

## **Curriculum Management: Development, Approval, Change & Withdrawal**

### Contents

<b>Overview and purpose</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Outline of the procedure</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Underpinning Principles</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Roles and Responsibilities</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Module Development &amp; Approval, including as Standalone Provision</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Module Change</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Module Withdrawal</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Programme (Provision) Development &amp; Approval</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Approval of Provision not leading to an award of the University</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>Approval of Provision leading to an award of the University (as set out in Regulation A4)</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Programme (Provision) Change</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>Programme (Provision) Withdrawal</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>41</b>



## Overview and purpose

1. This section of the Quality Framework sets out the University's approach to the development, approval and management of curriculum, across the lifecycle of both modules and programmes from initial idea, through approval, change and as appropriate, withdrawal.
2. The procedures, operated in conjunction with Edinburgh Napier's academic regulations are intended to ensure compliance with the expectations and core and common practices set out within the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.
3. These procedures are intended to cover the management of the full range of Edinburgh Napier's taught provision, including non-credit bearing and commercial provision. Provision delivered in partnership with other organisations must also adhere to the procedures set out within Section 4 of the Quality Framework. Provision related to Research Degrees should take into account the procedures set out within the [Research Degrees Framework](#).
4. These processes lead to the production of the University's definitive approved records for the provision (programmes and modules) that it intends to offer; offers; and has offered in the past. These definitive records will be retained and managed within the University's *Curriculum Management Environment*.



## Outline of the procedure

5. Since January 2023, the University's approach to Curriculum Management has been supported by its [\*Curriculum Management Environment\*](#). This is the single location of programme and module curriculum information and it is an expectation that all relevant members of staff engage with the system. The programme and module information has a range of different audiences, for example, some of the data requested is used to populate the programme specification for a student audience, some data is gathered to support the effective operation of the business processes associated with the programme delivery. The records are intended to capture business, quality and operational aspects of Curriculum Management.
  
6. Curriculum Management at Edinburgh Napier incorporates gateways within the processes for curriculum development and approval; change and withdrawal. These gateways and notifications are intended to:
  - a. ensure that the proposed work aligns with University and School strategic intentions;
  - b. ensure that sufficient time and resource is allocated to the curriculum management activity;
  - c. support the timely notification of development and change to relevant stakeholders, for information and for action;
  - d. support a co-production approach to curriculum management to actively involve relevant University stakeholders in working collaboratively with module and programme leads at key points during the process;
  
7. The first stage in all curriculum management processes is to seek and achieve school-level approval to proceed (Gate One). This authority resides with the School



Leadership Team (though this may be delegated, with approval by the Dean of School).

8. The second stage is the creation, or amendment of the business rationale for curriculum management (for example the rationale for the development of the module; programme; or justification and business implications for the amendment or withdrawal). This is approved by the Dean of School (Gate Two).
9. The next stage allows for the ongoing development of the curriculum management proposal in preparation for approval (Gate Three). For example, this might be the development of a new award-bearing programme; the creation of a short commercial course; the enhancement of a module; or an amendment to a programme's structure. The intention is that this should not be undertaken in isolation and that effective curriculum management allows for the effective and timely liaison and support with others across the School and University to help the proposal to be comprehensive and meet University expectations first time.
10. For most curriculum management proposals, the School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee will have responsibility for their consideration and approval. New award-bearing programmes will require to be approved by individual University Approval Panels.

## **Underpinning Principles**

11. All taught provision, regardless of whether it offers academic credit should be effectively designed and offer a high-quality University experience for all learners.



12. The development of all credit-bearing provision must take account of the [Scottish Credit & Qualifications Framework](#), and comply with the University academic regulations to ensure adherence to the National Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications in Scotland.
13. All credit-bearing provision must be constructively aligned to enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed in accordance with quality expectations set out in the UK Quality Code.
14. All proposals for taught provision delivered in partnership with another organisation should be presented to the University Collaborative Provision Committee prior to development.
15. All taught provision leading to an award of the University should embrace the principles underpinning the Edinburgh Napier ENhance Curriculum Framework and provide a holistic view of the student journey through the programme.
16. The development of provision should be a collaborative endeavour – involving relevant internal and external stakeholders to inform and sense-check the proposal.
17. The approval of all provision must be subject to appropriate, broad and in-depth scrutiny by a wide range of experienced individuals, including students and external subject specialists who use their academic and professional experience and judgement to critically evaluate and reflect upon whether each proposal will offer students a viable and secure learning experience.



18. Students must not be offered a place on any taught credit-bearing module or award or credit-bearing programme until the module or programme has received academic approval in accordance with these guidelines. Prior to approval being granted a taught credit-bearing module or award or credit-bearing programme may be advertised but it must be clearly and unambiguously stated that the module or programme is subject to formal University approval. Timings of module and provision change and withdrawal must be in accordance with the [Terms and Conditions set out by the University](#). Any provision including modules that will require timetabling in Trimester 1 of the following academic session will be required to be approved **no later** than week 12 of Trimester two in the preceding academic year. Provision and modules requiring timetabling for Trimester 2 or 3, must be approved **no later** than week 12 of Trimester three in the preceding academic year. Other amendments to modules, not impacting on timetabling, and which can be anticipated, must be considered and approved at least one trimester in advance of the module delivery to comply with the University Terms and Conditions. Programme teams should consider the timeframes necessary for approval and the effective marketing of the programme. Consideration should be given to whether the programmes need to be included in University information for prospective students, recruitment fairs etc. and whether students will be recruited via UCAS (lead in time, approximately 18 months prior to student enrolment).

19. Every effort should be made to avoid suspending or ceasing entry to a programme once offers have been made and accepted by applicant(s). At the point offers have been accepted by applicants, a contract exists between the University and the Student with obligations on the University to deliver the programme as advertised. In the exceptional circumstance that a programme team/School wish to suspend/withdraw entry to a programme the subject area must seek the approval



of the Head of International Operations & Admissions to do so. Such requests should be made no later than 10 weeks prior to the intended commencement of the programme. Offer holders should, where at all possible, be offered an alternative programme of study at the University. If this is not possible every effort should be made to support students funding alternative study options at other providers. If no alternative options are available or applicants have made commitments which are irreversible (e.g., applied for a Student Visa) then suspension or withdrawal of a programme should be avoided.

## **Roles and Responsibilities**

20. Module and Provision Leads are the academics responsible for leading the management of their provision approval, change and withdrawal proposals through Curriculum Management. They are responsible for ensuring that proposals are initiated and progressed in accordance with School/University timeframes, and in liaising with the School Curriculum Management Support team for support and guidance. Module and Provision leads may allocate collaborators to support the development of the proposal, though they retain overall responsibility and ownership of the proposal.
  
21. Programme Boards of Studies are responsible for the development, planning, management, operation and enhancement of the programme. Its remit is presented as Appendix 5. Boards of Studies offer a forum to consider proposals for changes to the programme and its constituent modules to ensure the coherence, academic standard and the quality of learning opportunities provided by the programme of study are maintained and enhanced. It is anticipated that



many proposals for change are discussed at Boards of Studies meetings or amongst members supported by the Curriculum Management Environment.

22. Curriculum Management Support teams in each School are responsible for supporting the progress of proposals through the approval, change and withdrawal workflows. Once they receive confirmation that approval has been confirmed at each gate they will progress to the next proposal stage. The Curriculum Management Support teams will help to ensure that all required data has been entered (responsibility for ensuring that the quality of the data is sufficient rests with the approval authorities at each gate). The Curriculum Management Support teams are a source of local support and can sign-post module and provision leads to additional support provided by other internal stakeholders.

23. The School Academic Lead for Quality is the Convenor of the School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee. The remit of the School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee is provided in Appendix 1. It is responsible for approving modules; module change; module withdrawals; provision change and provision withdrawals. It is also responsible for the approval of provision proposals which do not lead to an award of the University. The Committee is responsible for ensuring the readiness of proposals for provision leading to an award of the University prior to its submission to the University Approvals Panel. The School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee is responsible for ensuring the quality assurance of the School's definitive curriculum records.

24. The Dean of School, or an appropriate individual or School-endorsed group acting on their behalf, is responsible for ensuring that all curriculum proposals for approval, change or withdrawal are underpinned by a viable business case which





takes account of University business and strategic planning, in accordance with discussions held with University Leadership Team meetings during School Board. All proposals and their development should be sufficiently resourced.

25. External Peers are required to provide feedback and comment on the appropriateness of the proposal for approval, change and withdrawal. They are particularly requested to comment on subject area expectations regarding the content, academic challenge and learning, teaching and assessment practices. For approved provision, external examiners may be invited to offer this feedback (See Quality Framework Section 0b for further information).

26. Collaborative Groups. The following professional service departments have opportunity to receive notifications and provide comments on the proposal for provision approval, change and withdrawal:

- Curriculum Support Team
- Department of Learning, Teaching and Enhancement (Academic Practice; Academic Skills and Quality & Standards)
- Admissions and UK Recruitment
- Marketing
- Library
- International Recruitment
- Planning & Business Intelligence
- Finance
- Research & Innovation Office
- Global Mobility
- Student Futures
- Student Wellbeing and Inclusion



- Academic and Student Lifecycle (student records)

These comments are provided for the benefit of the approving bodies (School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee and the University Approvals Panel) and are intended to allow these internal stakeholders opportunity to provide reassurance that the proposals can be supported; or to highlight any potential risks to be taken into account when considering the proposal. Not all provision proposals will require the engagement of all teams and engagement will be case-by-case.

27. University Approvals Panel is responsible on behalf of Academic Board for the consideration and approval of provision leading to an award of the University.

### **Module Development & Approval, including as Standalone Provision**

28. There should be clear justification for developing a new module and prior to creating a record as part of Curriculum Management there is an expectation that internal conversations have been had within appropriate School-level forums to inform the initiation of the module proposal (for example Subject Group meetings, or Panels of Studies meetings etc). If the module is potentially to be included within existing approved programme structures, early conversations are encouraged, though this consultation will be a requirement further during the approval journey.

29. Once ready to create the proposal, indicative information relating to the module needs to be added to create the record. This will include:

- a) The School which will 'own' the module



- b) Title (NB this may be provisional at the beginning) though ultimately should broadly reflect the content of the module, as it will appear on the student transcript.
- c) Whether it is a credit or non-credit bearing module

Non-credit bearing provision is typically used for small units of provision, usually offered commercially, where the learning would not meet the minimum Edinburgh Napier requirements of 5 credits (requiring 50 notional learning hours). Examples might include one or two day workshops; or for activity where it would not be appropriate to summatively assess the learning outcomes. Non-credit bearing modules offered as standalone also require the completion of an accompanying provision record to capture relevant information outside of the module record.

30. A new module record will now be available for you to continue to populate.

Different stages of the approval process require new fields to be populated, and existing data to be extended. You are guided in this data entry process by a clear indication of the information required for each process gate.

31. Gate one in module approval requires school approval to proceed. As a minimum the following additional fields should be completed:

- a. The Subject Group area which will 'own' the module
- b. The fee profile type (will typically be standard, unless the module is intended to offer a special fee)
- c. The type of credit or non-credit bearing module type
- d. Short course type (select NA if a standard module)
- e. The SCQF level (level 7 = first year – level 12 = doctoral)
- f. The SCQF credit value (standard modules are 20 credits (ECTS 10)) – this will auto-populate the total learning hours associated with the module.



- g. A very brief statement in the rationale field to provide context for the proposal (a couple of sentences should suffice for this gate)
- h. A very brief statement regarding the provision overview
- i. Confirmation if a partner is involved (and may require CPC engagement)

This first stage proposal can then be submitted for approval to proceed.

There is nothing to stop the completion of further fields in the module record, though one of the principles of Curriculum Management is to ensure efficient use of staff resource, and should the proposal not be supported to proceed by the School, time and effort risks being wasted. Information provided beyond that required for the gateway is not required to be reviewed.

32. The School Leadership Team (or a delegated authority approved by the Dean of School) will consider these early-stage proposals and confirm that they can proceed to further, more detailed development or will recommend the proposal be cancelled if not supported by the School. Approval at this stage notifies a number of stakeholders, primarily for information to ensure that they can plan sufficient time to support the proposal, if necessary, on its approval journey.

33. Following approval to proceed, further information can be gathered and captured within the module record to proceed towards Gate two, business rationale approval. For this part of the development stage, the information primarily should relate to demonstration of a strong business rationale for the module under development, primarily focussing on the rationale for the development; confirming the likely costs associated with its development and operation; considering the risks associated with the module and how these might be mitigated. At this stage, module co-leads and collaborators can be identified and allocated to support the development of the module record. The rationale must be clear as to whether the



module is being developed for inclusion within new or existing programme structures, or whether the module is to be offered as a standalone module.

34. Gate two approval requires the completion of the following additional fields. You can also continue to update and refine data already added for the first gateway, as curriculum development is intended to be iterative and adaptive in response to conversations, and feedback gathered during module development:

- a. Worktribe reference (if the module is part of a commercial proposal)
- b. Confirmation if the module is to be offered to incoming exchange students
- c. Indicative module description/content (a few sentences should suffice for this gateway)
- d. Confirmation with respect to the inclusion of placement or work-based learning aspects
- e. When the module is intended to be valid from
- f. Develop the rationale further to set out the key reasons for the development of the module; the programmes it is intended to be included in etc.
- g. The risks associated with the development of the module
- h. Any development costs associated with the module
- i. Any delivery costs associated with the module
- j. If appropriate, upload additional information associated with the financial business case

35. Approval to proceed to academic development is subject to the business rationale being considered sufficiently robust by the School Senior Leadership Team. A snapshot of the record is captured at this time and added as a support document,



as it is recognised that the data relating to the business rationale may continue to develop as the module proposal firms up prior to submission for approval.

36. Once the business rationale is approved, the remainder of the module record can be completed to record the academic module design proposal. This must include consideration of:
- a. the intended learning outcomes required to achieve the purpose of the module (typically three to six learning outcomes are expected for a 20 credit module) which are set at the appropriate level of academic challenge in accordance with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF)
  - b. the understanding and skills required to gain entry to the module, including necessary pre-requisites. If the module is standalone, or offered to visiting students module pre-requisites should not be added. Module pre-requisites impact on where modules can feature in programme structures and require discussion and agreement with respect to the programmes the modules will form part of.
  - c. how student learning hours will be distributed across the module and how this supports the achievement of the learning outcomes. A 20 credit module should provide sufficient learning opportunities in terms of directed, scheduled teaching (lectures, seminars, tutorials); lab work; guided peer-to-peer activities; group work; independent tasks and reading; reflection and consolidation of knowledge and assessment preparation and tasks equivalent to around 200 hours. In a 15 week trimester, this equates to around 13-14 learning hours per week. The student workload information allows the expectations around the module design to be clearly expressed and communicated to students.
  - d. the timing and method for providing formative learning experiences and feedback so that students understand the strengths and limitations of



their past performance to enable them to learn and improve future performance. The volume, nature and timing of formative and summative assessment should be considered (taking into account information presented in the University's Assessment and Feedback guidance).

- e. Consideration should be given as to how summative assessment tasks will be developed to ensure that all module learning outcomes can be summatively assessed, taking account of University assessment regulations (e.g. use of one or two components of assessment).
- f. the availability of learning resources including provision of information technology software requirements, library or specialist equipment. Indicative reading should be curated within the Information Services Leganto system and the permalink added to the record. It is important for Quality Assurance that the reading list can be accessed to support how independent study hours will be utilised and the breadth and range of indicative reading material available to students. The permalink means that as the leganto list continues to be populated, the link to the module remains.
- g. the resources required to be provided by the student and potential costs that students might accrue in studying the module (in general, this should be minimal unless students have been made aware of these additional costs on applying to the course).
- h. where appropriate, professional, statutory or regulatory body accreditation or recognition requirements can be added, or mapping undertaken with respect to the PSRB Frameworks
- i. Mapping can be undertaken with respect to the modules contribution to the Edinburgh Napier Curriculum Enhancement Framework (ENhance) and the strengths of the module with respect to the ENhance Framework articulated.



37. During the development phase, other internal stakeholders from with the School and professional service departments may be invited by the module leader to view the proposal under development and support development.
38. The developing proposal can be exported and shared with external peers, and with students at Panels of Studies or SSLCs to continue to gather wider stakeholder feedback from those unable to access the direct Curriculum management record. Feedback gathered from these consultations should inform the ongoing development and the rationale updated to ensure that this is evident.
39. Once the module record is completed it may be submitted for consideration and approval at the School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee. The School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee will use its collective academic and professional experience, to consider whether each proposed module as described in the module descriptor report produced as a Curriculum Management output, meets the academic standard for the volume and level of credit as defined in the academic regulations, that the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches (incorporating formative assessment opportunities) enable students to achieve the learning outcomes and that the proposed module will provide students with access to a high-quality learning experience. The Quality Committee will seek assurance that external feedback has been sought and has been used to enhance the module proposal.
40. If the module is to be approved as a standalone delivery, it should be presented alongside the accompanying provision record for approval by the Committee. Short courses such as these may be supported by the Curriculum Management





team to have an expedited route through Gateways 1 and 2 at the same time (see provision approval).

## **Module Change**

41. This procedure relates to change to the content or structure of an approved module after the module descriptor or programme specification has been approved by the School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee or by the convenor of the relevant approving panel or Institutional-led Review (ILR) panel.
42. Opportunities to amend an approved module may be identified through formal monitoring and review activities or informally as part of ongoing changes to business, staffing or the external environment. The rationale section of the module record should be updated to reflect the reason and drivers for the proposed change. Consideration should be given as to whether there are any business rationale implications associated with the proposed change. The rationale should detail any consultation that has informed the change proposal, for example feedback from an industry liaison panel; or responding to student feedback etc.
43. Curriculum Management incorporates three categories of module change, reflecting a risk-based approach to managing the change. Module leads are only required to propose amendments, the categorisation of change level is confirmed by the Curriculum Management Support team in liaison with the School Academic Leads for Quality in adherence to guidance below:

### **a. An academic administration change (Level 0)**



**Principle - changes are those which have no consequential change to the module delivery or student experience.**

Examples include:

- Typos
- Change in module leader
- Changes in phrasing in how existing approved information is expressed, for example re-emphasising Enhance themes
- Updating the Leganto permalink url

**b. An internal module change (Level 1)**

**Principle – changes are changes which only impact the module itself and do not have significant wider implications on the programme or the provision record.**

Examples include:

- Changes to the module content or learning outcomes which have no impact on programme learning outcome mapping.

**c. A module change impacting on provision (Level 2)**

**Principle - changes which have a consequent impact on the programme and necessitate a change to the provision record.**

Examples include:

- Change to the module title; code; owning School; Subject Group Area; SCQF level and value; fee type; short-course type; Worktribe reference (all necessitate a new record)
- Changes to the module content or learning outcomes which impact on programme learning outcome mapping
- The trimester of delivery



- The mode of delivery
- The introduction or removal of pre-requisites for the module
- Changes to LTA approaches which impact on the holistic approach within a programme – for example if the programme is reliant on this module for introducing or developing an assessment approach used elsewhere in the programme
- Addition or removal of placement activity (necessitates a new record)
- PSRB (Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies) Mapping

For data-management reasons, some changes necessitate a new record and due to this you will not be able to amend these fields within the *Curriculum Management Environment*. Module leaders will be required to copy the record to create a new one and then you will be able to make the necessary amendments. Module leaders should clearly state that this represents a change rather than a new module in the rationale. This change may require the withdrawal of the previous version of the module.

44. Curriculum Management notifies programme leaders where a change is proposed for a module affiliated with an approved provision. This is intended to support ongoing communication within programme teams, for example to allow the change proposal to be discussed informally at Programme Boards of Studies to ensure that the proposed change has no unexpected consequences to the coherence of the programme.

45. The School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee is responsible for maintaining an oversight of all module changes. Level 0 changes do not require committee consideration or approval, though a report summarising these changes should be periodically received by the Committee to allow it to exercise its oversight duties. The School Quality Committee should consider and approve all



module change proposals which fall within level 1 and 2 categories. Level 2 changes should also be considered alongside the subsequent programme level changes associated with the module change.

46. In considering the change proposal, School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee should ensure that the module continues to meet the academic standard for the volume and level of credit as defined in the academic regulations, that the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches (incorporating formative assessment opportunities) enable students to achieve the learning outcomes and that the module continues to provide students with access to a high-quality learning experience. Where the change proposal also impacts on programme information, the School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee should ensure that the impact of the change is also considered holistically and the provision change also considered for approval.

47. The Curriculum Management System should assist tracking of changes made to modules over time, which may be helpful information to monitoring the impact of module and programme teams when preparing for the periodic Institution-led Review.

## **Module Withdrawal**

48. The withdrawal of an approved module is typically driven by circumstances at subject or school-level, or is required due to changes to fields that generate a new module record which supersedes previous version.



49. Each module record includes a tab to support the planning of its withdrawal. The rationale for the withdrawal must be clearly stated along with the implications of the module closure, for example the impact on: other module pre-requisites; approved programmes; student continuation etc. To support this, it is possible to notify stakeholders automatically. The implications must clearly set out the arrangements for ensuring that all prospective and current students expecting to undertake the module are informed of the change.

50. The intended final year and trimester of delivery must be stated.

51. School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee is responsible for approving the proposal to withdraw the module and for considering and approving the associated changes to the associated provision records.

## **Programme (Provision) Development & Approval**

52. Programme development must align with School and University strategic and operational plans and have adequate resource to support the development stage. It would typically be expected that most provision development would have its origins within the annual School Planning round, or through a strategic call for programme development. Curriculum Management requires all provision proposals to be granted School permission to proceed as the first stage of proposal.

53. Once ready to create the proposal, indicative information relating to the provision needs to be added to create the record. This will include:



- a. The School which will 'own' the provision
- b. Title (NB this may be provisional at the beginning as titles will be informed by market intelligence; Subject Benchmark Statements etc. later in the process as well as ensuring that the title takes account of University naming policy for joint and combined awards -see Appendix 2)
- c. Whether it is a credit or non-credit bearing provision

Non-credit bearing provision will be comprised of one or more non-credit bearing modules.

54. A new provision record will now be available for you to continue to populate.

Different stages of the approval process require new fields to be populated, and existing data to be extended.

55. The first stage of approval is School approval to proceed (Gate one). As a minimum the following additional fields should be completed:

- a. The Subject Group area which will 'own' the provision
- b. The intended award (including options for where the provision does not lead to an award)
- c. The intended credit value associated with the award which must be in compliance with the minimum requirements set out in the University academic regulations
- d. Whether the provision is collaborative
- e. The type of provision
- f. Estimated date of first intake



- g. Brief overview of the proposed provision (just a few sentences at this gateway)
- h. Brief rationale statement (just a few sentences at this gateway).

56. This first stage proposal can then be submitted for approval to proceed.

57. If the provision includes a partner or comes under the category of collaborative provision, additional processes detailed within Section 4 of the Quality Framework must also be undertaken.

58. There is nothing to stop the completion of further fields in the provision record, though one of the principles of Curriculum Management is to ensure efficient use of staff resource, and should the proposal not be supported to proceed by the School, time and effort risks being wasted. Only short courses may be supported through an expedited approach through Gates one and two.

59. The School Leadership Team (or a delegated authority approved by the Dean of School) will consider these early-stage proposals and confirm that they can proceed to further, more detailed development or will recommend the proposal be cancelled if not supported by the School. Approval at this stage notifies a number of stakeholders, primarily for information to ensure that they can plan sufficient time to support the proposal, if necessary, on its approval journey.

60. The second stage of approval is the satisfactory completion of robust business rationale to underpin the proposal (Gate two). This should be informed by market intelligence and other resource information to ensure strategic fit and financial sustainability. It is an expectation that colleagues from Planning & Business Intelligence and Finance take an active support role in this stage of the proposal



development, though the provision lead has a responsibility to initiate discussions and monitor progress with respect to this. Consideration of reputational, financial or other risks associated with the proposal should also be considered alongside how these might be mitigated. The University's approach to risk management can be found on the [Governance Services web pages](#).

As a minimum the following additional fields should be completed:

- a. Worktribe reference, if this is a commercial provision
- b. Course group (Planning & Business Intelligence to advise)
- c. SCQF level of final award (if applicable)
- d. Consideration of the risks associated with the provision proposal
- e. Confirmation with respect to whether a risk assessment is required, or not.
- f. Detail any external organisations associated with the provision proposal
- g. Detail any development costs associated with the provision proposal, including if specialist space will be required
- h. Detail any staff delivery costs associated with the provision proposal
- i. Detail any non-staff delivery costs associated with the provision proposal
- j. Confirm how the proposal relates to the School and University strategic objectives
- k. Provide specific information on how this proposal aligns and supports the University's employability strategy
- l. Provide supporting market intelligence research (add supporting documentation if appropriate)
- m. Confirm if there is potential for PSRB accreditation
- n. Provide an indication as to whether other Schools may be contributing to the provision (for example a proportion of modules)
- o. Provide an indicative breakdown of student numbers
- p. Confirm if any additional documents have been uploaded to support this gateway.





- q. Add information with respect to fees and funding.

Once this information has been considered and entered into the provision record it can be submitted for consideration at Gate two.

61. The Dean of School is responsible for confirming that the business rationale is sufficiently robust for the provision development to continue. A snapshot of the record is captured at this time and added as a support document, as it is recognised that the data relating to the business rationale is likely to continue to develop as the provision proposal firms up prior to submission for approval.

62. Once the business rationale is approved, the remainder of the provision record can be completed focussing primarily on the academic design of the programme working towards the point of consideration for approval (Gate three). Edinburgh Napier expects programme design to be informed by external and internal reference points including, but not restricted to:

- a. [Subject Benchmark Statements](#), where applicable
- b. Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Frameworks, where applicable
- c. The [Scottish Credit & Qualifications Framework](#)
- d. [The QAA Characteristics Statements](#), where applicable e.g. for Masters degrees; and short microcredential courses
- e. [Edinburgh Napier Strategy, and supporting enabling strategies](#) – particularly the Learning & Teaching Strategy
- f. [Edinburgh Napier Academic Regulations](#)
- g. Edinburgh Napier Curriculum Enhancement Framework



During the development phase, consideration should be given as to when and how to engage relevant stakeholder groups, including students; alumni networks; industry (or industry liaison panels); employers etc.

Internal stakeholders within the University will be notified that the proposal is progressing to development stage and they should be invited by the provision lead to support the design, as appropriate, assisting with feedback and guidance on the draft provision record to help the proposal to meet University expectations first time.

63. The provision record must capture the outcomes of the development, including:

- a) The programme learning outcomes developed to take account of the Scottish Credit & Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Programme learning outcomes are typically setting out the knowledge and the skills which should be achieved for the successful completion of the programme. [Subject Benchmark Statements published by the Quality Assurance Agency](#) may provide general guidance to support the articulation of learning outcomes typically associated with disciplinary areas.
- b) The admission requirements for this provision to ensure that students entering the programme are prepared for success, including recognition of prior learning. For provision leading to an award of the University, there is an expectation that the University Admissions and Recruitment team can help to develop and articulate this information in the provision record.
- c) Curriculum design should be a collaborative exercise undertaken in partnership with colleagues, including the module leaders responsible for, or developing, modules included within the programme (provision structure) and with the



appropriate support of relevant professional services. The Curriculum Design tab allows the expression of the outcomes of these discussions to provide prospective students and other stakeholders with confidence that the programme has clear aims, a coherent learning and teaching approach across its constituent modules and adopts inclusive principles in its design; that student support specific to this provision has been considered; that the opportunities offered to students on the provision, if applicable, are transparent and that prospective students are clear as to what employment and further study opportunities might follow from successful completion of the programme. A report can be generated from the Curriculum Management Environment to consider assessment patterns across the modules in the provision structure and this should be used to consider the student experience with respect to assessment tasks.

- d) Given the strategic importance of the Edinburgh Napier Curriculum Enhancement Framework (ENhance) there is a separate opportunity to present the provision's strengths and areas for development with respect to the ENhance themes, though aspects of ENhance are also expected to be woven through, and evident throughout the proposal.
  
- e) The module (or module availabilities) associated with the provision proposal should be added within the structure, in compliance with the University academic regulations to ensure that modules with the sufficient and correct credit values be studied at each stage of study. The compulsory modules selected must be mapped against each appropriate programme learning outcome (ie. If the module is passed which PLOs are achieved).



- f) Any expenses to be incurred by students, specific to the provision. It is important that this is transparent to prospective students from the outset.

In completing this information, consideration may be given to the guidance provided to University Approval Panel members (Appendix 4).

64. The provision record includes opportunity for internal stakeholders to add comments with respect to how advice and guidance has been incorporated to provide transparency in the curriculum design process and to reassure School Quality and Curriculum Management Committees that due process has been undertaken during the development phase in advance for submission for University Approval (where applicable). Typically, relevant internal stakeholders (dependent on the type and nature of the proposed provision) will either meet and/or review the proposal during the development and as it reaches completion add a statement for the attention of the School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee/University Approval Panel. This might be to confirm that feedback has been satisfactorily incorporated; or to highlight potential risks that the Committee should be altered to. Engagement of internal stakeholders in completing these statements will be regularly monitored with respect to the effectiveness of this approach to co-creation.

### **Approval of Provision not leading to an award of the University**

65. The School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee has responsibility for considering and approving non-credit bearing provision and provision that does not lead to an award of the University (for example short courses), with the exception of those delivered in partnership with another organisation which must adhere to CPC guidance. In approving these proposals the School Quality &



Curriculum Management Committee will assess, using the collective academic and professional experience, whether University expectations for the academic standard and quality of the student learning experience are satisfactorily met and that the proposal presents no significant reputational risk. Following the approval of non-credit bearing provision, the School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee should ensure that the provision leads are aware of operational requirements which must be undertaken to complete the course set-up.

66. The School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee has responsibility for confirming the readiness of proposals for provision leading to an award of the University to progress to university-level approval.

#### **Approval of Provision leading to an award of the University (as set out in Regulation A4)**

67. A University Approvals Panel can be allocated and set following School approval to progress. The School Academic Lead for Quality, in consultation with the Head of Quality & Enhancement, will appoint the University Approvals Panel. Panel members are required to have completed mandatory training prior to participating.

68. A standard University Approvals Panel will consist of:

- a. a convenor (typically a member of an Academic Board sub-committee, but not from the proposing school)
- b. at least one independent external academic peer who is a subject specialist in the proposal under consideration,



- c. an independent student panel member (appointed from the pool maintained by DLTE)
- d. an academic peer from another School (typically a member of an Academic Board sub-committee or a colleague who has achieved fellowship of the HEA – ideally this should also be an individual from a different School to the Convenor)
- e. a professional service colleague (typically a member of an Academic Board sub-committee or a colleague who has achieved or is seeking fellowship of the HEA, including Associate Fellowship)
- f. a member of the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement, nominated by the Head of Quality & Enhancement
- g. a clerk from the sponsoring School Support team.

69. If a programme team would find it beneficial to have additional members of the University Approvals Panel, for example representatives from industry or the professional, statutory or regulatory body this should be discussed during the preparation for the event. In the spirit of transparency and to support opportunities for training and development, each University Approvals Panel event will also permit one observer to sit alongside the Approvals Panel members – however this observer is not a member of the Approvals Panel and is not involved in its decision-making processes. Requests to participate as an observer should be directed to the Head of Quality & Enhancement. It is recommended that consideration is given to encouraging diversity within panel membership.

70. Given the purpose of the University Approvals Panel the event will always be arranged as a synchronous meeting.

71. A typical University Approvals Panel agenda will, as a minimum, include:



- a. a meeting of the Panel to confirm detailed agenda and areas of focus
- b. a meeting with programme team (which can also include colleagues from the professional services who contribute to the programme) and Senior School representatives, as appropriate to clarify any points arising from Panel members' initial scrutiny. Programme representatives may wish to deliver a short introductory presentation (5-10 minutes), or a presentation may be recorded to be provided to the Panel in advance.
- c. A physical or virtual tour of specialist learning and teaching facilities relevant to the proposal (where appropriate)
- d. a meeting of the Panel to discuss and agree the outcome of the approval event
- e. a meeting with programme and School representatives to provide initial feedback on the outcome of the University Approvals Panel.

72. The agenda for each University Approvals Panel will be agreed by the University Approvals Panel convenor in liaison with the DLTE Quality & Standards Manager associated with the School and will be based on the indicative schedule attached at Appendix 3.

73. The following information should be made available to University Approval Panel members 20 working days in advance of the event:

- a. A schedule of the event, including names and job titles of panel members and the Programme Approvals Panel Guide (Appendix 4)
- b. The programme specification output from the Curriculum Management Environment, or view access to the record in the Curriculum Management Environment



- c. Confirmation of stakeholder engagement, including feedback from external peer
- d. Module booklet, providing module descriptors for all modules within the structure
- e. Minute extract from School Quality & Curriculum Management meeting when proposal was considered.

74. A minimum of 10 business days prior to the event, Panel members should provide the Clerk with a brief written summary of the points they wish to explore with the programme team and Senior School representatives during the meeting. These comments will be shared with the Convenor.

75. The University Approvals Panel will assess, using the collective academic and professional experience and judgement, whether University expectations for the academic standard and quality of the student learning experience for a taught award or credit-bearing programmes are met. The Panel will also provide comment and feedback on the overall appropriateness, quality and standard of the proposal and provide a judgement with respect to achievement of the University Curriculum Enhancement Framework threshold.

76. The outcomes available to the University Approvals Panel are:

- a. **Approved** without amendment to the Provision proposal record
- b. **Approved with recommendations** which the programme team will be encouraged to reflect on in implementing the proposal. Unlike conditions, recommendations do not need to be taken into account before the programme is offered to students. However, recommendations should be





incorporated into the Programme Team's Programme Enhancement Action Plan and the plan must be signed off by the Convenor.

- c. **Approved with conditions** which must be addressed and the amended proposal record signed-off by the Panel Convenor before the proposal can be deemed to be approved. In such cases the University Approvals Panel will provide the programme team with precise feedback on the matters to be addressed. In discussion with the programme team the Panel will agree a date by which the proposal can be amended to take account of each condition which will enable the convenor to sign-off the proposal as being approved.
  
- d. **Not approved.** In the unlikely event that the University Approvals Panel does not believe that a proposal can be approved the Panel will provide the programme team with precise feedback on the matters to be addressed before the decision can be reconsidered. In such cases the Panel convenor will provide the Dean of School, School Academic Lead for Quality and the relevant Head of School Support Service with the reason for this decision being made and precise feedback on the matters to be addressed before the decision can be reconsidered.

77. Students must not be offered a place on a programme until academic approval has been granted. Prior to approval being granted, the programme may be advertised but must clearly state that it is subject to formal approval.

78. The Clerk is required to produce a report including the following as a minimum:

- a. The title of the provision under consideration and the date



- b. The names and job titles of Panel Members
- c. Key themes raised by panel members and explored during the event
- d. The outcome reached with respect to approval, including period of approval (no more than six years) which must be recorded in the provision record by the Curriculum Management Support Team
- e. The decision reached with respect to Curriculum Enhancement Framework threshold, which will be added into the provision record by the Curriculum Management Support Team
- f. The conditions and recommendations set by the Panel, including date agreed for conditions to be met by.
- g. Commendations or areas of positive practice identified by the Panel which should inform the development of the programme enhancement action plan by the programme leader.

79. The draft report should be shared with the Convenor within 10 business days, though the extract detailing conditions and recommendations should be approved for circulation as soon as possible following the event. The report should be shared with the Programme team for comment on matters of factual accuracy and then approved for circulation to the School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee and the University Quality & Standards Committee.

### **Programme (Provision) Change**

80. This procedure relates to change to the content or structure of an approved provision record after it has been approved by the University Approval Panel or Institutional-led Review (ILR) panel.



81. Opportunities to amend an approved programme may be identified through formal monitoring and review activities or informally as part of ongoing changes to business, staffing or the external environment. The rationale section of the provision record should be updated to reflect the reason and drivers for the proposed change. Consideration should be given as to whether there are any business rationale implications associated with the proposed change. The rationale should detail any consultation that has informed the change proposal, for example feedback from an industry liaison panel; or responding to student feedback etc.

82. Curriculum Management incorporates three categories of provision change, reflecting a risk-based approach to managing the change. Provision leads are only required to propose amendments, the categorisation of change level is determined by the Curriculum Management Support team in liaison with the School Academic Leads for Quality, in adherence to the guidance below:

**a. Academic administration changes (Level 0)**

**Principle –changes are ones which have no consequential change to the student experience or relate to updates agreed as part of wider-University decision making and are outwith the control of the provision lead**

Examples include:

- Updates to the phrasing of existing approved information to re-express what is already delivered/offered (for example to strengthen description of ENhance alignment)
- Annual update of admission criteria by the University's admissions team
- Amendments to provision fee type or source of funding (necessitates a new record)



## **b. Minor changes (Level 1)**

**Principle – changes are minor changes to the provision which do not significantly alter the aims or intended learning outcomes or essence of the programme agreed at the original event. These might be typically considered as ‘house-keeping’ amendments.**

Examples include:

- Updating provision record to take account of level 2 module change proposals
- The addition or removal of optional modules to the programme structure
- Replacement of a compulsory module with another compulsory module which maps to the same programme learning outcomes (more than one substitution per stage of study would be considered a level 2 change)
- PSRB-related amendments

## **c. Major changes (Level 2)**

**Principle – changes are significant changes which could significantly impact or alter the aims or intended learning outcomes or essence of the programme agreed at the original event. The changes require confirmation that measures remain in place to ensure the quality of the student learning experience or student outcomes.**

Examples include:

- Owing School and Subject Group (all necessitates a new record)
- The change of programme title (and exit award titles) (all necessitates a new record)
- Change to other identifying information, including School; award credit; provision type; SCQF level/value (necessitates a new record)



- Changes to the Programme learning outcomes (and the mapping to the modules)
- Additions of pathways into the provision suite
- Change of the mode of delivery
- Changes to the duration of the programme, including entry points
- Changes to provision structure (change of more than one compulsory module per stage of study)
- Requests to suspend recruitment onto the programme temporarily
- Changes to the programme assessment approach which impact how it is described within the provision record
- Changes that impact upon the University regulations
- Incorporation of a placement activity (necessitates a new record)
- Incorporation of collaborative provision (necessitates a new record)

For data-management reasons, some changes necessitate a new record and due to this you will not be able to amend these fields within the *Curriculum Management Environment*. Programme leaders will be required to copy the record to create a new one and then you will be able to make the necessary amendments. Programme leaders should clearly state that this represents a change rather than a new programme proposal in the rationale to ensure that stakeholders are aware of the context of this 'new provision' proposal. This change may require the withdrawal of the previous version of the provision.

83. Curriculum Management notifies affiliated module leaders where a change is proposed in the provision record their module in part of. This is intended to support ongoing communication within programme teams, for example to allow the change proposal to be discussed informally at Programme Boards of Studies



to ensure that the proposed change has no unexpected consequences to the coherence of the programme.

84. The School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee is responsible for maintaining an oversight of all provision changes. Level 0 changes do not require committee consideration or approval, though a report summarising these changes should be periodically received by the Committee to allow it to exercise its oversight duties. Both level 1 and level 2 changes need to be considered and approved by the School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee. Level 2 provision changes require additional scrutiny, including from an external peer/examiner and the Committee must be reassured that relevant stakeholders have had opportunity to comment on the proposed changes

85. In considering the change proposal, School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee should ensure that the provision continues to meet the academic standard for the volume and level of credit as defined in the academic regulations, that the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches (incorporating formative assessment opportunities) enable students to achieve the learning outcomes and that the module continues to provide students with access to a high-quality learning experience.

86. The Curriculum Management System should assist tracking of changes made to programmes over time, which may be helpful information for monitoring the impact of module and programme teams when preparing for the periodic Institution-led Review.



## Programme (Provision) Withdrawal

87. The withdrawal of an approved programme is typically driven by circumstances at subject or school-level and would normally be expected to have been subject to prior discussion at School Board level or as part of the planning round. Withdrawal is for the permanent removal of the offering from Edinburgh Napier's portfolio.
88. Each provision record includes a tab to support the planning of its withdrawal. The rationale for the withdrawal must be clearly stated along with the implications of the closure and the teach-out period. To support this, it is possible to notify stakeholders automatically when a withdrawal proposal is submitted. The implications must clearly be set out, including the arrangements for ensuring that all prospective and current students expecting to undertake the programme are informed of the change.
89. The intended final year and trimester of delivery must be stated, as well as anticipated date for the final graduation (if applicable).
90. School Quality and Curriculum Management Committee is responsible for approving the proposal to withdraw the provision and for ensuring effective management of the teach-out arrangements.
91. In some cases, it may be in the best interests of students for their programme to be completed through a credit transfer or similar arrangement with another higher education institution. The arrangement may lead to a student's registration being transferred to another institution or retained by the University. In cases where students request such an arrangement, the University will take all reasonable



steps to ensure a satisfactory agreement is reached. In cases where the University proposes such an arrangement, students must agree to it in writing.





<b>School Quality &amp; Curriculum Management Committee (2023/24 onwards)</b>	
<b>Terms of Reference</b>	
<p><b>Purpose:</b> To oversee the effective management of quality assurance and enhancement matters relating to the School's taught provision, supporting the implementation of the University's approach to curriculum management and ensuring that full account is taken of the University academic regulations and Quality Framework expectations.</p>	
<p><b>Remit:</b> Working on behalf of the School Education &amp; Student Experience Committee</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider and approve all new taught credit and non-credit bearing modules ensuring that University expectations are adhered to.</li> <li>2. Maintain oversight of all changes made to approved taught modules, and consider and approve significant changes to modules, taking into account any resultant amendments necessary to provision (programme) records</li> <li>3. Maintain oversight of new taught provision under development to ensure sufficient and timely guidance and support is being allocated (from within the School and wider University) during its development</li> <li>4. Review and confirm readiness for University consideration of new provision proposals leading to an award of the University.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Quorum:</b> As a minimum the Convenor, one internal academic peer, one external academic peer and a representative from DLTE should contribute to the meeting</p> <p><b>Frequency of Meetings:</b> 10-12 times per year. Extraordinary meetings may be required to consider significant proposals.</p>



<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Consider and approve proposals for provision within the School's remit (non-credit bearing provision; short credit bearing provision that does not lead to an award of the University)</li> <li>6. Consider and approve proposed changes to approved provision, ensuring University expectations are adhered to.</li> <li>7. Maintain oversight of module and provision withdrawal proposals and ensure closure management is in line with University expectations, retaining oversight until closure is completed</li> <li>8. Ensure the timely consideration and reapproval of modules and provision records in accordance with the Institution-Led Review (ILR) planning schedule</li> <li>9. Maintain oversight of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body and accreditation activity underway in the School</li> <li>10. Retain oversight of School Recognition of Prior Learning activity in accordance with the Quality Framework</li> <li>11. Monitor and ensure the effective application of the academic regulations and make recommendations to the University Quality &amp; Standards Committee on any proposed changes, or exemptions required by the School</li> <li>12. Maintain oversight of external examiner appointments, including ensuring timely recruitment and replacement of examiners</li> </ol>	<p><b>Current Working Groups:</b></p> <p>None</p> <p><b>Minutes:</b></p> <p>Minutes and papers will be held in electronic copy</p> <p><b>Reporting line:</b></p> <p>The Group shall report to the School ESEC.</p> <p><b>Equality Issues:</b></p> <p>Those officers with responsibility for nominating or appointing members to the committee as prescribed by the constitution should, in doing so, have due regard to inclusion.</p>
--	--



13. Receive annual reports analysing themes emerging from the external examiner reports and responses provided to examiners
14. Manage and oversee the effectiveness of annual monitoring and review activity in the School, ensuring that matters relating to the enhancement of learning, teaching and assessment practices are shared with the School Education and Student Experience Committee
15. Provide feedback on the implementation of the University's Curriculum Management arrangements, including recommendations for further develop thereof.

### **Constitution & Membership**

- School Academic Lead for Quality (Convenor)
- At least one representative from each Subject Group within the School (internal academic peers)
- Representative from another School (external academic peer)
- Representative from the Quality & Standards team within the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement
- Student member (ideally recruited through Student Quality Consultant scheme)
- School Quality & Accreditation Manager

Supported by a Quality Officer from the School Support Service.

All members should receive induction training on appointment.

[Course: School Quality & Curriculum Management Committee Training |](#)

[Moodle Community - Edinburgh Napier University](#)



## Provision Naming Guidance when incorporating more than one subject

### Subject components

- Subject components assist the University in achieving consistency in the ways in which qualification titles convey information about the level, nature and subjects of study in accordance with expectations set out in [The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies](#).
- A subject component is a grouping of modules from the same subject area which, when combined with other subject components, form an approved programme of study. The term 'component' in this instance is not to be confused with components of assessment defined in the academic regulations.
- a joint award title indicates that there is an approximately equal balance between two subject components. The award title can reflect this with 'and' between the subjects eg. English and Film
- a combined award title indicates that there is a major and a minor subject component where the minor subject component accounts for at least a quarter of the programme. The award title can reflect this by the word 'with' appearing between the subjects eg. English with Film

### Joint honours undergraduate programmes

- The award title for a joint bachelor's degree with honours and all exit award titles will take the form *Subject A and Subject B*.
- To gain a joint bachelor's degree with honours a student must successfully achieve:



- a. 480 credits, with neither component falling below 200 credits or exceeding 240 credits, from the pool of compulsory or option modules, and including a minimum of 40 credits at SCQF level 10 as a dissertation or final project.
- b. Table 1 sets out the minimum and maximum credit requirements in each subject component from the pool of compulsory or option modules to gain a joint bachelor’s degree with honours and all associated exit awards.

**Table 1: Minimum and maximum credit requirements in each subject component to gain a joint undergraduate award**

<b>AWARD TITLE</b>	<b>CREDIT TO GAIN AWARD</b>	<b>MINIMUM CREDIT</b>	<b>MAXIMUM CREDIT</b>
Joint bachelor's degree with honours	480	200	240
Joint bachelor's degree	360	160	200
Joint diploma of higher education	240	120	120
Joint certificate of higher education	120	60	60

**Combined undergraduate programmes**

- The award title for a combined bachelor’s degree with honours and all exit award titles will take the form *Subject A (major component) with Subject B (minor component)*.
- To gain a combined bachelor’s degree with honours a student must successfully achieve either:
  - a. a maximum of 320 credits in the major subject component and a maximum of 200 credits in the minor subject component from the pool of compulsory



or option modules plus a minimum of 40 credits in either subject component at SCQF level 10 as a dissertation or final project

- b. a minimum of 240 credits in the major subject component and a minimum of 120 credits in the minor subject component from the pool of compulsory or option modules plus 80 credits from either subject component from the pool of compulsory or option modules plus a minimum of 40 credits in either subject component at SCQF level 10 as a dissertation or final project.

Table 2 (major component) and Table 3 (minor component) set out the minimum and maximum credit requirements in each subject component from the pool of compulsory or option modules to gain a combined bachelor's degree with honours and all associated exit awards.



**Table 2: Minimum and maximum credit requirements for a major subject component to gain a combined undergraduate award.**

AWARD TITLE	CREDIT TO GAIN AWARD	MAJOR COMPONENT	
		MINIMUM CREDIT	MAXIMUM CREDIT
Combined bachelor's degree with honours	480	240	320
Combined bachelor's degree	360	200	260
Combined diploma of higher education	240	140	180
Combined certificate of higher education	120	80	80

**Table 3: Minimum and maximum credit requirements for a minor subject component to gain a combined undergraduate award**

AWARD TITLE	CREDIT TO GAIN AWARD	MINOR COMPONENT	
		MINIMUM CREDIT	MAXIMUM CREDIT
Combined bachelor's degree with honours	480	120	200
Combined bachelor's degree	360	100	140
Combined diploma of higher education	240	60	100
Combined certificate of higher education	120	40	40



**Indicative University Approvals Panel agenda**

- 0900            The Panel convenes.
- 0900-1030      The Panel meets to confirm the topics to be covered during the meeting with programme team and School representatives.
- 1030-1200      The Board meets with programme team and School and/or external representatives to discuss matters arising from their reading of the proposal.
- 1200-1245      The Board meets to reflect on the outcome of the meeting with programme team and School representatives. This will include:
- recording a decision with regard to the proposal
  - agreeing any conditions or recommendations
  - agreeing a position with respect to ENhance threshold
  - identifying achievements, strengths and areas of innovative or positive practice
- 1245-1300      The Board meets with programme team and School representatives to provide initial feedback on the outcome of the Programme Approvals Board.

Please note, this agenda is indicative and will require adaptation if additional business is being considered as part of the approval event.





## The Programme Approvals Panel Guide

This guide is intended to provide guidance to support panel members in applying their academic and professional experience and judgement to consider the overall appropriateness, quality and standard of a proposal for a new taught award or credit-bearing programme.

It provides Panel members with indicative headings for setting out the points they wish to discuss with the programme team and School representatives during their meeting.

Panel members comments may be shared with other Panel members before the meeting takes place, but will not be shared with the School or programme team.

Please note, the prompts are intended to support members as they read through the proposal and members should not feel obliged to comment on all of the topics, nor should members feel restricted in limiting comments to the themes listed below. Experience and expertise will determine the themes members would wish to explore further with the programme team.

Panel members may find it helpful to enrol on [the University Moodle Course which has been developed to support panel members](#).

As external panel members may be unable to access the Moodle course, we have produced supplementary guidance specifically for external panel members and this is available to access from the [Quality Framework's related resources page](#).

The Quality & Standards team will continue to review and update this guide to ensure that it best supports the delivery of the University Strategy and feedback is welcome from colleagues via [quality@napier.ac.uk](mailto:quality@napier.ac.uk)



1. **General comments and feedback on the proposal**
  - a. first overall impression of the proposal, for example, anything that you think is missing or anything that has pleased, surprised or disappointed you
  - b. any perceived areas of good or innovative practice, strengths and achievements
  - c. any areas where you consider further development or improvement would be of benefit
  - d. any additional information that you would wish to have made available
  
2. **Specific Themes for Consideration:**
  - a. Does the proposal take appropriate account of internal and external reference points, such as the Subject Benchmark Statements; University academic regulations; PSRB requirements (if applicable)? Do the award and exit award titles sufficiently reflect the content and learning outcomes?
  
  - b. Does the proposal offer students a well-structured and coherent journey through their programme? Is it clear how the modules support the achievement of the programme aims and learning outcomes? Is there a coherency to the programme proposal's assessment and feedback approaches and structures in place for student support and guidance?
  
  - c. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the programme supports and contributes towards Edinburgh Napier's strategy? Is the proposal sufficiently supported by the School/University (staff resource and expertise; facilities; support infrastructures etc)?



- d. Does the proposal support industry/employer needs? Has sufficient consideration been given to external expertise?
- e. Is there sufficient evidence that the proposal is student-focussed? For example, is there evidence that the proposal has been shaped as a result of student voice/feedback; does the proposal offer opportunities for students to shape their curriculum, for example is choice offered to students?
- f. Is there sufficient evidence that the proposal promotes skills in digital and data literacy and the creative use of digital technologies, and recognises that students may be starting from different baseline abilities?
- g. Is there evidence that the proposal has considered how the curriculum links to communities beyond the University? Are there activities within the proposal to develop and strengthen disciplinary or student communities within the University?
- h. Is there evidence of the programme team's consideration of the University's Curriculum Enhancement Framework's themes: employability; research-practice integration; inclusion; global outlook; sustainability. Are the themes embedded in the curriculum (content; student opportunities; learning design; assessment strategy etc). Where are the areas of strength? Are any themes dependent upon a single module/staff member?



<b>Programme Boards of Studies</b>	
<b>Terms of Reference</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b> To be responsible to the School Education and Student Experience Committee for the development, planning, management, operation and enhancement of the programme	
<p><b>Remit:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To ensure that the operation of the programme complies with the University expectations with respect to the academic calendar; academic regulations and any professional or statutory body requirements, where appropriate.</li> <li>2. To consider proposals for changes to the programme and its constituent modules to ensure the coherence, academic standard and the quality of learning opportunities provided by the programme of study are maintained and enhanced.</li> <li>3. To ensure that any significant matter affecting the delivery of the programme is addressed in an effective and appropriate manner, taking into account current management or resource implications or constraints, as appropriate.</li> <li>4. To ensure that the programme of study is subjected to appropriate internal and external peer review to confirm that the assessment arrangements remain appropriate to the nature of the intended learning outcomes and that the programme of study meets the standard expected by the academic community.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Quorum:</b></p> <p>As a minimum the Convenor, a student representative and one third of the membership</p> <p><b>Frequency of Meetings:</b></p> <p>At least 3 times per year</p> <p><b>Current Working Groups:</b></p> <p>None</p> <p><b>Minutes:</b></p> <p>Minutes and papers will be held in electronic copy</p>



<p>5. To ensure that there are effective formal and informal methodologies for communicating with students, including adequate means for providing students with appropriate responses to all matters raised, including ensuring that all students are informed of ongoing changes made in response to student feedback.</p> <p>6. To monitor and review module and programme performance and student outcomes data (including student recruitment targets).</p> <p>7. To ensure the timely completion of annual monitoring and review informed by evidence and data gathered during the academic session.</p> <p>8. To maintain and regularly review the programme enhancement plan, taking into account opportunities for improvement or sharing of positive practice.</p> <p><b>Constitution &amp; Membership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme Leader (Convenor)</li> <li>▪ Depute programme leader</li> <li>▪ All constituent (or relevant?) module leaders</li> <li>▪ Student representative(s) from across all years of the programme</li> <li>▪ Programme Administrator</li> </ul> <p>If the programme board of studies oversees a suite of programmes – the convenor should be the programme director and all programme leaders should be members.</p>	<p><b>Reporting line:</b></p> <p>Reporting to the School ESEC.</p> <p><b>Equality Issues:</b></p> <p>Those officers with responsibility for nominating or appointing members to the Programme Board of Studies as prescribed by the constitution should, in doing so, have due regard to inclusion.</p>
--	---

### **Suggested Indicative Forward Schedule of Business**



**Autumn**

- Reflection of induction process for new starters/direct entrants
- Consideration of matters raised during SSLC
- Annual monitoring and review – incorporating module and programme performance data; student survey feedback; external examiner feedback; other student and stakeholder feedback
- Review and update of programme enhancement plan, including consideration of strategic School or University initiatives
- Admission and recruitment update
- Timetable feedback
- Consideration of module/programme change proposals and confirmation of changes approved by the School/University
- Resource and Staffing planning, including liaison with external examiners
- Programme operational issues

**Winter/Spring**

- Reflection on Tri 1 module survey results; Assessment Boards and student outcomes/support needs (including post board academic counselling)
- Consideration of matters raised during SSLC
- Consideration of module/programme change proposals and confirmation of changes approved by the School/University
- Review and update of programme enhancement plan, including consideration of strategic School or University initiatives
- Resource and staffing planning, including liaison with external examiners
- Programme operational issues

**Spring/Summer**

- Reflection on Tri 2 to date and planning arrangements for the PABs, or outcomes following the Boards
- Consideration of matters raised during SSLC
- Identify themes for programme annual report, including a reflection on areas of good practice and innovation
- Review and update of programme enhancement plan including consideration of strategic School or University initiatives
- Consideration of module/programme change proposals and confirmation of changes approved by the School/University
- Resource and staffing planning, including liaison with external examiners
- Programme operational issues

Version	Update Details
<b>Management</b>	
V1 – Approved January 2023	detail pilot approach to student membership in School Quality & Curriculum Management Committees; clarify professional services contribution to new programme approval; clarify terminology on subject components.
V1.2 – Updated September 2023	
V1.3 Updated September 2024	Clarity added with respect to module to PLO mapping

