Code 08: 2023 Version 1 Effective from: 1 October 2023		

24th September 2023	2021 Version 01.1	Updated to reflect implementation of Worktribe and revised committee structures.
1 February 2021	2021 Version 01	Improving clarity of wording in sections 58 and 98, and updating job titles.
1 February 2021	2020 Version 01	Updates to add provision for the Welsh Language.
1 September 2020	2018 Version 01	Major changes to programme proposal, marketing, and validation procedures, timelines, and reviews, as well as to streamline available programmes

16. Joint teaching across levels (e.g. across Levels 5 and 6 or across Levels 6 and 7) should not be used:

   Where Level 5 students will not have acquired the necessary skills, knowledge or understanding of context at Level 4 to allow an appropriate version of a Level 5 module to be designed for a particular subject/topic.

   Where Level 6 students will not have acquired the necessary skills, knowledge or understanding of context at Level 4 or 5 to allow an appropriate version of a Level 6 module to be designed for a particular subject/topic.

   Where joint teaching across levels would compromise the standards expected in a professionally accredited course.

The School appoints a Lead Programme Developer (LPD) who will usually be at least Senior Lecturer level. For proposed joint programmes, an LPD must be appointed from both Schools. A professional services team to support the LPD will be convened initially by the College Planning Officer and include individuals from the Marketing, Communications, Recruitment, Admissions and Quality Enhancement teams. The LPD must work with the professional services team, a Student Advisor and

made and then checked and approved by the Quality Enhancement Unit prior to registration for new students.

The Programme approval route is determined by the perceived level of risk. Taking into account the range of factors outlined in Table 1 below and based on the full programme specification and aligned modules, the Quality Enhancement Unit will select the appropriate route.

Fast-track applications may take low, medium or high-risk routes.

of new core and
compulsory modules.

Other risk factors.

> The curriculum and the degree to which it reflects the programme aims and learning outcomes and relevant subject benchmark statements and professional standards where relevant.
>
> The relevance of the programme, particularly in relation to developments in the subject area and employment opportunities.

While the criteria used to assess programme proposals will vary according to context, academic validation will focus on ensuring that programmes meet the principles set out in Section 1.1 above. Modules submitted as part of a new programme, at revalidation or as standalone additions will be considered according to the following criteria:

> The module learning outcomes, including their clarity and suitability for the specified level of learning.
>
> The relationship of the module learning outcomes to the programme learning outcomes if the module is proposed to be core or compulsory to any programme.
>
> The extent to which the teaching and learning strategy, structure and assessment strategy will provide learning opportunities needed to enable students fulfil the learning outcomes.
>
> Its impact on Welsh-medium or bilingual teaching.
>
> Inclusive teaching and assessment.
>
> How does the module address the United Nations Sustainability Development Goals
>
> The appropriateness of the credit weighting.
>
> The fit of the assessment to the Bangor Assessment Framework.
>
> The relationship of the assessment strategy to the programme-level assessment strategy if the module is proposed to be core or compulsory to any programme.
>
> The opportunities students may have to develop and demonstrate transferable skills.
>
> Where the module involves teaching and/or assessment by staff who are not members of the University, the nature of supervision provided.
>
> Whether staff involved in the delivery of the module or students undertaking the module must undergo Disclosure and Barring Service checks.

Decisions on programmes considered through the Executive Approval Route will be ratified by the PVC (Education and Student Experience) and reported to the Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group.

Where programmes are to be considered by the Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group, Schools will liaise with the External Assessor and the Quality Enhancement Unit will liaise with the Internal Assessor and the Student Reviewers. In the case of proposals for programmes to be delivered through collaborative provision, the Quality Enhancement Unit will appoint an External Assessor.

All three reviewers will independently produce a report that reflects the principles outlined above in Section 1.1. The LPD will need to make any recommended amendments to the programme or associated new modules and resubmit the programme for programme scrutiny no later 28 days before the Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group meeting in order to ensure that members of the group receive the documentation 14 days ahead of the meeting.

The Quality Enhancement Unit will collate full programme specifications, aligned module descriptions (exported from Worktribe), External Assessor Statements and evidence of engagement with External Assessor revisions. These will be forwarded to members of the Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group together with evidence of student and stakeholder involvement (see Appendix 2).

Members of the Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group will consider the full range of programme level issues (reflecting the principles set out in 1.1) together with the reports and the

LPDs are expected to attend the Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group meeting to present their case and answer queries.

Where further revisions are required, the programme and aligned module records will be amended on Worktribe by the School and submitted for approval by the deadline determined by the Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group.

Validation panels will receive the full programme specifications, aligned module descriptions (exported from Worktribe) and evidence of student and stakeholder input into programme design.

Where programmes are to be considered by a validation panel, the Quality Enhancement Unit may in some case, provide initial feedback to the School so that the programme is ready to go forward for validation. In these cases, the LPD will need to amend the programme and resubmit it, no later than six weeks before the validation meeting.

A validation panel will normally comprise of:

> Head of the Quality Enhancement Unit (or nominee chosen from the Validation Pool)
> External Subject Specialist.
> A representative from the Validation Pool (who must not be from the presenting School)
> Student representative
> A QA officer who will act as panel secretary.

A professional or employer representative may be sought where appropriate.

Staff from the presenting School(s), including the LPD, must attend the validation panel to

If a programme is submitted outside the usual timeframes (non-UCAS or fast-tracked) the full Programme Specification and aligned module descriptors must be made available to the Quality Enhancement Unit at least 28 days before the meeting. This is so the finalised documentation can be sent to Panel members at least 14 calendar days before the meeting.

In the event that the request in made outside the 18-month timeline or that deferred students have applied for the programme, the Programme Lead will work with the Marketing, Communications and Recruitment teams to offer all applicants alternative provision. They will then confirm that all applicants have been offered alternative programme and moved to them where they choose to do so (part two of the withdrawal request form). When approved by PVC (Education & Student Experience),

The Curriculum Quality Assurance Delivery Group will consider the clarity and measurability of the Action Plans outlined and the progress against the previous   Action Plan. The Group will focus its attention particularly on programmes where particular risks and opportunities have previously been identified by the Education and Student

3. A full and updated programme specification for each programme, exported from Worktribe.

4. Copies of QA1 forms for the last 3 years.

5. Copies of External Examiners reports for the last 3 years.

6. Copy of the most recent Internal Quality Audits applicable to the programmes.

7. Copies of all module outlines associated with the programmes to be revalidated.

8. An outline of professional competencies (if applicable).

9. PRSB reports (if applicable).

10. Staff CVs (for programmes delivered through external collaborations)

If a programme has been reviewed for accreditation by an external body within 12 months of the intended revalidation date, the Chair of Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group can allow the report of the external review to be submitted to Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group instead of the documentation described above.

School-wide revalidation events will normally be arranged to align to relevant subject areas within the School. Programme specific revalidations may be arranged if required by a PRSB.

The membership of the validation panel is defined in Section 2.20. Staff from the presenting School must attend the validation panel to summarise the aims of the programme and to answer

changes.

If any of the programmes proposed for revalidation follow the usual UCAS recruitment cycle, the full Programme Specification and aligned module descriptors must be made available to the Quality Enhancement Unit by the December deadline (see Worktribe timelines) but may be considered in advance of this deadline. The panel will consider the principles for programme and module design set out above in Section 1.1.

validation of the current programme is withdrawn, students who have already started that programme can complete their studies.

Where revisions are required, the programme and aligned module records will be amended on Worktribe by the School and submitted for approval by the deadline determined by the validation panel. Revalidation reports are sent to Curriculum Programme Approval Delivery Group for report and discussion in terms of trends, enhancement themes and training needs.

During 2023/24, the IQA cycle will be suspended as the University reviews the method with the intention of integrating it further in the oversight framework and introducing risk-based elements.

The University uses Internal Quality Audits as part of the process to monitor and enhance the

The purpose of an audit visit is to verify that a School has processes and mechanisms to maintain quality and standards, and that they are operating effectively and efficiently. Links to relevant College level committees are explored. The audit must also include all collaborative provision. The audit report will recommend enhancements to teaching and learning.

preparations for the audit and in completing the self-evaluation document. Students should submit

The Internal Quality Audit schedule follows a 6-year cycle:

A	1	Member of the Quality Enhancement Unit or Curriculum Quality Assurance Delivery Group attends Board of Examiners as an observer
A	2	Internal Quality Audit
A	3	Revalidation of taught programmes
A	4	
A	5	
A	6	
B	1	Member of the Quality Enhancement Unit or Curriculum Quality Assurance Delivery Group attends Board of Examiners as an observer
B	2	Internal Quality Audit

Where PSRBs require revalidation to be in a cycle of fixed length other than 6 years, the audit cycle will be amended accordingly. Changes to the audit cycle for a School can be approved by the Chair of the Curriculum Quality Assurance Delivery Group.

An audit visit will typically last one full day and involves:

Inspection of a self-evaluation document, relevant committee minutes and other documentation concerned with teaching and learning.
Meeting(s) with the Head of School and staff with responsibility for different aspects of teaching and learning (e.g. examinations, pastoral care, admissions).
Meeting(s) with student representatives, undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research.
Meeting(s) with other staff involved in quality assurance and/or teaching and learning (e.g. new staff members/administrators).
Meetings, where appropriate, with College level staff e.g. College Directors of Teaching and Learning, Research, Director of Graduate School.

The audit team must normally include the Head of Quality Enhancement (or nominee), a senior academic from another School and
Assessor, and the Quality Assurance Manager. Other members can be co-opted onto the team at the discretion of the Chair.

Schools must nominate   External Assessors. An External Assessor should not be a current or recent External Examiner for the School and should preferably have knowledge of quality assurance processes and procedures. The Chair and Secretary of the audit panel will choose the External Assessor. Schools will be informed of the panel membership at least four weeks in advance of the audit.

Audit visits will consider teaching at all levels from undergraduate to taught Master s and research, including
paragraphs below.

Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught provision:

The academic standards of programmes.
Assessment and feedback.
Student progression and achievement.

Œ 08:

This section should indicate how the School intends to enhance quality and/or improve performance.

In the Commentary section, the School is asked to write a commentary (no more than 2 sides of A4) reflecting on the major strengths and challenges it has identified.

The following Supporting Documentation should be supplied:

1. Details of the composition and responsibilities of School and where relevant College level