# CPC3 – Points to be considered during the academic approval process

This guide is intended to provide Collaborative Provision Committee’s approval panel members with a list of potential topics to be considered when assessing, using their academic and professional experience and judgement, the overall appropriateness, quality and standard of a proposal for a new taught award or credit-bearing programme. It also provides panel members with indicative headings for setting out the points they wish to discuss with the programme team and partner representatives during the approval meeting. Where appropriate, a summary of panel members’ comments will be shared with programme team(s) and partners before the meeting takes place.

Please note, the prompts are intended to support panel members as they read through the documentation, and panel 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 panel members would wish to explore further with the programme team.

The Quality & Standards team will continue to review and update this guide to ensure that it best supports the delivery of the University’s approved Strategy and feedback is welcome from colleagues via [quality@napier.ac.uk](http://staff.napier.ac.uk/services/dlte/quality/qualityframework/Pages/section4forms.aspx)

1. **General comments and feedback on the proposal.**
2. first overall impression of the proposal, for example, anything that you think is missing or anything that has pleased, surprised or disappointed you
3. any perceived areas of good or innovative practice, strengths and achievements
4. any areas where you consider further development, or improvement would be of benefit
5. any additional information that you would wish to have made available either before the panel meeting or on arrival at the meeting.
6. **Specific Themes for Consideration:**
7. Contributing to the implementation of University Strategy. How effective is the proposal in providing a clear focus on the programme(s) with local ownership and a holistic view of the student journey from enquiry to completion?
8. How effective is the proposal in indicating how the programme(s) will contribute towards addressing the following specific key strategic deliverables:

* developing strong links with business
* encouraging articulation from partner colleges
* providing placement and enterprise opportunities for all students
* providing international study opportunities and increased outward mobility for all students
* encouraging student engagement with Edinburgh Napier Students’ Association to enhance experience, engagement and volunteering
* encouraging effective programme representation and peer mentoring
* embracing innovation in learning and teaching and the use of technology to support learning
* adopting a pedagogic approach based on active learning and principles of assessment for learning.

1. **Academic standards** (information for commenting on this section will primarily be drawn from the programme provision record)
2. How effective is the proposal in taking appropriate account of external reference points in setting the academic standard of the proposed provision?

* The framework for qualifications of higher education institutions in Scotland
* relevant qualification and/or subject benchmark statements
* professional, statutory or regulatory body requirements where appropriate.

1. Comment on the appropriateness of the intended learning outcomes required to achieve the final award and any exit awards available to students who do not complete the programme.
2. Comment on the extent to which the proposed learning, teaching and assessment approaches enable students to achieve the programme and exit award learning outcomes.
3. Comment on the extent to which student focus, inclusion, employability, sustainability, research practice & integrations, citizenship and community and digital & information literacy are embedded within the programme.
4. Comment on the extent of the mechanism and responsibilities in place for:

* the management of academic standards
* the assessment, moderation and external examining of the proposed provision
* monitoring and reviewing the proposed provision and reporting on the outcome of such activity.

1. **Quality of learning opportunities.**
2. Comment on the overall quality and coherence of the proposed student learning experience including academic and pastoral support and students’ wider educational needs.
3. Comment on the mechanisms to enable students to provide the programme team with systematic feedback on their learning experience.
4. Comment on the extent of the mechanism and responsibilities in place for:

* The admissions process and ensuring that it has been discussed with and understood by the partner, particularly in relation to evidence of students’ English language scores and certificates
* the management and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities
* assuring that the quality of teaching and learning is being maintained and enhanced
* assuring that students are supported effectively
* providing staff with access to personal development to facilitate the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities
* ensuring that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes.

1. Comment on the mechanisms to ensure that learning resources are accessible to students and sufficient to enable them to achieve the learning outcomes.
2. How effective is the proposal in supporting the strategic objective of providing students with a personalised learning experience through individual support?
3. **Published information.**
4. Comment on the appropriateness of the mechanism and responsibilities for communicating information on the proposed provision to potential students and other stakeholders.
5. Comment on the appropriateness of the mechanism and responsibilities for assuring the accuracy and completeness of published information that is managed by the school.
6. **Partnership information.**
7. Comment on the ability of the partner to deliver the proposed provision and support students’ learning (for example, the adequacy of subject learning resources, the experience, qualifications and availability of academic staff and the provision of social and recreational facilities).
8. Comment on the partner’s understanding of UK higher education quality assurance and enhancement expectations (for example, knowledge of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, a clear understanding of the University’s expectations on the provision of student assessment feedback and the annual monitoring process).
9. Comment on the extent of partnership working between University and partner programme teams.