DRAFT/CHAIR’S APPROVED DRAFT/CONFIRMED\*

\*amend as appropriate

<faculty Name>

Section 1: Event details

**Programme Approval/Re-validation** \*delete as appropriate

**Report of panel event held on <date> at <time> in <location>**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Award Title/s  (incl. all interim exit awards) |  |
| Course code |  |
| Programme Leader |  |
| Liaison Manager  (collaborative programmes only) |  |
| Start date |  |
| Period of approval | Only if the panel wishes to set a period of approval of less than 5 years. |
| Latest revalidation due date | Enter academic year (up to five years from commencement of delivery) |
| PSRB accreditation | If applicable |
| Conformity to the University Regulations for Study | Conforms to the <insert specific framework>  *or*  Is at variance with the <insert framework> as follows:  The variations have been approved by QLIC on <give date of approval and minute reference> and are noted in the Programme Specification. |
| Implementation plan, and effect on other programmes, if applicable | Ensure sufficient detail is given to enable the Student Records & Curriculum Management Team to update the University record, e.g. if existing provision is being replaced, indicate date of last cohort, and complete a closure form for the discontinued provision. |

**Context**

The proposal under consideration was…

Give brief contextual details, in order to aid readers’ understanding of the rest of the report. Please refer to the notes attached to this template (in Table 1) for guidance on what to include.

**Panel Membership**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Chair:** | |
| Name | Job title and Faculty |
| **Internal panel members:** | |
| Name | Job title and Faculty |
| Name | Job title and Faculty |
| Name | Job title and Faculty |
| **External panel member:** | |
| Name | Job title and institution |
| **Panel Officer:** | |
| Name | Quality Assurance Officer, APQO |
| **Panel Secretary:** | |
| Name | Job title and Faculty |
| **In attendance:** (if any other staff are in attendance, indicate the capacity in which they joined the Panel) | |
| Name | Job title and reason for attending |

SECTION 2: EVIDENCE BASE

2.1 The Panel was provided with the following information:

The minimum requirements are set out in the Quality & Standards Handbook, but you may wish to add to this list to reflect any additional evidence submitted by the programme team to support the proposal.

* Submission document
* Programme specification/s
* Programme handbook/s
* Module descriptors
* List other documentation received here….

2.2 The Panel also met with the Programme Development Team listed below:

Extend/shorten this list as applicable and indicate role in delivering/managing the programme.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** |
|  | e.g. Programme Lead; Module Leader; Head of Department; etc |
|  |  |

2.3 If the Panel met with any students, give brief details of the number of students, and their programme and year of study (names should not be included).

2.4 Give details of any campus tours provided for the Panel, and details of the facilities and learning resources viewed.

In forming their conclusions (see section 3 below), the Panel referred to the programme approval criteria, as stated in the Quality and Standards Handbook (G2.3)

SECTION 3: CONCLUSIONS

Please refer to the notes in Table 2 for guidance on how to complete this section.

**3.1** The Panel decision was to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of the programme/s to the University’s Quality & Learning Infrastructure Committee, subject to x conditions and y recommendations (see below).

*OR*

The Panel decision was to REFER the proposal for further work as there were a number of significant issues to be addressed (the main body of the report should clearly outline the issues that need to be addressed in the re-submitted proposal). This was to allow time for the Programme Development Team to consult more widely and fully revise the documentation, to be considered by a re-convened Panel on a date to be agreed.

*OR*

The Panel decision was to REJECT the proposal due to a range of substantive issues which need to be addressed. This decision requires the proposal to be re-submitted for approval from the start of the process as set out in the Quality & Standards Handbook, and section 4 of the report should be clear about the deficiencies in the submission which led to the panel’s conclusion that the criteria for approval could not be met.

**3.2 Commendations**

The Panel commended the Programme Development Team on the following points of good practice:

List commendations.

**3.3 Conditions**

In order to meet the criteria for approval, the Programme Development Team must:

List conditions (*giving section 4 paragraph references*).

It was agreed that the revised documentation, including a report on how the conditions have been addressed, using the University template for responses to conditions, should be submitted to the Panel Chair and QAO by <date>.

**3.4 Recommendations**

The Panel recommended that the Programme Development Team give consideration to the points listed below:

List recommendations here (*giving section 4 paragraph references*).

The Programme Team’s initial response to the recommendations should be included in the ‘responses to conditions and recommendations’ report, with further detail about any action taken to be provided in the next annual programme review report.

**3.5 Matters for consideration/monitoring by the Faculty**

(see guidance note in Table 2 - delete if not applicable)

**3.6 Matters for consideration by the University**

(see guidance note in Table 2 - delete if not applicable)

RECORD OF DISCUSSIONS LEADING TO CONCLUSIONS

See Table 3 in the guidance notes.

* 1. **<INSERT HEADING HERE>** 
     1. Text
     2. Text
  2. **<INSERT HEADING HERE>** 
     1. Text
     2. Text

Add more paragraphs, as necessary.

REPORT SIGN OFF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Chair | Date of approval of draft |
| Panel | Date confirmed by panel members |
| University QLIC | Date of receipt |
| Faculty AESC/QLIC | Date of receipt |

See Table 4 in the guidance notes on the process for approval of the report.

**Please delete the rubric in red, and any other text which does not apply, before submitting the report.**

**GUIDANCE NOTES – DELETE THESE PAGES BEFORE SUBMITTING THE REPORT**

*Table 1*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SECTION 1**  This sectionof the report sets out the official information about the programme/s being approved, which are required in order to ensure the University’s systems are set up correctly, and gives some context for the event. You will see some text in red, indicating a part of the report where you need to make a choice or add content to that section – please delete any red guidance text once the report is complete. This section is largely self-explanatory, but the notes below might help you with some of the more complex parts of this section. | |
| **Conformity to the University’s Regulations for Study** | The majority of new programmes should conform to the regulations, but it is important that any variations required are formally approved and recorded in the report (in order to inform Registry so they can ensure the programme is set up correctly on the system), on the programme specification and in the student handbook. |
| **Implementation** | the documentation submitted by the programme team should indicate the arrangements for implementing the new programme (e.g. the date that each level of the new programme will be implemented) and any impact this will have on existing provision, and this should be summarised in the relevant box in section 1. In the case where the new programme replaces current provision, the panel should be satisfied that key stakeholders, especially existing students, and applicants holding offers, have been consulted and are in agreement with the proposed implementation arrangements. |
| **Context** | Under this heading, you should draw out and summarise the key aspects of the proposal under consideration (the submission document is likely to be a useful reference for this section, but don’t simply cut and paste from it). Key points might include, for example:   * the programme is new provision (state which Department/School will be managing it) * the programme is new and replacing existing provision (state what it is replacing) * the proposal is for a revalidation of existing provision (briefly outline the nature of the revisions, and state whether it is a quinquennial revalidation, which replaced periodic review in 2020-21) * the programme is making use of existing modules (state which programmes these are drawn from) * the programme is breaking new ground for the Faculty * the programme has been designed to meet the needs of a particular sector * the event combines programme approval and PSRB accreditation * etc.   If the programme is to be delivered by a collaborative partner give brief details of:   * whether this is a new or existing partner;   + if new, state the nature of the partner organisation and its experience of delivering higher education;   + if an existing partner, whether it is an ACP member or (if not ACP) how long there has been a relationship between the University and the partner organisation; * date of approval (or extension) of the partnership by LPAG and details of any areas LPAG asked the approval panel to explore (which should be recorded in the main body of the report); * for ACP provision, identify any of the programme/s which are to be delivered as part of an apprenticeship standard, and give the date of approval of the apprenticeship proposal (T7.1 form) by LPAG; * the key purpose/context for the development of the collaborative provision; * whether this is a completely new programme, or a programme also being delivered on campus at Brookes or by other partners; * for Foundation Degrees, state the Honours degree progression options available to graduates; * any other distinctive aspects of the proposal. |

*Table 2*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SECTION 3**  This sectionof the report gives details of the panel’s conclusions with respect to the approval of the proposal. The majority of proposals reaching this stage of the approval process are approved, with or without a number of conditions and recommendations, which should also be stated. However, the panel may refer or reject the proposal (with reasons which should be clear from the account of the discussions recorded in section 4), in which case you should select one of the optional paragraphs in 3.1. Remember to delete the text which does not apply. | |
| **Commendations** | Commendations should relate to action that is being taken which the panel considers to be having a particularly positive effect on the quality of teaching and learning. Try to articulate the commendations so as to be specific about the good practice identified by the panel – this will assist QLIC/TLEC and the equivalent Faculty committees to disseminate good practice and therefore improve practice in teaching, assessing and supporting learning across the University. |
| **Conditions** | Conditions should be set where essential action is required to address an issue which has the potential to put academic standards at risk; or where action is required in order to meet the University’s criteria for approval or other procedural or documentary requirements. Remember that the programme/s can only be advertised as ‘subject to validation’, and delivery of the programme/s cannot commence, until all conditions have been met.  It is important that conditions and recommendations (see below) are expressed clearly, so that it is plain to the programme teams what action they are expected to take in response (especially when a proposal has been referred and requires re-submission). Try to avoid the use of vague or generic terms, or technical jargon, when describing conditions and recommendations. |
| **Recommendations** | Recommendations are more advisory in nature and refer to action that the panel feel would enhance the learning experience but where no threat is posed to academic standards or to the student experience. They should be addressed in the PDT’s response to conditions and recommendations, but action does not need to be completed before the new programme delivery starts. |
| **Matters for the Faculty** | This is where you may record any issues that do not affect the completion of the programme approval process, but require attention as soon as possible after approval has been confirmed and therefore need to be monitored by the Faculty AESC/QLIC. These should be recommendations for action at Faculty level, rather than by the programme team, which can be completed within a reasonable timescale (i.e. not substantially longer than for the completion of conditions set for the programme team). Faculty AESC/QLIC must refer any issues with resourcing implications to the Faculty Executive. |
| **Matters for the University** | These issues are uncommon in the context of new programme approvals, but this is where you may record any institutional issues arising during the approval process, which the Panel considers should be taken into account by QLIC on receipt of this report. |

*Table 3*

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 4**  For approved proposals, this section is required only to include a record of the points discussed in the panel meetings with staff and students which led to the conclusions recorded in section 3 above.  It is important that the Panel explores all the areas set out in the criteria for programme approval (detailed in guidance note G2.3 on the conduct of approval panels) but, as a minimum, the report only needs to record discussions in which the Panel was not satisfied that the criteria were met – and hence led to conditions or recommendations – or where they identified particularly good practice which led to commendations. You should select headings according to the topics covered. A fuller report may be needed in the following situations:   * A Panel may ask for additional areas of discussion to be included in the report, if they feel important undertakings/assurances were given by the PDT, which need recording. * For proposals involving delivery by a collaborative partner, a fuller report may be required, in order to provide assurance that all criteria for University approval were met, for audit/contractual purposes. * Where conjoint approval events are held with professional bodies, there may be a requirement for a fuller report which covers the discussions held under all the approval criteria headings, whether or not conditions/recommendations are set. Make sure you check what the PSRB requirements are, so that you ensure all the relevant information is included. * Where a proposal is referred or rejected, a fuller account of the panel’s deliberations should be provided (most likely covering all the criteria for programme approval), to aid the proposing team in the subsequent development and re-submission of the proposal. |

*Table 4*

|  |
| --- |
| **Approval of the report** |
| The DRAFT report should ideally be checked by the Faculty’s link QAO and submitted to the Chair for approval within two working weeks of the event.  Once the Chair is satisfied with the report, it should be classified as CHAIR’S APPROVED DRAFT and sent to the rest of the panel for their approval.  The report should also be shared with the PDT (who may comment on factual accuracy) at this point, although they should have been provided with a record of the conditions and recommendations immediately after the event.  Once the report has been CONFIRMED through this process (this should ideally be within one month of the event) it should be submitted to the University Quality & Learning Infrastructure Committee via the Faculty’s link QAO. It should also be considered by the Faculty’s equivalent committee (FAESC or FQLIC). |