oversight". This has been used as a source of reference for School's to enable them to consider the effects of cumulative change and continues to be available to Schools via a shared drive.

In some instances, Schools were unclear about what level of change constitutes a major amendment, which would require University level scrutiny. Examples of this include the level of cumulative change since the last

Periodic Review or a significant restructure/recalibration of a programme. Major changes are amendments which significantly change the educational purpose of a programme or changes which affect more than one third of the total number of credits of a programme. Amendments of this nature require approval from University Programme Approval Committee (UPAC) following approval at School Programme Approval and Review Committees (PARCs). Reference should be made to the Quality Manual under the programme development, approval and amendment section (http://www.city.ac.uk/about/education/quality-manual/3-programme-development-approval-and-amendment#tab=0) and further advice sought from Student and Academic Services where required.

Both academic and professional staff reported that the process for approving BoS amendments seemed laborious and time consuming for often minor amendments to programmes. Issues include incomplete information/sign-offs and updated specifications not being available in the shared drive repository for implementation on SITS which hold up the process. A new web form is therefore being developed in order to streamline the process and alleviate some of the issues that can slow the process down. In addition, work to scope the requirements for a system to manage programme and module information has been agreed and will be progressed through the Transformation Programme. Schools are asked to be mindful of the deadlines in place to ensure that amendments may be processed in adequate time prior to registration.

Work to ensure compliance with the recently published guidance from the Competitions and Markets Authority on how consumer law applies to Higher Education providers is covered in a separate report. This may have implications for the management of programme amendments in the future including their timing.

5. Conditions arising from Programme Approval

A report detailing the progress in meeting conditions arising from programme approvals in 2014-15 has been submitted to this meeting as Paper 16 (ii)

Seventeen programmes were considered by Stage 1 UPAC in 2014-15 and nine were considered at Stage 2, which represented a significant level of development over the academic year. Over half of the proposals received at Stage 1 had a condition to include a statement on the articulation of the programme with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications within the programme specification. Staff developing proposals are therefore encouraged to seek support from LEaD regarding FHEQ statements prior to submitting the programme for approval. Reference should also be made to the guidance documents made available in the online Quality Manual (http://www.city.ac.uk/about/education/quality-manual/3-programme-development-approval-and-amendment)

Missing sign-offs from Finance (including full financial spreadsheets), Timetabling, Library or the Dean continued to be an issue this year and were still pending at the time of the Stage 1 UPAC meeting for a number of programmes. This resulted in conditions being set for around half of programmes that were approved at Stage 1. All sign-offs requested in the Stage 1 and Stage 2 approval forms should be provided by the published paper submission deadline to avoid unnecessary delays in the approval process and to aid the Committee's consideration of a proposal.

Other conditions resulted from the need for more detailed information on careers i.e. under the *to what kind of career might I go on* section in the programme specification. As much detail as possible should therefore be included within the documentation about careers that graduates may go on to.

In 2013-14 over half of the proposals received at both Stage 1 and Stage 2 had a condition relating to the enhancement of programme and module specifications in liaison with LEaD. In 2014/5 there was a marked improvement with a significant decrease in conditions being set around this.

6. Programme Terminations

A report detailing programme terminations approved by PARCs on behalf of Boards of
Studies can be found on the web. Associate Deans (Education) are reminded that following PARC approval, all terminations and suspensions must be signed off by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor. This year there were occasions when a proposal was made to terminate a programme which had not been submitted to Student and Academic Services for sign-off by the DVC. This resulted in delays with the information being removed from the website and other marketing materials. PARC secretaries will be reminded of the process for terminations.

7. Summary of programme approval activity as of June 2015

- A significant amount of programme development activity has taken place during the last academic year with a total of 26 programmes being considered across Stage 1 and 2 meetings.

- 13 of the approvals were for taught postgraduate programmes and 12 approvals related to undergraduate courses. Two approvals at stage 1 were for online distance learning provisions.

- Two of the undergraduate approvals were for integrated Masters programmes and were approved at Stage 2: MSci Programmes (MSci Computer Science/MSci Computer Science with Games Technology/MSci Computer Science with Cyber Security) and Masters in Optometry.

- The re-structure of the MSc Management programme was also approved.

- Proposals have been received from all Schools this year; with the majority of activity being undertaking by the School of Arts and Social Sciences and School of Health Sciences.

8. Reflections on activity in 2014-15, including any thoughts for enhancements

University Programme Approval Committee members and professional staff in Schools were asked to provide feedback on activity specifically relating to proposals considered during 2014-15 which is reflected on below.

- Some proposals with a planned 2015/6 start date were received by the Stage 1 Programme Approval Committee relatively late in the year. Since marketing activity for a programme cannot commence until it has been approved at Stage 1 UPAC, late consideration means that marketing activities will commence later, and that student numbers on the first year of the course may be impacted. Staff developing programmes with a start date in the next academic year are encouraged to submit programmes for Stage 1 approval as early as possible. The Stage 1 meetings scheduled in March and June 2016 should be reserved for the consideration of programmes commencing within two academic years i.e. these meetings should consider programmes with a September 2017 start date. A note clarifying this accompanies the published University Programme Approval Committee dates.

Some Committee members highlighted frustration when incomplete paperwork is submitted to University Programme Approval Committee, as outlined in the conditions arising from programme approval section above. According to their Terms of Reference, School PARCs are responsible for ensuring the quality of information provided for University-level approval or review panels and Schools should therefore ensure that documentation is complete and any issues raised by the PARC are addressed prior to submission to UPAC. Staff re encouraged to contact Student and Academic Services for advice before a proposal is submitted for PARC approval. In many cases, this could result in a reduction in the number of conditions set, which could reduce the lead-time for a programme to complete the approval process.

- Feedback from colleagues highlighted that the membership of the University Programme Approval Committees was not always clear. Colleagues should be directed to the Terms of Reference and Membership for UPAC that are provided on the University website under Academic Committees (http://webapps.city.ac.uk/adu/university_governance/new/pac/pac.html). Further details are also given in the report from the approval meeting produced by Student and Academic Services.

- In some instances, Schools were unclear on the process for obtaining comments from the External Adviser where they were unable to attend Stage 2 PARC. As set out in the programme approval guidance, it should be ensured that External Advisers are notified of the Stage 2 PARC meeting date well in advance with attendance confirmed. In exceptional circumstances only, where the External Adviser is unable to attend, a meeting should be organised in advance of the PARC to be attended by the External Adviser, PARC Chair, the Programme Team and the PARC Secretary. The minutes from this meeting should then be provided to the PARC for its consideration and should be submitted as part of the UPAC Stage 2 documentation.

- The quality of documentation submitted for approval at both Stage 1 and Stage 2 continues to vary, which resulted in two programmes not receiving approval from UPAC at Stage 1 in 2014-15. It had been suggested by Schools that School representatives attend Stage 1 to respond to Committee's queries. However, it is considered that the documentation should provide a sufficiently clear articulation of the proposal and rationale, that this should not be required at Stage 1. Staff are encouraged to liaise with Student and Academic Services as early as possible for advice/support.

- PARCs are responsible to the Board of Studies for the peer-review and scrutiny of new or amended programme proposals. There were some instances of PARCs not being quorate when considering proposals at School level, which could affect the robustness of the scrutiny process and quality of proposals being submitted to UPAC. Schools are reminded that the quorum for PARC is 50 per cent of the membership, and that this also applies where consideration of proposals exceptionally takes place by correspondence and email, in that at least 50% of members must express a view where decisions are being taken.

- As reported in previous years, there continue to be issues relating to timely liaison between those developing proposals and professional staff, both in Schools and Professional Services, who are asked to comment on or authorise relevant sections. The impact of this is that feedback cannot be incorporated in time for submission to the next stage of approval.

Laura Tull
Academic Development Officer
Student and Academic Services
August 2015