NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

THE QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT (QME) HANDBOOK

16th Edition, August 2018

CONTENTS

All annexes are available for download from the QME pages of the University intranet:

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the *Quality Management and Enhancement* (QME) Handbook (hereafter "the QME Handbook") is to set out

- The University's Quality Enhancement Policy
- Our approach to academic quality and standards
- Our Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) systems and procedures, and the ways in which these work.

The QME Handbook explains the QME roles and responsibilities of individual staff, course and professional services teams, and the function of University's committees. It also describes the ways in which students are able to participate in quality assurance processes, and the mechanisms used to gather and respond to student feedback. Examples of QME documentation are included in Annexes to the QME Handbook. **All annexes are available for downloading from the QME pages of the intranet (The QME Handbook).**

The University continuously develops its procedures, maintains its track record in high quality provision and consolidates its QME systems. This Handbook is reviewed and updated annually.

July 2018

1. QUALITY ENHANCEMENT POLICY

1.1 A strong and outward-looking specialist University

Norwich University of the Arts is a specialist University with a national reputation for excellence. As an outward-looking specialist Higher Education Institution (HEI) with Taught Degree Awarding Powers (TDAP), the University is prominent in Norwich, the East of England and increasingly in the national and international arena. The University enjoys positive and proactive relationships with other HEIs, the community, business, the creative and cultural professional bodies and feeder institutions. Over its history, The University has developed a strong focus as a creative academic community, with staff and students fully involved in debate and development around its offer and plans for academic development and subsequent review.

The University's Vision is:

To be the best specialist University for Arts, Design, Architecture and Media study in Europe, producing graduates of the highest quality.

Underpinning our Mission are the following Core Values:

We are committed to:

1. Achieving excellence in learning, teaching and the wider student experience, to give our students the best possible preparation for their future lives and careers

2. The continuous development of our curriculum and our academic portfolio, to meet the changing needs of students, the creative and cultural sectors, and society

3. Research, consultancy and other forms of professional and business engagement, to promote innovation, enterprise and the development of knowledge and skills

4. The development of our staff, estate and physical resources, as the bedrock of a professional and supportive academic community, and with equality, diversity and environmental sustainability to the fore

5. Growth and development of the University, to build the organisation's long-term sustainability and strengthen our impact.

1.2 Track record and strengths of the University

The University received a 'Gold' award by the Department for Education in recognition of its excellent standard of teaching in June 2017; the award is valid for up to three years. The Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) Panel identified

teaching, learning and outcomes for students at the University as being consistently outstanding. The TEF Panel Statement of Findings confirms that:

- The provider metrics supplemented by the submission indicate that students from all backgrounds achieve consistently outstanding outcomes. Very high proportions of students continue with their studies and progress to employment or further study, and to highly skilled employment where the provider notably exceeds its benchmark.

- The metrics indicate outstanding levels of satisfaction with assessment and feedback from a diverse body of students, notably exceeding the provider benchmark. The metrics also indicate very high levels of student satisfaction with teaching on my course and with academic support, with below benchmark levels noted for some student groups.

1.2.1   The University has a track record of successful external assessments of its quality and standards by bodies such as the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and Higher Education Funding Council (HEFCE). In 2003, the institution (as Norwich School of Art and Design) underwent a successful QAA institutional audit. Subsequent to this, the institution took the strategic decision to apply to the Privy Council for Taught Degree Awarding Powers (TDAP). These were granted in November 2007 and were implemented on 1 September 2008, at which point the institution was renamed Norwich University College of the Arts.

1.2.2   The institution underwent a further successful QAA institutional audit in November 2010 and following a successful application to the Privy Council, the University College assumed its full University title and became Norwich University of the Arts on 21 January 2013.

1.2.3   HEFCE introduced a revised operating model for quality assessment in 2016-17. From 2016-17, the Annual Provider Review (APR) is the core mechanism HEFCE is using to assess quality in higher education providers. Norwich University of the Arts received a positive outcome for APR in May 2017, which confirms that we fully meet HEFCE's requirements for quality and standards.

1.3   Key strengths of the University include the following:

1.   A national reputation for quality of learning and teaching within a specialist environment
2.   A track record of successful external assessments of its quality and standards
3.   Expert staff with a strong commitment to scholarly activity, research and business/community engagement, and the benefits of these for learning, teaching and course development
4.   A commitment to collaboration and partnership with other education providers, regional and national bodies, the creative industries and the community to enhance the economic prosperity of the region
5.   A broad range of specialist undergraduate and postgraduate taught provision, through to research degree level
6.   Effective governance, management and leadership

7. Sound finances and an integrated approach to course and professional services development, evaluation and review, with resource planning and investment
8. High-quality specialist learning resources
9. Close links to the creative and cultural industries in the region and beyond
10. Strong applications, recruitment and retention
11. A community in which academic and professional services staff and students are encouraged to participate in debate and development
12. Robust and time-tested procedures for approval, monitoring and review
13. A shared commitment by academic and professional services staff to enhancing the quality of the student experience

1.4 What does the University mean by "quality management and enhancement"?

1.4.1 The University uses the term "quality management and enhancement" ("QME") to signal that quality is pro-actively *managed* at the University (because a high quality student experience and student satisfaction are seen as priorities) and that quality is continuously *enhanced* (because the assumption is made that there is always room for improvement). "QME" processes are not limited to academic areas, rather, the University focuses on enhancement of the overall student experience, i.e. that provided collectively by courses, Faculties and professional services. This is progressed and supported through annual Enhancement Plans, through which, the University implements clear and measurable enhancements to further improve the quality of the student experience at NUA.

1.5 QME principles

1.5.1 As the University addresses the developments identified in its Strategic Plan, three key principles underpin the University's QME systems and procedures:

1. That all academic and professional services staff have a role to play in the enhancement of the student's experience
2. That close engagement with students, staff and their views is essential for effective QME; and
3. That the goal of the University's QME systems and procedures is the continual enhancement of the quality of the student and staff experience.

1.6 QME objectives

1.6.1 Quality in the University is assured by a number of systems and procedures. Many of these (notably those which contribute to annual monitoring) work to an annual cycle. Others, such as the Periodic Review of courses, operate over longer timescales. The objectives of the QME systems and procedures are:

1. To enhance the quality of courses and university professional services
2. To attract a high quality student application and intake
3. To ensure that the University is a reflective community committed to continuous enhancement; and

4.   To retain the confidence of key stakeholders, including external accreditors and funding bodies *(see also 2.7 below)*.

1.7   Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) and accrediting organisations

1.7.1   The University works collaboratively with a number of external bodies in the assurance of quality and standards and is committed to meeting the expectations and requirements of relevant external bodies. A key strategic objective for the University is to build partnerships and collaborations and to seek appropriate accreditation for courses where appropriate and available.

1.7.2   To this end, the University Senior Management Team, advised by academic and professional services staff, keeps under review the benefits and risks of accreditation and (i.e. Creative Skillset, HEA, etc.). At the time of writing, the University works with a single professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) in the form of the Architects Registration Board (ARB). The main accrediting body for courses in both faculties is Creative Skillset and BA (Hons) Games Art and Design is also accredited by the Independent Game Developers' Association (TIGA). The University has three lines of provision accredited by the Higher Education Academy (HEA); these are the CPD Scheme (one line of provision) and PG Cert. HE (two lines of provision).

1.8   A collaborative and engaged approach to the student experience

1.8.1   The University's academic and professional services staff work collaboratively in order to maximise the quality of the student experience and engage students with course content and their University more widely. Students spend their time in centralised resources such as the Lecture Theatre, seminar rooms, workshops and the Library, and in studios. They seek advice from academics, course administrative staff, workshop staff, Careers and Employability, the Ideas Factory, Finance, Student Support, Academic Support, Chaplaincy, and the Norwich Centre, (the University's contracted provider of counselling). The University also recognises that students collaborate with and support each other. Schemes such as the Peer Assisted Learning Mentoring Scheme (PAL Scheme) are designed to encourage and promote mutual support and sense of academic community.

1.8.2   This collaborative approach is promoted by the strategic planning and management of academic and professional services. It builds on the sense of academic community between staff and students within the context of a specialist institution, and encourages the commitment of staff and students to aspire and achieve to common goals.

1.8.3   The University's approach to enhancement has been underpinned by successive Learning and Teaching Strategies. The Student Experience Strategy 2010-15 which was approved by Academic Board in June 2010 was concluded in 2016. It was replaced by the Strategy for Learning with a clear focus on achieving

excellence in learning, teaching and the wider student experience, to give our students the best possible preparation for their future lives and careers.

1.8.4   The University also takes the position that the successful delivery of a high quality student experience relies in part upon the availability of clear, accurate and up-to-date information for students. Emphasis is therefore placed on the ongoing refinement of information for students, and collaboration between academic and professional services staff to ensure that information is accurate and up to date.

1.9   Systems and procedures

1.9.1   The University operates a range of systems and procedures, which facilitate continuous enhancement. These are described in subsequent sections of this *Handbook.* They are designed to ensure that Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) is focused on the University's future development and progress rather than only on the review of past actions and events, and that action is taken to address internal and external factors that might place quality or academic standards at risk. They include the following:

1.   A system of elected student representatives and a wide range of opportunities for student participation and feedback *(paras. 2.4 – 2.5.8)*

2.   A committee structure which ensures a wide range of opportunities for staff and student involvement in the University's deliberative processes *(paras. 2.6 – 2.11 and Annex A)*

3.   Advice contained in written reports and verbal feedback from external examiners *(section 3 and Annex D)*

4.   The use of external and internal information in strategic and operational management *(section 3)*

5.   The use of feedback gathered from employers, work placement hosts and dialogue with Creative Industry Liaison Groups *(paras. 3.14.1 – 3.14.2)*

6.   Reference to the UK Quality Code *(paras. 3.12.1 – 3.12.9)* in the University's QME systems and procedures, including those for:
     a. course development, approval and periodic review *(section 4)*
     b. annual monitoring *(section 5 and Annex J)*

7.   The use of annual Enhancement Plans to promote an enhancement agenda and address matters identified through the annual monitoring process. (The annual monitoring procedures incorporate the identification of risks to quality and standards, and Enhancement Plans are required to respond to these as appropriate) *(Section 5, Annex J and annual monitoring guidelines on QME pages of the intranet)*

8.   The dissemination of good practice identified by external examiners and through the annual monitoring procedures *(para. 5.4)*

9.   Pedagogic developments as set out in the relevant sections of the Strategy for Learning.

10.   The ongoing refinement of information for students about learning, teaching and assessment, and the professional services of the University *(Pre-enrolment system, Unit Handbooks, intranet)*

11.   The operation of the University's Award and Credit Scheme and the Student Regulations and Procedures (*available on the intranet)*, which reflect the expectations of the UK Quality Code

12.   Policies and procedures for the recruitment, development and reward of staff *(para. 1.11, Section 6 and HR pages of the intranet).*

1.10   QME management responsibilities

1.10.1   Overall responsibility for QME is vested in the Senate, chaired by the Vice-Chancellor. Within the Senior Management Team (SMT), strategic responsibility for QME resides with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic), who is Chair of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. Operational management of QME is the responsibility of the Academic Registrar and Quality Manager.

1.11   The staff experience

1.11.1   The University's foregrounding of continuous enhancement of the student experience does not imply lack of attention to the experience of *staff*. The Strategic Plan and sub-strategies (notably the Strategy for Learning, Human Resources Strategy, and Research Strategies) also recognise the importance and value of the academic and professional services staff communities within the University.

2.   THE ROLE OF STAFF, STUDENTS AND COMMITTEES IN QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

2.1   The role of staff

2.1.1   The University's approach to securing and maintaining academic standards and academic quality is summarised below. All staff, individually and in groups, contribute to delivery of a high-quality student experience. Together with student representatives, staff at all levels of the University are represented on University committees or working groups. All staff play a role in securing and maintaining standards and the assurance of quality through active membership of staff teams and University committees.

2.2   Defining, reviewing and maintaining academic standards

2.2.1   Academic standards are defined by the University with reference to the UK Quality Code.

2.2.2   At course level, academic standards are defined through the course development, approval and review process, which includes input from external advisors and panel members.

2.2.3   Academic standards are reviewed and maintained through the annual monitoring process and periodic reviews of courses, again with external inputs.

2.2.4   Course Committees, Faculty Board of Study, Course Approval and Periodic Review Panels and the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, play key roles in the academic debate through which standards are defined and maintained.

2.3   Confirming and assuring academic standards

2.3.1   The Senate has direct responsibility for monitoring academic standards. Academic standards are confirmed and assured by the following, using clearly defined Unit Learning Outcomes, Assessment Requirements and Grading Matrices which indicate levels of performance and achievement:

     i.   The assessment process, including internal moderation of marks by course teams
     ii.   The role of external examiners
     iii.   Internal Verification processes scrutinising standards across awards
     iv.   Formal meetings of Course Assessment and Final Award Boards.

2.3.2   In defining and managing academic standards, the University works within a framework of internal and external guidance:

     i.   The NUA Award and Credit Scheme (internal)
     ii.   The Student Regulations and Procedures (internal)
     iii.   The Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) Handbook (internal)

      iv.   The *UK Quality Code* (external), including the Framework for HE Qualifications and relevant Subject Benchmark Statements

      v.   Course Specifications and Course Guides (internal – see **Annex F**).

2.4 Student participation and feedback

2.4.1   Students fulfil an important role in quality management and enhancement (QME). Close working between staff and students is a characteristic of specialist institutions in which academic staff and students share a vocational allegiance and a passion for their creative subjects. Close staff-student dialogue is found in, for example, group and individual studio practice which specialist institutions support and in collaborative projects, work-related learning and Ideas Factory projects for external clients.

2.4.2   There are opportunities for students to provide feedback to staff, to discuss issues, and to resolve difficulties, for example via daily or weekly contact in the University or via email. Such opportunities are characteristic of the sense of academic community and proximity between staff and students in a specialist HEI, and can be a 'hidden' feature of such institutions' QME systems. The University also enables students to participate and provide feedback through the following formal mechanisms:

      i.   Membership of Course Committees, the Student Representatives Group and other University committees

      ii.   Completion of the University's Internal Student Surveys (ISS), other internal evaluations (e.g. for workshops), the National Student Survey and HEA Surveys – UK Engagement Survey (UKES) and Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES).

      iii.   Meetings with external examiners

      iv.   Membership of panels for course periodic reviews

      v.   Meetings between panels and student groups at course periodic reviews

      vi.   Involvement in staff recruitment processes. (NB Student involvement is not a procedural requirement and is at the discretion of the University.)

      vii.   Focus groups

2.4.3   The Students' Union President is a member of the University Council, the Senate, Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the Equality & Diversity Committee. They also meet regularly with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Academic Registrar and other senior officers within the University who provide support and guidance on finance, welfare and related matters.

2.5 Feedback *TO* students

2.5.1   Student participation is only effective if it is part of a two-way process where the University provides feedback to students about action taken in response to matters that students have raised.

2.5.2   In the **committee structure**, Course Leaders and other committee chairs are responsible for addressing matters raised by student representatives, and

providing feedback at subsequent meetings. Student representatives are responsible for providing feedback to other students from committee meetings – in the case of Course Committees, this will be to the students on their course; in the case of other committees, this is to the Students' Union President, who arranges for dissemination to the student body.

2.5.3   Where possible, student feedback from *Internal Student Surveys* is addressed immediately by the relevant Course Leader and staff. If this is not possible, matters raised by students are taken forward by the Course Leader through discussions with relevant staff and/or through the Annual Course Review (ACR) process, in which student representatives are involved through their membership of Course Committees and the Faculty Board.

2.5.4   Student feedback from *workshop session evaluations* is addressed by the Resources Manager and workshop staff. Where possible, feedback is addressed immediately. If this is not possible, matters raised by students are taken forward by the Resources Manager through discussions with relevant staff. Feedback is provided to students by the Resources Manager and/or relevant workshop staff. *(Please refer to https://net.nua.ac.uk/wiki/workshops:about_the_workshops:feedback and https://net.nua.ac.uk/wiki/workshops:the_media_lab:feedback)*

2.5.5   Institutional issues, together with matters identified in the *National Student Survey, UK Engagement Survey (UKES)* and *Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)* are addressed through the Institutional Enhancement Strategy. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the Senate, both of which include the Students' Union President in their membership, consider the key annual monitoring reports and Institutional Enhancement Strategy.

2.5.6   The *Student Representatives Group* is chaired by the Academic Registrar and is normally attended by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or by other members of the Senior Management Team as appropriate. Cross-University issues identified through Surveys are discussed at meetings of the Student Representatives Group. Action taken in response to these, and to items in the Institutional Enhancement Strategy, are reported back and monitored by the Student Representatives Group. The Student Representatives Group is a key forum where the University (via the PVC (A)) feeds back directly to Representatives on a range of issues, actions and outcomes identified through the University's dialogues with the student body.

2.5.7   Focus Groups are chaired by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and provide an opportunity to seek views from small groups of students on Cross-University issues identified through Surveys.

2.5.8   Student feedback from *meetings with External Examiners* is communicated to the relevant Course Leader. Matters raised by students are taken forward by the Course Leader through discussions with relevant staff and/or through the ACR

process, in which student representatives are involved through their membership of Course Committees and the Faculty Board.

2.5.9 **External Examiners' Reports** and the University's responses to these are made available to students via the intranet in January. The University also uploads reports on actions taken to address annual **Enhancement Plans.**

2.6 The role of the University's committees

2.6.1 The University's committee structure is set out in **Annex A**.

2.6.2 While one of the University's QME principles is that all academic and professional services staff contribute to the quality of the student's experience, a number of groups and committees have particular roles to play; for example,

  i. The *Senate,* chaired by the Vice-Chancellor, is the University's senior committee and determines the overall approach to quality and standards.

  ii. The *Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee*, a sub-committee of the Senate whose terms of reference include responsibility for course planning and development, and quality enhancement across academic and professional services

  iii. The assessment of students is a fundamental aspect of QME. Through their consideration of students' performance in relation to course learning outcomes and assessment criteria, internal assessors and *Course Assessment and Award Boards* fulfil a key role in measuring and confirming academic standards and quality. Membership of Course Assessment and Award Boards is in accordance with Annex A and approved by the Deans using the template in **Annex B.** Student progression and completion rates together with degree classifications are considered by course teams and reported to the Senate and its sub-committees through the Annual Course Review (ACR) process. They are also reported annually to the University Council. Assessment regulations and procedures are described in the *Student Regulations and Procedures.*

  iv. Groups, which have key operational responsibilities for quality and standards, include the Senior Management Team (SMT), Course Committees and Faculty Board. Each member of SMT ensures that quality procedures are followed in their areas of responsibility, and that students' academic and support needs are continually addressed. Deans and Course Leaders have particular responsibilities for quality and standards at Faculty and course level.

2.7 University Committee Structure

2.7.1 The aims of the University committee structure are:

  i. To secure appropriate representation of staff and students on University committees

ii. To ensure that staff and students have a voice in the University's deliberative processes

iii. To ensure staff and student participation in the development of University strategy and policy

iv. To provide a framework for monitoring the implementation of the Strategic Plan, its sub-strategies and University policies.

2.7.2 All committees are responsible for ensuring that their work reflects the aims and targets of the Strategic Plan 2014-19. All committees are required to self-assess their performance and review their Terms of Reference annually, at the final meeting of the academic year; working to a brief provided by the QME Office, Committee Chairs may propose revisions to Terms of Reference and Membership and should discuss these in the first instance with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic). Revisions to Terms of Reference and Membership must be approved by the Senate.

2.7.3 While the committee structure is essential to the University's deliberative processes, it is recognised that staff and students have many demands on their time. The following guidelines therefore apply:

i. The recommended maximum time for a committee meeting is 2 hours, and no meeting should last longer than 2.5 hours. Normally morning meetings will commence at 9.30am, and afternoon meetings at 2.00pm.

ii. No member of staff below the level of Course Leader or professional services manager should be required to spend more than half a day per week in committee meetings, taken as an average across the calendar year. This upper limit will be proportional for members of staff on fractional contracts.

2.7.4 In addition to its committees, from time to time the University will appoint Working Parties or Groups to undertake specific tasks or projects.

2.8 Committee representation and membership

2.8.1 In addition to chairing the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor is an ex-officio member of all committees.

2.8.2 Students are represented by the SU President on the University Council and the following: the Senate, Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and Equality and Diversity Committee. Each course team holds regular Course Committee meetings and these are attended by course student representatives. The committee structure also includes the Student Representatives Group, which is chaired by the Academic Registrar and includes the SU President and elected student representatives. Where students are not included in the membership of a

committee, the Chair may co-opt a student representative(s) for one academic year at a time.

2.8.3 Elections will be held for academic and professional services staff membership of the committees where indicated in Annex A. The term of office will be three years for all committees.

2.8.4 Below the level of Course Leader/ professional services manager, no member of academic or professional services staff should normally hold more than two memberships (not including Assessment and Award Boards).

2.8.5 Staff who are not permanent members of committees by virtue of their appointment in the University will not normally be eligible for re-election to the same committee within a period of two years from the end of their first period of office. The maximum term of office will be three years.

2.8.6 Staff who are permanent members of committees through their appointment in the University are responsible for disseminating information and decisions from committees to the groups they represent.

2.8.7 In addition to their approved membership, committees may co-opt additional members for specific purposes.

2.8.8 The quorum for committees will normally be three members plus the Chair. For committees consisting of six members or fewer, the quorum will be two members plus the Chair. If a committee is concerned about making a particular decision at a meeting, the decision should be deferred until the Chair has sought advice from either the Academic Registrar or the Quality Manager.

2.9 The relationship between staff team meetings and committees

2.9.1 The Senior Management Team (SMT), and all courses and professional services hold regular team meetings, chaired by the senior team member or their nominee. These meetings are effective for communicating strategic and operational issues and developments. Course level meetings additionally play a key role in the Annual Course Review (ACR) process.

2.9.2 The senior team member is required to ensure that team views and advice are communicated from team meetings to the Chair(s) of relevant committee(s).

2.9.3 Deans, Course Leaders and professional services managers are also required to ensure that effective communication concerning team discussions and decisions takes place with hourly-paid staff.

2.9.4 To ensure that hourly-paid staff have access to information about University committees and associated development opportunities. Deans, Course Leaders

and professional services managers are required to ensure that all hourly-paid staff are clearly signposted to the Governance section of the University intranet.

2.10   Committee procedures and communications

2.10.1   All committees are required to observe the University's *Guide to House-Style for Agendas and Minutes* on the QME pages of the intranet. This incorporates clear guidance on committee management and operation, and the purposes of agenda items. Draft committee minutes with Action Tables should be circulated within three weeks of each meeting.

2.10.2   Committee business should be substantive. Committee Chairs and team leaders throughout the organisation are encouraged to be focused and disciplined about agendas and the business brought forward for discussion.

2.10.3   Committee Chairs are required to communicate effectively with each other about relevant business and to ensure that minutes are placed on the intranet.

2.11   The committee structure

2.11.1   A diagrammatic representation of the relationship between the Senate and other University committees and the Terms of Reference and Memberships of University committees are set out in alphabetical order in Annex **A**.

3. EXTERNALITY AND INFORMATION IN QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

3.1.1 An important feature of the University's QME systems and procedures is the use of external advice, together with information drawn from both external and internal sources.

3.2 External examiners

3.2.1 Each undergraduate and postgraduate course has at least one external examiner, the number of examiners allocated to a course being dependent on student numbers and the breadth of the course curriculum.

3.2.2 Each Course Assessment Board includes the relevant external examiner(s). Final Award Boards include one undergraduate external examiner - the Lead Examiner, identified by the University and agreed with the examiner at the commencement of the academic year.

3.2.3 For courses or programmes operating within collaborative partnerships, the University will be responsible for the appointment, induction and functions of external examiners in accordance with the following procedures.

3.3 Procedures and criteria for the nomination and appointment of external examiners

3.3.1 External examiners are appointed by the Senate. They are nominated by Deans for consideration in the first instance by the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee on behalf of the Senate.

3.3.2 The QME Office will notify the relevant Dean of the need for nominations of new or replacement external examiners.

3.3.3 Deans will provide the QME Office with names, contact details and key background information for three potential nominees. In nominating potential external examiners, Deans will take note of the following criteria:

3.3.4 Potential external examiners are expected to have:

   i. Competence and experience in the field covered by the course(s)
   ii. Academic or professional qualifications to at least the level of the qualification being externally examined
   iii. Experience of designing assessments and operating assessment procedures (either internally or externally)
   iv. Sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the discipline to be able to command the respect of colleagues
   v. Familiarity with the standard to be expected of students in the course(s) to be examined
   vi. Fluency in English
   vii. Met the criteria set out by relevant professional, statutory or regulatory bodies

    viii. Awareness of contemporary developments in the design and delivery of the flexible curriculum – in this context, the examiner should also be prepared to work within the context of credit-rated, unit-based Award and Credit Scheme

    ix. Expertise in the enhancement of the student experience.

    x. Previous external examining experience

3.3.5   To avoid potential conflicts of interest, external examiners should not be nominated if they are:

    i.   A member of the University Council

    ii.   A near relative of a member of staff or student involved with the programme of study

    iii.   An examiner on a cognate course in the University

    iv.   Closely associated with the sponsorship of students on the course

    v.   Closely associated with placements or training

    vi.   Required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the programme of study

    vii.   In a position to influence significantly the future of students on the programme of study

    viii.   Involved in collaborative research activities with a member of staff

    ix.   An external member of the approval panel for the programme of study.

3.3.6   In order to provide sufficient time for the effective performance of their duties, external examiners should normally not hold more than two external examiner appointments.

3.3.7   Former members of staff and students may not be appointed as external examiners until a period of at least five years has passed since they left the institution.

3.3.8   Nominees who have retired (or who retire during their period of appointment) must be able to demonstrate sufficient evidence of continuing involvement in the relevant discipline, and with current developments in HE teaching, learning and assessment.

3.3.9   There should normally be no more than one external examiner from the same institution appointed to the same Faculty at the University.

3.3.10   No more than one external examiner should be appointed to a course from any department or unit.

3.3.11   An external examiner should not be appointed from a department or unit in an institution where a member of the University's staff is also serving as an external examiner.

3.3.12   A period of five years shall lapse before an external examiner is replaced by another member from the same institution. An exception to this principle may be made where a specialist subject is taught in only a very small number of higher education institutions, for which a special case should be made on an individual basis.

3.3.13 External examiners who have completed their period of appointment may be re-appointed in exceptional circumstances but only after a period of five years has elapsed since their last appointment.

3.3.14 Under certain circumstances, the University may consider nominees who are new to external examining, provided that they are part of a team and/or mentored by an external examiner who meets the criteria outlined in para. 3.3.4.

3.3.15 Under certain circumstances, the University may consider nominees who do not fulfil all of the above criteria. Such cases might occur where there is evident benefit in appointing an external examiner from the creative or cultural sectors, who possesses considerable professional experience but not the formal qualifications anticipated, academic background, or sufficient experience of assessment. Particular attention needs to be given in discipline areas that are very small and specialist and where the pool of potential external examiners is therefore restricted. The Senate will consider such cases and, if the appointment is approved, the University will ensure that appropriate training and support is provided to the examiner.

3.3.16 On receipt of names, contact details and background information on potential nominees from Deans, the QME Office will approach potential nominees in order to ascertain whether they are interested in being considered for appointment. Potential nominees will be provided with a 'Recruitment Pack' and invited to submit a full curriculum vitae to include External Examining experience. Following this, CVs will be sent to the PVCA to decide whether a potential nominee should be formally considered by the University.

3.3.17 QME Office will complete the External Examiner Nomination Form (Annex C) for Nominees who are considered suitable in liaison with the Nominee. Completed and signed nomination forms are submitted for consideration by the Chair of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and, subsequently, approval by the Senate.

3.3.18 External examiners are appointed for a term of office of 4 years. Exceptionally, with the approval of the Senate, a term of office may be extended beyond the 4-year maximum for 1 year; for example, in order to provide continuity between external examiners or in order to provide continuity for a course which is closing.

3.3.19 It should be noted that the Senate has the authority to terminate the appointment of an external examiner if they fail to fulfil their obligations; for example, through negligence or misconduct, or failure to submit a written annual report by the due date.

3.4 Briefing of external examiners

3.4.1 Through the QME Office, the University shall provide external examiners with the following:

i. A copy of the *Student Regulations and Procedures*, drawing attention to key sections on assessment regulations, external examiners etc.
ii. A copy of the NUA Award and Credit Scheme

    iii.   The template for external examiners' annual reports *([Annex D](#))*

    iv.   The University's Single Equality Scheme

    v.   A copy of the relevant Unit Handbooks

    vi.   Any relevant course instructions and notes of guidance

    vii.   A schedule of the visit

    viii.   External examiner reports from the previous two years and the University's responses to these

    ix.   Annual Course Reviews from the previous two years

    x.   Staff information: list of course team members on a standard template prepared and maintained by the QME Office.

3.4.2   All new external examiners are invited to an induction meeting at which their duties and obligations (including any legal obligations) will be outlined, and which will cover the following:

    i.   The role of external examiners and the relationship between the University's internal and external assessment processes

    ii.   The University's expectations of external examiners –
- Terms of reference of external examiners
- Attendance by external examiners
- The purpose of the interim visit
- Online assessment and feedback
- Assessment Grading Matrices
- Sampling and verification, including the internal verification process
- Moderation and adjustment of marks
- The roles of Assessment and Award Boards
- External examiners' reports
- Rights and responsibilities of external examiners
- *Undergraduate awards:* Units BA3a and BA3b/BSc3a and BSc3b/ARCH3B – including submission, assessment and feedback procedures; Marginal Fail or Fail of Unit BA3a/BSc3a; the 10,000-word Research Report option.

    iii.   The role of the QME Office.

3.5 Terms of reference of external examiners

Please refer also to the paragraphs below on Guidelines on Sampling and Verification by External Examiners (section 3.7 below), and Moderation and Adjustment of Marks by External Examiners (section 3.8 below).

3.5.1   The terms of reference of external examiners are as follows:

    i.   To make an annual visit to the course as part of final assessment procedures. All examiners are also invited to make one interim visit per year during a period determined by the University. New external examiners will receive a welcome and induction as part of their first interim visit. External examiners of new courses are expected to visit the course at the end of the first and second years of operation in order to build their awareness of the course and its academic standards before the first cohort reaches final assessment.

ii.   External Examiners appointed to PG provision attend twice a year for MA Assessment and Award Boards/PG Cert Assessment and Award Boards.

iii.   NB: It is acknowledged that external examiners may occasionally be prevented from attending the University due to circumstances beyond their control. On such occasions, the Academic Registrar must be notified at the earliest opportunity, so that alternative arrangements can be agreed.

iv.   To sample student work which will be (a) sent to the examiner at an agreed point(s) during the academic year and (b) organised for visits by the examiner.

v.   To review relevant documentation, including Unit Handbooks, Project Briefs, assessment documentation, tutorial records, and Annual Course Reviews (ACRs).

vi.   To meet with students and staff.

vii.   To verify that all candidates have been assessed fairly and in accordance with the *Student Regulations and Procedures*; have fulfilled the course learning outcomes at the appropriate standard; and have been recommended for awards which reflect the level of their academic achievement.

3.5.2   To meet with students either individually or in groups as part of the process of sampling a range of academic achievement. Meetings may take place with groups of students or with individuals. External examiners may undertake viva voce examination of students.

3.5.3   To attend any meeting of a Course Assessment Board, Final Award Board or Resubmission Board of which they are a member, and to endorse the results of the assessment process by appending his/her signature to the results documentation. *NB: Any meeting of a Board at which a decision on the conferment of an award is made requires the presence of the Lead Examiner. If he/she is unable to be present, the Academic Registrar must be notified immediately, so that alternative arrangements can be made. Where awards are considered and approved at Resubmission Boards, they are not confirmed until the written approval of the Lead Examiner has been obtained.*

3.5.4   To satisfy themselves that the conduct of business and decision making by the University's Assessment Boards and Award Boards, and the documentation of their proceedings, are consistent with best practice in the sector. This ensures comparability of the University's academic standards with those of similar awards at other UK Higher Education Institutions.

3.5.5   To take part in appeals procedures when requested. The University does not routinely involve external examiners in its consideration of student appeals, since this is not always necessary or appropriate. However, when it is necessary, the

University will contact the relevant external examiner(s). In the event that an appeal is upheld and, as a consequence, a student is permitted to submit or resubmit work, or have work which was previously submitted re-assessed, the University will contact the external examiner at the earliest possible opportunity to advise them of this fact. The University will also make clear whether the external examiner is required to reconsider in its entirety the work in question or ratify a mark, depending on the circumstances of the individual appeal.

3.5.6   Through the Vice-Chancellor, to report to the Senate on the standards achieved by students on the course, and on other matters as requested by the approved template for external examiners' reports.

3.5.7   To inform the Vice-Chancellor of any matter which, in the examiner's view, militates against the maintenance of appropriate academic standards.

3.5.8   In cases of suspected plagiarism or cheating, external examiners will be notified prior to their visit and during their visit will be provided with the internal documentation relating to the case. External examiners will not be asked to make a judgement but will be asked to confirm that the correct internal procedures have been followed.

3.6   Rights and responsibilities of external examiners

3.6.1   To attend any meeting of an Assessment or Award Board of which they are a member.

3.6.2   To see any assessment material relating to the course.

3.6.3   To be provided with details of work that students are required to produce for assessment.

3.6.4   To inform internal assessors at the Assessment and Award Boards, and in general discussion of assessment practice, of their views about internal assessment procedures and decisions.

3.6.5   To meet with students in order to discuss assessed work as part of the sampling process.

3.6.6   To withhold endorsement of the results of assessment through not signing the required documentation at the conclusion of Assessment and Award Boards.

3.6.7   To meet the Vice-Chancellor or his nominated representative in order to discuss any matter relating to the course, which the external examiner has declared a matter of principle. The decision of the external examiner shall either be accepted as final by the Final Award Board of the University or shall be referred to the Senate. Where there is a disagreement within a group of external examiners on any matter, which is declared a matter of principle, and this cannot be resolved within the group, the dispute must be referred to the Senate.

3.6.8   To write directly and in confidence to the Vice-Chancellor. In such cases, student representatives on the relevant course will be informed that a confidential report

has been made. They will also be informed if there are implications for students, and if so, what these are.

3.6.9   If an external examiner has serious concerns about issues related to the University's academic standards, and has exhausted all internal procedures including a confidential report to the Vice-Chancellor, the examiner should refer to the QAA's Concerns scheme.

3.7   Guidelines on sampling and verification by external examiners

Please refer also to paragraphs on internal verification in the Student Regulations and Procedures.

3.7.1   At both undergraduate and taught postgraduate level, verification by external examiners is undertaken on the basis of sampling of students' work across the range of classifications (undergraduate) or marks and grades (postgraduate), to ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are being maintained by internal assessors. Sampling rationalises the external examination process and allows examiners to spend more time with the students and work in the sample. The sample of work from a course unit must include all items of assessment which contribute to the overall unit assessment requirements, including any written work.

3.7.2   At *undergraduate* level, the unit sample selected by the Course Leader must include the following:

   i.   Work by all students whose proposed unit mark is in the Marginal Fail and Fail classifications
   ii.   Work by 25% of the remainder of the cohort, representing the First Class, Upper Second, Lower Second and Third Class classifications.

3.7.3   At *taught postgraduate* level, the unit sample selected by the Course Leader must include the following:

   i.   Work by all students whose proposed MA Project grade is in the Distinction or Merit classification
   ii.   Work by all students whose proposed unit grade is in the Marginal Fail and Fail classifications
   iii. Work by 25% of the remainder of the cohort.

3.8   Moderation and adjustment of marks by external examiners

3.8.1   The external examiner's task is to moderate assessments from an appropriate sample of students' work, not to act as an additional marker. External examiners may moderate students' results collectively where they consider that the overall assessments have been too high, too low or do not span an appropriate spread of the whole range of possible marks.

3.8.2   Moderation of cohort marks *(undergraduate courses)* or grades *(postgraduate courses)* must be proposed and ratified at the meeting of the relevant Course

Assessment Board or MA Assessment and Award Board. The guidance set out below must be followed when external examiners and internal assessors are considering the moderation of cohort marks or grades:

    i.   The pattern of marks/grades in the sample may be used as the basis for moderation of the marks of an overall cohort of students

    ii.   Examiners may choose or may be asked by the Course Leader to consider the work of a wider group of students if the marks or grades of the original sample cannot initially be verified.

3.8.3   External examiners may recommend adjustments to individual unit marks/grades where these are, in their view, anomalous, or with reference to the overall mark/grade profile of the cohort. Following discussion with the course team, the external examiner may ask the course team to review a mark/grade. Where possible, changes should be agreed in advance of the Course Assessment Board. The mark(s) must not be changed on the mark spreadsheet before the meeting of the Course Assessment Board. All proposed change(s) to marks must be verbally reported to the Course Assessment Board by the Course Leader, and ratified by the Course Assessment Board.

3.8.4   Where course teams and examiners are unable to reach agreement about proposed changes to unit marks/grades prior to the relevant Course Assessment Board, the case for any such changes must be discussed by the Board. A majority of the Board must agree on whether the proposed change(s) should be implemented. Where the view of the Board is evenly divided, the Chair will take the final decision with the advice of the Academic Registrar or their representative.

3.9   External examiners' reports

3.9.1   Each external examiner submits an annual report to the Vice-Chancellor after the June assessment period (undergraduate awards) or the September assessment period (postgraduate awards), the actual dates to be confirmed each year by the QME Office. Examiners' reports are considered by the Vice-Chancellor and then circulated to the relevant Dean, Course Leader, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Academic Registrar and QME with commentary as appropriate.

3.9.2   QME send the *Responses to External Examiners' Reports pro forma (Annex E)* to the relevant Dean, Course Leader and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic). It is the responsibility of the Course Leader to ensure that all members of the course team receive a copy of the examiner's report. Responses to external examiner's reports are developed following the guidelines outlined in *Annex E*.

3.9.3   Recommendations made by external examiners, together with other matters raised in their reports, are considered by course teams, Deans, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and other staff as appropriate, who make written responses to examiners' reports on the *Responses to External Examiners' Reports pro forma*. Completed pro formas are considered as follows during the annual monitoring process:

    i.   Course team annual evaluation meetings (July-September)

      ii.   Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee annual monitoring meeting (November).

3.9.4   The Quality Manager and Academic Registrar prepare an institutional overview of common themes and recommendations from external examiners' reports, including the comparability of standards, for consideration by the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the Senate.

3.9.5   The completed *Responses to External Examiners' Reports pro formas* are circulated to external examiners with Annual Course Reviews (ACRs).

3.9.6   The payment of annual fees and expenses is conditional on receipt of the examiner's written annual report.

3.9.7   If an external examiner's written annual report has not been received by the Vice-Chancellor by 31 August (undergraduate courses) or 31 October (postgraduate courses), the University shall formally write to the examiner, drawing attention to this matter and advising them that, if the report is not received within a further month, their appointment shall be terminated with immediate effect by the University in accordance with para. 3.3.19.

3.10   Externality Higher Education Academy (HEA)

3.10.1   It is an HEA requirement that externality is embedded within quality assurance processes as well as recognition decision making within all lines of accredited provision and for all categories of Fellowship. External reviewers/ assessors are also required for D3/ D4 recognition decisions within the Norwich University of the Arts Professional Recognition Scheme for Arts, Design, Architecture and Media (PRS-ADAM) scheme.

3.10.2   Externality for the recognition decision-making for the PRS-ADAM scheme is achieved through continued engagement with the HEA and the External Examiner for the scheme who is the external reviewer at the Professional Recognition Panel.

3.10.3   The appointment of external reviewers/ internal panel members should be based on appropriate knowledge and understanding of, and experience in working with, the UKPSF. External reviewers will independently assess applications for Fellowship and reach recognition decisions through discussion with internal reviewers. This will ensure that assessment criteria are consistently applied and that a benchmark for internal standards is clearly defined which operates in line with the wider sector and direct application to the HEA.

3.10.4   External reports relating to CPD schemes will be summarised in the Annual Report to HEA.

3.11   External advisers

3.11.1   The University regularly seeks external advice about academic developments. This includes the participation of external academics and industry practitioners on course approval and periodic review panels, and, when appropriate, in selection procedures for the appointment of staff. They may also be appointed to

advise on professional services, or on aspects of strategic or operational development (e.g. course development, improvement of professional services, pedagogic issues, resource management).

3.12   External information used by the University

3.12.1   UK Quality Code

The University actively engages with the UK Quality Code (UKQC) through review of its quality assurance processes.

The University's QAA UK Quality Code Guidance *(available on the QME pages of the intranet)* provides guidance about the UK Quality Code (UKQC) and explains how the University has mapped its activities against the UKQC and the expectations and indicators described therein. Each section of the University's UKQC mapping will be reviewed by the Quality Management Group every two years.

3.12.2   Framework for HE Qualifications (FHEQ)

3.12.3   The NUA Award and Credit Scheme (notably the sections on "Aims and Outcomes of Undergraduate/Postgraduate Study") reflect the key expectations of the FHEQ. The aims, outcomes and level descriptors for undergraduate and taught postgraduate awards are outlined in the Framework documents and are used by the University to inform course development, approval and review. For postgraduate research programmes, learning outcomes and assessment criteria aligned to the FHEQ are provided in the University of the Arts London *Research Degrees Handbook and Regulations* and the University's *Research Student Handbook*.

3.12.4   Subject Benchmark Statements

3.12.5   Subject Benchmark Statements are also used by the University to inform course development, approval and review. The aims, learning outcomes and content of course units reflect the expectations of relevant Subject Benchmark Statements (currently those for Art and Design, Computing and Architecture) together with the FHEQ level descriptors. Course Guides provide an outline of the subject and generic skills articulated by Subject Benchmark Statements and the University's approach to the development of skills by courses. In addition to these Subject Benchmark Statements, courses may reference other subjects, for example *Communication, Media, Film and Cultural Studies.* The University's development of new provision will be informed by other Subject Benchmark Statements as appropriate.

3.12.6   Master's Degree Characteristics Statement

3.12.7   The aims and outcomes of postgraduate study reflect the expectations of the Master's Degree Characteristics Statement (QAA, September 2015). These are

used by the University to inform MA course development, approval and periodic review.

3.12.8   Programme Specifications

3.12.9   The University produces a definitive Course Specification and Course Guide for each undergraduate and taught postgraduate course. These are made available to prospective applicants and other external audiences via the NUA website, and to students via the VLE on, or immediately prior to, enrolment. *(Please refer to **Annex F**)*.

3.13   Quantitative external information used by the University

3.13.1   Quantitative external information used by the University may include:

Data from external market research
Data from regional studies
Other HEIs' HESA data, for comparison/benchmarking
Data produced by HEFCE, UCAS and other organisations.

3.14   Qualitative external information used by the University

3.14.1   Qualitative external information used by the University for QME purposes includes the reports of external examiners and feedback gathered from employers and work placement hosts.

3.14.2   The University Faculties convene Creative Industry Liaison Groups (CILGs) to advise on curriculum matters. CILGs include alumni of the University. In addition to advising about course design and content, CILG members may assist with work placements and other aspects of work-related learning.

3.15   Internal information used by the University

3.15.1   In addition to external advice and information, the University uses internally produced information for QME purposes:

3.16   Quantitative internal information used by the University

3.16.1   The University collects a range of quantitative information. Student profiles are assessed from data collected from UCAS application forms and at enrolment. Application, recruitment, retention, progression, achievement and first destination data is used in a number of operational contexts, and in the annual monitoring procedures. This has been enhanced through the introduction of a comprehensive fees assessment form which provides all of the information required for the University to make accurate, efficient and fair fees assessments; enhancement to the inputting and flow of cohort data in order to improve efficiency; more sophisticated use of cohort data to inform widening participation activities, recruitment, marketing and course development; staff development for Course Leaders in the analysis of cohort data in their Annual Course Reviews (ACRs); analysis of the reasons why some students terminate their studies

between academic years; and revisions to the postgraduate course application form.

3.17 Qualitative internal information used by the University

3.17.1 Qualitative internal information used by the University includes outputs from Internal Student Surveys and other internal evaluations (e.g. workshops); UKES and PTES outcomes, information from Peer Observation of Professional Practice (POPP); and annual staff Appraisal Development and Review (ADR).

3.18 University information in the public domain - the new Public Information Requirements

3.18.1 In 2003, HEFCE published circular 03/51 *Information on Quality & Standards in HE.* This described a body of information, which all HE institutions are expected to collect and analyse, routinely, for QME and other planning purposes. In September 2012, this was superseded by the new HEFCE public information requirements and the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education Part C: *Information about higher education provision.* Public information is made available through the Key Information Sets (published via Unistats) and the wider information set published by the University.

3.18.2 In 2015, the UK funding bodies carried out a review of Unistats and the KIS, as part of a wider 'Review of Provision of Information about Learning and Teaching, and the Student Experience'. One of the key findings from this review was that detailed information about course structure and delivery was what prospective students found most important, and that the summary of metrics presented on Unistats was not the best way to provide it. The outcomes of that consultation, 'Summary of responses to consultation on changes to the National Student Survey, Unistats and information provided by institutions' (HEFCE 2016/15), published in August 2016, included the decision to remove some information and transfer responsibility for publishing detailed information, including course delivery and costs, to providers' own websites. The funding bodies will collect data on course-level links and publish it on Unistats so that students can access it easily.

3.18.3 In 2015 confirmation was received that HE providers are regulated by the Competition and Markets Authority and CMA Consumer protection law will generally apply to the relationship between HE providers and prospective and current undergraduate students.). It sets out minimum standards that apply to various aspects of an HE provider's dealings with students, for example in relation to information provision and complaint handling, and the requirement of fairness for terms and conditions. It sits alongside sector-specific regulatory obligations that are relevant to many HE providers. The University have mapped its practice against these requirements and is fully compliant.

3.18.4 The Unistats website (www.unistats.ac.uk) publishes a range of statistical information for each course including information contained within the Key Information Sets as follows:

- The results of the National Student Survey including satisfaction with the Students' Union (provided by Ipsos Mori)
- UCAS tariff points and entry information for current students (derived from HESA data)
- The degree classifications of graduates (derived from HESA data)
- Employment prospects and average salary information (from the Destination of Leavers from Higher Education Survey (DLHE) and the longitudinal DLHE survey at 40 months)
- Professional body accreditation
- Data on students continuing at the institution, completing awards or leaving without awards
- Information about the University and links to the website.

3.18.5   The wider information set - http://www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/wider/ is published via the University internet, or intranet (for internally available information) and covers:

- Information on the institutional context including the Mission, Strategic Plan, The QME Handbook, information on learning and teaching and the employability statement
- Information about aspects of courses and awards including course information, programme specifications, Course Guides, results of internal student surveys and links with employers
- Information on the quality and standards of courses (internal information but made available externally on request) including, course approval; monitoring and review; external examiners; student representation; and procedures for appeals and complaints.

3.18.6   The above information is available for scrutiny by external audiences, including prospective students and their parents/advisers; other HEIs; feeder institutions; employers and industry organisations; local and national government.

4.   COURSE DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND PERIODIC REVIEW – including review of Award and Credit Scheme

4.1   A key feature of the University's framework for assuring the academic standards of its awards is its procedures for course development, approval and periodic review. These ensure that proposals for course development are fully debated by the appropriate University committees and that approval and periodic review meet the requirements of the Senate and the expectations of the UK Quality Code. *NB Information about these procedures can also be found on the QME pages of the intranet (Course Approval and Periodic Review).*

4.1.1   Part of the framework for assuring academic standards includes the ongoing review and development of the University's Award and Credit Scheme. Reviews of the Scheme will be proposed by the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and agreed by the Senate as part of the calendar of events described at 4.5.1. The procedures described below for periodic review will apply to reviews of the Scheme, except where otherwise indicated.

4.1.2   Additional requirements in respect of the development, approval and review of collaborative provision are outlined in the University's *Collaborative Provision Policy and Procedures*.

4.1.3   The QME Office maintain handbooks on course approval and review events which provide detailed guidance for staff involved in the process and/or as panel members.

4.2   Course development and course approval

4.2.1   *Proposals for new courses* – Proposals for new courses are informed by the Strategic Plan and approved for development by the Senior Management Team, which considers the demand for the proposed course, resource requirements, and other issues, prior to initiating planning and development. The development and approval process for new courses culminates in internal and external approval events. Final approval is the responsibility of the Senate. Courses are approved indefinitely but are subject to periodic review, normally every five years. See section 4.3 below.

4.2.2   *Proposals for amendments to generic course units* – Course units in the NUA Award and Credit Scheme are generic and are approved by the Senate. Guidance on proposals for amendments to course units can be found in ***Annex G**.* Proposals are considered by the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. Final approval is the responsibility of the Senate.

4.2.3   *Proposals for new project briefs or amendments to project briefs* - Proposals for new project briefs or amendments to project briefs should be submitted by the Course Leader to the relevant Dean. Deans are responsible for checking that the new or revised project brief helps to meet the relevant unit Aims and Learning Outcomes of the Unit. Guidance on proposals for new project briefs can be found in Annex F and guidance on amendments to project briefs can be found in ***Annex G.***

4.2.4   *Proposals for changes to project briefs for collaborative arrangements-* Proposals for new project briefs or amendments to project briefs for courses validated under collaborative arrangements will be subject to scrutiny by the relevant external examiner prior to approval by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

4.2.5   It is recognised that under certain circumstances it may be necessary to introduce amendments to Unit Handbook outside the normal annual cycle. When such circumstances become apparent, they must be brought to the attention of the Dean who will advise on the appropriate procedure.

4.3   Course periodic review

4.3.1   Courses are approved indefinitely but are subject to periodic review, normally every five years. The periodic review process involves the preparation of relevant documentation by the Course Leader and team, consideration of a range of qualitative and quantitative data by the course team and Faculty, and the preparation of a Critical Evaluation by the Course Leader *(Annex I).* The Critical Evaluation is formally considered by the Internal Review Panel and at a subsequent external periodic review event. (*Annex I*). The Internal Review Panel may set Conditions and Recommendations for the course team and may require amendments to be made to the Critical Evaluation prior to its circulation to the panel for the external periodic review event.

4.4   Involvement of students, representatives of industry and creative practice, and external academics in course development, approval and periodic review

4.4.1   The University involves students, representatives of industry and creative practice, and external academics in course development, approval and periodic review.

4.4.2   Student representatives contribute to discussions about amendments to courses, and course periodic reviews, through their membership of the Course Committee and the Faculty Board of Studies, and through meetings between periodic review panels and groups of students. Course Approval and Periodic review panels include a student member. The Students' Union President contributes to discussions about course development, approval and periodic review through membership of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the Senate.

4.4.3   Student representatives, industry representatives and external academics contribute to course development, approval and periodic review through membership of external panels for approval and periodic review events.

   The University draws a clear distinction between the employment of its external examiners and other external academics in course development, approval and periodic review. External examiners may be consulted about the development of new courses and amendments to existing courses, but are not normally included in panels for approval or periodic review events.

4.5   **Course approval and course periodic review events**

4.5.1   The University plans and organises an annual calendar of course approval and periodic review events. These are co-ordinated by the QME Office.

4.5.2   The QME Office provides each course which is undergoing development and approval or periodic review with a timeline including deadlines for the preparation of event documentation, responses to Conditions and Recommendations following internal and external events, and preparation of the definitive Course Guide. This timeline details the actions required from those involved at each stage of the approval or review process.

4.5.3   Course approval (for new courses) takes place in two stages:

       i.   Internal course approval event
      ii.   External course approval event.

4.5.4   Course periodic reviews (for existing courses) take place in two stages:

       i.   Internal course periodic review event
      ii.   External course periodic review event.

4.5.5   Award and Credit Scheme review normally takes place in two stages:

       i.   Internal staff and student consultation and discussion (format to be agreed by Pro-Vice Chancellor (Academic) and Deans)
      ii.   External scheme review event.

4.5.6   Internal course **approval event or internal course periodic review event** is designed to enable review of course documentation by a panel of staff, and to set Conditions and make Recommendations for revisions and amendments prior to the course external approval or course periodic review event. The University views the internal scrutiny stage crucial to its approval and periodic review procedures and as valuable opportunities for peer review, CPD and peer debate.

4.5.7   The **external course approval or course periodic review event** is held to enable scrutiny and peer review of documentation by a panel of staff and external advisers from other HEIs and industry. External events conclude with the panel setting out any Conditions which the course team are required to meet prior to the commencement or (in the case of periodic reviews) continuation of the course, and Recommendations for the overall enhancement of the course and the student experience.

4.5.8   The role of the panel at internal and external approval events and external periodic review events is to satisfy themselves that the institutional and course documentation are effective in assuring the academic standards and quality of the award(s) to be conferred. The QME Office maintain and provide a checklist of issues for the consideration of approval and review panels. In particular, the panel will ensure that:

i. The course(s) meets the requirements for the relevant award(s) and the proposed academic standards are appropriate, taking account of the UK Quality Code and other relevant external reference points

ii. The course(s) offers a coherent educational experience with relevant subject-specific and generic knowledge and skills

iii. The teaching and learning methods described in the course documentation will enable students to achieve the learning outcomes

iv. The admission requirements and entry qualifications are appropriate and equivalent to those of existing University courses.

4.5.9 Conditions and Recommendations are defined as follows:

4.5.10 **Condition**: A condition shall be set when the panel has identified an issue or area of concern where the University's academic standards, and/or the quality of education provided to enable students to achieve those standards, are at risk, unless the condition is set and satisfied by the specified deadline. A panel shall not normally set more than three conditions. If more than three conditions are set, the panel shall formally consider whether the proposal can be approved, since the identification of a significant number of conditions suggests that the proposal/review should be rejected.

4.5.11 It is a requirement that all Conditions are met prior to the commencement or (in the case of periodic review) continuation of the course. Actions taken to fulfil Conditions must be outlined on the *Responses to Conditions and Recommendations* template, which will be provided by the QME Office. Dates by which Conditions must be met are set by the Quality Manager in advance of the internal and external stages of approval and review.

4.5.12 **Recommendation**: A recommendation shall be set when a panel believes that the quality of education provided to enable students to achieve the academic standards set for a pathway or course would be enhanced if the recommended action is taken.

4.5.13 It is a requirement that all Recommendations are considered by the course team or the University, with the outcomes outlined on the *Responses to Conditions and Recommendations* template, which will be provided by the QME Office. However, it is also recognised that work in response to certain types of Recommendation may be ongoing. Ongoing actions are reported on through Annual Course Review (ACR). The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee will monitor work undertaken in response to such Recommendations for one academic year following the approval/periodic review event.

4.5.14 In the event that an internal course approval panel is unable to approve a new course, the Chair of the panel shall alert the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and the Quality Manager to the panel's recommendation. This will normally happen at

the conclusion of the internal event, in which case the external approval event will normally be postponed.

4.5.15   Dates by which formal responses must be made to Recommendations Conditions are set by the QME Office in advance of the internal and external stages of approval and review.

4.5.16   **Commendations:** The Chair of the event may choose to highlight particular areas of good practice or excellence in the form of commendations. These are included in the Conditions and Recommendations template.

4.6   Guidance for the nomination and appointment of external panel members

4.6.1   The QME Office will notify the relevant Dean of the need for nominations of external panel members. Nominations will be approved by the relevant Dean and where necessary reviewed by the PVC (Academic). In nominating external panel members, Deans will take note of the following criteria:

i.   External academic panel members should not have been involved with the course development or have been employed as an External Examiner at the University within the previous five years.

ii.   External panel members will have experience relevant to the course in question. Academic panel members will have relevant subject specialism and experience of teaching and course development at the level of the course under approval or review. Industry specialists will be practitioners in a field relevant to the course being considered.

iii.   External academic panel members shall not have had any formal links with staff, students or courses at the University (e.g. through employment) within the last five years.

iv.   Nominees who have retired will not normally be considered unless it can be demonstrated that they have retained their expertise or familiarity with current practice in the relevant subject area.

v.   Nominees will not be considered if they have been appointed to an approval or review panel by the University within the last three years.

4.7   Documentation, itineraries and panel compositions for course approval and periodic review events

4.7.1   Annex H sets out the normal requirements for internal and external approval events and Annex I sets out the normal requirements for internal and external periodic review events. The Chair of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee may adapt these in order to meet any additional requirements pertaining to individual courses.

4.7.2   In the case of periodic review, the Chair may assign specific themes or sections of the Critical Review to individual panel members.

4.8   Procedures and responsibilities following external events

4.8.1   It is the shared responsibility of the Event Chair and the Dean and Course Leader for the course under approval or review to ensure that responses to

Conditions and Recommendations are completed and course documentation is updated by the agreed deadline following the external approval or review event.

4.8.2   The Event Chair is responsible for signing off the course team's responses to Conditions and Recommendations. The Chair of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee is responsible for reporting on event outcomes to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the Senate.

4.8.3   The Event Officer will be responsible for circulating draft reports of the event to panel members for ratification prior to the report being circulated to the Dean and course team.

4.8.4   The final versions of Unit Handbooks are normally approved by the Event Chair and sent to QME, which is responsible for the publication of final versions.

4.9   Course withdrawal

4.9.1   The Senior Management Team is responsible for decisions on the withdrawal of courses based on course quality, recruitment or other strategic oversight. In the event that a course is to be withdrawn, the University will ensure that current students are notified of the changes at the earliest opportunity and that students continue to receive appropriate teaching, support and access to resources to enable the final cohort to complete the course under the auspices of the University.

4.9.2   Once a decision has been taken to withdraw a course, the Senior Management Team will ensure that appropriate action is taken to ensure that staff and students are informed of the decision and that appropriate strategies are in place to ensure that current students are able to continue their studies to completion. Action taken will ensure the University meets the guidance set out in the UK Quality Code Chapter B8, *Programme Monitoring and Review: Indicator 3.*

4.10   Collaborative Provision Policy and Procedures

4.10.1 The University's *Collaborative Provision Policy and Procedures* were approved by Academic Board in June 2008 and a revised version was approved by the Senate in 2014. The Policy and Procedures are referenced to the UK Quality Code Chapter B10: *Higher education provision with others.* The policy and procedures will be implemented at such time that the University enters into developmental discussions with potential partners concerning formal collaborative arrangements. This section of the *Guidance* will be updated at that time.

5.   ANNUAL MONITORING

5.1   The annual monitoring process, together with course approval and periodic review (section 4 of this Handbook), are central to the assurance, enhancement and ongoing security of quality and standards at Norwich University of the Arts.

         NB Detailed guidance on the annual monitoring procedures can be found on the QME pages of the intranet and Annex J.

5.2   Student involvement

5.2.1   Student representatives are included in course team discussions of Annual Course Reviews (ACRs). Student feedback, including that received through the National Student Survey, is considered as part of the process. The Students' Union President is a member of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the Senate, and is thus involved in annual monitoring at these stages.

5.3   Data for annual monitoring

5.3.1   A range of data is considered in the annual monitoring procedures, including student retention, achievement and destinations. The cycle of annual monitoring encompasses the following, which feed into the course, Faculty and professional services processes at the appropriate points and which are considered by the University's management groups:

- Application and Recruitment – report on the cycle for the year of entry produced by the Academic Registry in first part of the Autumn Term
- External Examiners' Reports and Responses – *mid-July to November*
- NSS Results – received in August, with institutional and course responses agreed and ongoing thereafter.
- ISS/UKES/PTES outcomes are provided as available and any issues arising feed into the ACR process.
- Unit Results (average mark, no. of fails, failure rate, mark distribution) Progression/Retention data
- Award Profiles
- Student Profile/Equality & Diversity
- DLHE (% in employment and % in further study, % professional and managerial jobs, salary range)

5.4   Identification and dissemination of good practice

5.4.1   The University has a well-established system for identifying and disseminating good practice, raising the profile of good practice and innovation in both academic areas and professional services. The key mechanism for identifying and disseminating good practice is the annual monitoring process. Examples are identified by Course Leaders and collated by QME Office into a single document for discussion at the Annual Monitoring Meetings of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the Senate. Annual Course Reviews (ACRs) include consideration of the reports of external examiners, who have the opportunity to identify examples of good practice at course level. The University's programme of Development Days incorporate staff presentations and workshops on good

practice identified in the most recent annual monitoring cycle. The good practice of individual staff is recognised through the University's Student Experience Awards scheme.

5.5   Annual Course Review

5.5.1   Annual Course Review (ACR) is concerned with the capacity of courses to deliver the stated aims and learning outcomes and a high quality student experience. The outputs of ACR lead to quality enhancement through, for example, amendments to curriculum content and/or delivery, and resource developments. Course teams discuss and evaluate their course throughout the year, and review progress with their Course Enhancement Plan, through a standing agenda item at Course Committee meetings. ACR also requires course teams to identify potential risks to the quality of their provision, and mechanisms to mitigate these. Identified risks are considered at each stage of the University's annual monitoring procedure, including Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the Senate, and where appropriate they are forwarded to the relevant Risk Management Groups for consideration.

5.5.2   The QME Office sends each external examiner the final version of the relevant ACR no later than the beginning of January.

5.6   Faculty Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting

5.6.1   The Faculty Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting is responsible for approving Annual Course Reviews (ACRs) and Course Enhancement Plans. The Faculty Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting will reflect and conclude on items for Enhancement to feed into the Institutional Enhancement Strategy, which is approved by the Senate.

5.6.2   At the end of the Faculty Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting, the Deans agree upon the items to be carried forward into the Institutional Enhancement Strategy to support the ongoing development of the quality of learning opportunities in the Faculties. The minutes of the Faculty Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting, and External Examiner responses are considered by the annual monitoring meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (LTQC), feeding into LTQC's subsequent report to the Senate.

5.6.3   See also the QME Annual Monitoring pages on the intranet.

5.7   Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes

5.7.1   The Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes Annual Monitoring Report is completed to a format agreed between the University and the University of the Arts London. It is a requirement of the validation partnership between the two institutions and is considered at the annual monitoring meeting of the Senate.

5.8   Routine Monitoring of Professional Services

5.8.1   The University's strategic approach to the enhancement of learning opportunities also extends to the routine monitoring of professional services areas. This is the executive responsibility of the relevant member of the Senior Management

Team, working with professional services managers and teams. The key student-facing professional services are the Library, Workshops, and Student Support.

5.8.2   Routine monitoring of professional services draws upon feedback from a range of sources, which is made available as follows:

1. The Internal Student Survey
2. The National Student Survey – results uploaded QME section of intranet following publication
3. External Examiners' Reports – uploaded to External Examiners and Annual Monitoring Outcomes section of the intranet following receipt by the University.

5.8.3   Feedback from the above may supplement that gathered through mechanisms operated internally by professional services. It is used by the relevant professional services team and SMT member(s) in the ongoing development and implementation of enhancements to the area.

5.8.4   CPD for professional services staff is a matter for discussion between the relevant professional services manager and their SMT manager.

5.9   Institutional Enhancement Strategy

5.9.1   In 2018-19, the Senate approved a three-year Enhancement Strategy to replace the one year Institutional Enhancement S. Institutional-wide actions are agreed and set for each academic year spanned by the strategy. An annual evaluation of progress towards the three-year targets is assessed at each subsequent annual monitoring point.

5.9.2   Each course identifies a Course Enhancement Plan as part of its Annual Course Review (ACR). As noted above (para. 5.6.2), at the end of the Faculty Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting, the Deans agree upon items to be feed into the review of the Institutional Enhancement Strategy. These will normally be items of institutional relevance. These are brought forward for discussion at the LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting together with items identified by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and Academic Registrar (representing key resource areas and the Student Representatives Group).

5.10   The role of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee

5.10.1   The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee is responsible for monitoring and developing quality and standards across the University's academic provision, and the implementation of the Quality Enhancement Policy. The Committee's Terms of Reference *(please refer to Annex A of this Handbook)* include the following responsibilities delegated from the Senate, which it exercises in part through its oversight of the procedures for annual monitoring.

viii.   The development and operation of the University's systems and procedures for quality management and enhancement, and ensure that these procedures meet the expectations of external regulators,

professional and statutory bodies (PSRBs), validating institutions, and accrediting bodies

ix. The monitoring of the implementation of the Strategy for Learning and achievement of targets, ensuring that developments in learning and teaching reflect the aims and targets of the Strategic Plan

x. To promote innovation and continuous enhancement in learning and teaching and the student experience

xi. To monitor and report annually on the quality of the University's taught provision including the HEA accredited PG CertHE

xii. To monitor and report on the operation of the University's HEA accredited CPD route to professional recognition

xiii. To monitor the external indicators and metrics that will be used to inform external assessments in quality assurance and teaching excellence and advise the Senate of action which should be taken to maintain and enhance the quality of the student experience

xiv. To monitor relevant external developments, consider the implications for the University, and make recommendations for refinements to University policy and practice to the Senate and/or the Senior Management Team.

5.10.2 The annual monitoring meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee receives and considers the following:

i. UG and PG Annual Course Reviews (ACRs) and Enhancement Plans
ii. NUA Responses to External Examiners' Reports
iii. Review of Peer Observation of Professional Practice Scheme
iv. Institutional overview of common themes and recommendations from external examiners' reports, including the comparability of standards
v. Good Practice
vi. Review of appeals and complaints for the reporting period
vii. Review of the Institutional Enhancement Strategy for the reporting period
viii. Areas of potential risk with summary of mitigating actions
ix. Proposed Institutional Enhancement Strategy for the next reporting period.

5.10.3 Subsequent to the annual monitoring meeting, the Chair of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee reports formally to the Senate.

5.11 The role of the Senate

5.11.1 The Senate is the senior committee of the University and is chaired by the Vice-Chancellor. Its Terms of Reference *(Annex A of this Handbook)* include the following:

- To determine the University's academic policies and procedures
- To ensure that the University's academic standards are maintained and the quality of its academic provision continuously enhanced
- To co-ordinate the design, approval, monitoring and review of academic programmes of study.

5.11.2   The Chair of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee reports formally on annual monitoring to the Senate. The Senate receives and considers the following:

      i.   Confirmation that courses, Faculties, and postgraduate research programmes have been monitored and evaluated following the University's approved procedures

      ii.   Institutional overview of common themes and recommendations from external examiners' reports, including the comparability of standards

      iii.   Review of appeals and complaints for the reporting period

      iv.   Review and update of Institutional Enhancement Strategy

      v.   Good Practice

      vi.   Areas of potential risk with summary of mitigating actions

      vii.   Outline proposals for future routine refinements to the annual monitoring procedures.

5.12   Outcomes from annual monitoring

5.12.1   Following the annual monitoring meeting of the Senate, final versions of institutional annual monitoring papers are disseminated as follows:

5.12.2   Annual Course Reviews (ACRs), PGR Annual Monitoring Report, PG Cert Annual Monitoring Report, Review of and update of the Institutional Enhancement Strategy - uploaded to QME pages of intranet by end of January

5.12.3   Good Practice document - disseminated as PDF to all staff and uploaded to Learning and Teaching pages of intranet by end of December (with link to this document from QME pages of intranet)

5.12.4   External Examiners' Reports and Responses, and Review of previous year's Institutional Enhancement Strategy – disseminated to students via the intranet by end of January

5.12.5   ACRs and Responses to External Examiners' Reports – disseminated to External Examiners by end of January.

5.13   Monitoring Reviews of courses and professional services

5.13.1   The University holds Monitoring Reviews of courses and professional services when circumstances so require; for example, in response to student feedback about the quality of teaching or resources, or when the University is planning significant resource developments. Like course approvals and periodic reviews, panels for Monitoring Reviews include external advisers from HE and industry.

5.13.2   The fundamental aim of Monitoring Reviews is to enhance the University's provision for students. Courses and professional services are reviewed in the context of the University's Strategic Plan and the developing external environment. Monitoring Reviews allow the University to take stock of provision in courses and professional services and to explore issues relating to:

    i.   The management and operation of the area, and mechanisms to enhance the student experience

    ii.   The development of the area's accommodation, equipment and staffing

    iii.   The development of University strategies and policies in relation to the area under review.

5.13.3   Monitoring Reviews are undertaken by a panel, which includes representatives of University staff, the Students' Union President or other student representative(s), and external advisers. An Academic Registry Officer acts as event officer for Monitoring Reviews. Panels are normally chaired by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) as Chair of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.

5.13.4   The terms of reference and documentation and itinerary for Monitoring Reviews are prepared by the Academic Registrar in liaison with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

5.13.5   The review panel formulates conclusions and recommendations for the Senate at the end of the event, and these are fed back to staff. The formal report of the event is comprised of the minutes of the event together with the course or professional services team's responses to conditions and recommendations. Subsequent to the completion of the event report, the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee is responsible for the monitoring of actions in response to the panel's conditions and recommendations. It is recognised that work in response to recommendations may be ongoing. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee monitors this during the year following the Monitoring Review, reporting progress to the Senate. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee and the Senate normally sign off the final version of the report on the responses to conditions and recommendations no later than the end of the academic year following the Monitoring Review.

6. QUALITY ENHANCEMENT AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF STAFF

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 The University's Strategic Plan 2014-19 confirms its commitment to strengthening the academic community through the continuing professional development of its staff and creating opportunities for engagement in research and professional practice. The Strategic Plan recognises the importance of the currency and expertise of academic and professional services staff on the quality of the student experience.

6.1.2 The quality of staff is assured through the University's policies and procedures in the following areas:

   (i)   The Recruitment and Selection of Staff
   (ii)   The Guide to Induction for Line Managers
   (iii)   Appraisal and Development Review (ADR)
   (iv)   The Staff Development Policy
   (v)   Continuing Professional Development for Academic Staff Policy
   (vi)   The Peer Observation of Professional Practice Scheme
   (vii)   The QME Handbook
   (viii) The Student Regulations and Procedures
   (ix)   Strategy for Learning
   (x)   Guidelines for Mentoring of New Staff

6.1.3 The Senate has overall responsibility for approving the policies and procedures associated with the quality enhancement and continuing professional development of staff.

6.1.4 Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee has delegated responsibility for the monitoring and review of the following policies and procedures:

   i.   The Peer Observation of Professional Practice Scheme
   ii.   The QME Handbook
   iii.   The Student Regulations and Procedures
   iv.   Strategy for Learning
   v.   Code Of Ethics For Undergraduate And Taught Postgraduate Students
   vi.   Staff Handbook on Assessment and Feedback
   vii.   Accreditation of Prior Learning Policy
   viii.   Collaborative Provision Policy
   ix.   User Services Policy
   x.   Library Collection Development Policy

6.2 The recruitment and selection of staff

6.2.1 Staff are recruited in strict accordance with the University's *Recruitment and Selection of Staff – Policy and Procedure* which ensures that the need for a post is established, the appropriate job description and person specification are

agreed, and that the selection process is consistent and equitable. Recruitment and selection processes are overseen by the Director of Human Resources.

6.2.2   All new staff recruited are required to undertake a period of probation to enable the new staff members and line managers to assess objectively whether or not the employee is suitable to the role, and to help new employees perform effectively in their new employment. The requirements for probation is set out in the University's *Probation Policy and Procedure*.

6.3   Staff Appraisal and Development Review (ADR)

6.3.1   The University recognises its employees as its greatest asset. Appraisal and Development Review (ADR) is one of the ways in which the overall strategy of the University - the Strategic Plan - is linked to the operational targets of individuals and the area in which they work. ADR is the method chosen by the University to review and appraise the performance of its staff and to ensure that the performance of individuals contributes to the achievement of strategic goals. A key focus of the ADR process is on acknowledging good performance, raising poor performance, the opportunity to undertake new projects, support for research, and support for professional development.

6.3.2   The ADR process is supported by *Guidelines on Staff Appraisal and Development Review (ADR)* and the *Performance Policy and Procedure* are published on the HR section of the intranet and are overseen by the Director of Human Resources.

6.4   Peer Observation of Professional Practice

6.4.1   Peer Observation of Professional Practice is considered an important development tool providing opportunities for academic staff to reflect on their practice in teaching and the promotion of learning, and provide opportunities to share good practice. The emphasis of the scheme is on excellence in teaching and is an important part of our continuing strategy of enhancement. All academic, learning support and technical staff on substantive contracts, and all new hourly-paid staff are expected to participate in the Scheme at least once during the course of each academic year. The outcome of Peer Observation may be used by individuals as evidence towards recognition under the University's accredited Professional Recognition Scheme (see section 6.6). The Peer Observation scheme is coordinated by the Head of Learning and Teaching with an overview of its effectiveness monitored by the Annual Monitoring meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee

6.5   Continuing Professional Development

6.5.1   The overall aim of the University's staff development programme is to be both *responsive to* and a *driver of* change. The University's staff development priorities are informed by the Strategic Plan. Staff are made aware of staff development and training opportunities via: information circulated from the

Director of Human Resources; the system for Appraisal Development Review (ADR); and informal discussions with line managers.

6.5.2   Staff are also able to apply for funding and other support for individually identified activities, e.g. attendance at conferences and short courses.

6.5.3   The University delivers a programme of professional development events through a cycle of University Development Days, Research Days, and Research Seminars. University Development Days are preceded by an all staff meeting with the Vice-Chancellor. These provide opportunities to brief staff about institutional, national and sector issues, and for staff to debate these and provide feedback to the University's management, and to facilitate the dissemination of good practice.

The purpose of University Development Days are:

1.   to support and enhance the total student experience
2.   to promote teaching excellence
3.   to promote excellence in professional services to students
4.   to support innovative practice in teaching, learning and assessment
5.   to celebrate and disseminate good practice both from within the University and in relation to external sources
6.   to engage with practical workshops, demonstrations or case studies as a means of scrutinising institutional or sector practice
7.   to promote internal face-to-face networking and collaboration between staff
8.   to identify key areas for continuing professional development

The purpose of University Research Days are:

1.   to alert staff to sector and University-wide research policy developments impacting on the creative disciplines and their collective and individual practice
2.   support staff and PGRs in engaging with, and contributing to the University's research culture
3.   to provide dedicated time for staff and PGRs to share ongoing research
4.   to provide a forum for developing collaborative research narratives and specific projects through the University Research Themes
5.   to promote and share innovative pedagogic research and research-led teaching
6.   to identify key areas for the continuing development of staff and PGR research portfolios and careers

The purpose of University Research Seminars are:

1.   to provide a forum for University-based and external colleagues to present on-going, significant research relevant to the University Research Themes and research in the creative disciplines

2.	to alert colleagues, PGRs and (where relevant PGTs and undergraduates) to innovative research of national and international calibre that helps them to critically position their own work

The University' Staff Development Policy and Continuing Professional Development Policy for Academic Staff are published on the Learning and Teaching pages of the University intranet.

**6.6	NUA Professional Recognition Scheme**

6.6.1	The University has developed a professional recognition scheme that is accredited under the Higher Education Academic (HEA) accreditation arrangements and is aligned with the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF). The UKPSF is at the core of the University's Professional Recognition Scheme and develops the concept of professional recognition for the institution. Further information can be found in the Guide to applying for Professional Recognition: Higher Education Academy Fellowship Scheme (HEA)

6.6.2	The process of professional recognition enables individuals to be awarded one of four categories of Fellowship of the HEA, Associate Fellow, Fellow, and Senior Fellow, in acknowledgement that their practice evidences successful engagement with the dimensions of the UKPSF and the requirements of the category.

6.6.3	The University has two lines of accredited provision under the scheme:

(i)	Norwich University of the Arts Professional Recognition Scheme for Arts, Design, Architecture and Media (PRS-ADAM).

(ii)	The Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Arts, Design, Architecture and Media

6.6.4	The Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Arts, Design, Architecture and Media will be subject to the quality management and enhancement (QME) arrangements applicable to all taught courses and outlined in Sections 3, 4 and 5 of this Handbook:

6.6.5	The Norwich University of the Arts Professional Recognition Scheme for Arts, Design, Architecture and Media (PRS-ADAM) is subject to the guidelines published in the Operational Handbook. The Professional Recognition Panel makes recognition decisions under the PRS-ADAM scheme. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee is responsible for approving the composition of the panel.

6.6.6	The Head of Learning and Teaching is responsible for the operational management of the PRS-ADAM scheme and leads the process for participants in compiling evidence and submissions for consideration by Professional Recognition Panels. Staff seeking nomination are supported through their

application by a HEA trained Mentor. The mentor is not involved in the assessment of the application.

6.6.7   Staff involvement in research, consultancy and professional practice is important in terms of informing curriculum developments; income generation; raising the profile of academic provision; developing regional, national and international links; and promoting the University to the wider community. It contributes to quality enhancement through ensuring that the University has a body of staff who are professionally active and engaged with current developments in the subject area. It enhances the quality of the student experience through ensuring that staff maintain, develop, and pass on to students their understanding of creative and professional practice.

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS
QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT
University Committee Terms of Reference and Membership and Structure Diagram

1.   The committee structure

A diagrammatic representation of the relationship between the Senate and other University committees and the Terms of Reference and Memberships of University committees are set out in alphabetical order below.

```
                                          ┌──────────┐
                                          │  SENATE  │
                                          └──────────┘

┌───────────────┐  ┌──────────────┐   ┌─────────────────┐        ┌──────────────┐  ┌─────────────────┐
│ Equality &    │  │ ASSESSMENT/  │   │ Learning,       │        │ Research     │  │ Professorial &  │
│ Diversity     │  │ AWARD BOARDS │   │ Teaching        │        │ Committee    │  │ Honorary Awards │
│ Committee     │  │              │   │ & Quality       │        │ (RC)         │  │ Committee (PHAC)│
│ (EDC)         │  │              │   │ Committee (LTQC)│        │              │  │                 │
└───────────────┘  └──────────────┘   └─────────────────┘        └──────────────┘  └─────────────────┘

                   ┌──────────────┐
                   │ Progress     │
                   │ Review       │
                   │ Board (PRB)  │
                   └──────────────┘

         ┌───────────────┐  ┌─────────────────┐   ┌──────────────────┐  ┌──────────────┐   ┌─────────────────┐
         │ Faculty Board │  │ Postgraduate    │   │ Coordinated      │  │ AD-HOC       │   │ Research Degrees│
         │ of Studies    │  │ Taught Board of │   │ Support Group    │  │ SCC          │   │ Committee (RDC) │
         │ (FBOS)        │  │ Studies         │   │ (CSG)            │  │ APL          │   │                 │
         │               │  │ (PGT-BOS)       │   │ Disability       │  │ APPEALS      │   │                 │
         └───────────────┘  └─────────────────┘   │ Support Group    │  └──────────────┘   └─────────────────┘
                                                   │ (DSG)            │
         ┌───────────────┐                         └──────────────────┘
         │ Course        │
         │ Committee     │
         └───────────────┘

   ┌───────────┐  ┌──────────────┐  ┌──────────────┐  ┌──────────────┐  ┌──────────────────┐
   │ Digital   │  │ Learning &   │  │ Student Reps │  │ Quality      │  │ Employability    │
   │ Enhancement│ │ Teaching     │  │ Group        │  │ Group        │  │ Group            │
   │ Group     │  │ Group        │  │ (SRG)        │  │              │  │                  │
   └───────────┘  └──────────────┘  └──────────────┘  └──────────────┘  └──────────────────┘
```

2. Senate

2.1 Terms of Reference:

- To implement the University's Strategic Plan.

- To be responsible for providing assurance to the governing body (University Council) on matters related to the management of the University's academic activities, and the academic quality and standards of its provision. To determine the University's academic policies and procedures.

- To ensure that the University's academic standards are maintained and the quality of its academic provision continuously enhanced.

- To co-ordinate the design, approval, monitoring and review of academic programmes of study.

- To ensure compliance with procedures for student progression, the award of qualifications, and for nominations for honorary Doctorates.

- To commission, approve and monitor the sub-strategies of the Strategic Plan.

- To approve external examiner nominations.

- To define the University's policies for marketing, admissions and recruitment.

- To advise on any other matters which the Vice-Chancellor may refer to the Senate.

2.2 Membership:

Vice-Chancellor *(Chair)*
Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Academic Registrar
Dean of Design and Architecture
Dean of Arts and Media
Director of Human Resources
Director of External Relations
Director of Research
Director of Finance
Director of Innovation and Engagement
Head of Library and Learning Support
Associate Dean/Head of Taught Postgraduate Programmes
Quality Manager
Up to 3 elected members of academic staff
Up to 3 elected members of professional services staff
Students' Union President

The quorum will be three members plus the Chair.

The Administrator for the Academic Registrar will act as convening secretary to the Board

2.3   Senate sub-committees

2.3.1   The Senate will establish such committees as it considers necessary to enable it to carry out its responsibilities provided that each establishment is approved by the Vice-Chancellor. So far as is practicable the Senate will delegate specified functions to its sub-committees.

2.3.2   The following sub-committees are approved for operation in 2018-19:

3.   Senate sub-committees

3.1   Accreditation of Prior Learning Panel

3.1.1   Terms of Reference

- To consider AP(E)L applications to the University's undergraduate or taught postgraduate courses in line with the University's entry and admissions criteria.

- To ensure that applications are assessed and mapped appropriately against the Learning Outcomes of the relevant course and level of study.

- To offer places to successful applicants on an appropriate course and level of study.

- The APL Panel will be convened as required.

3.1.2   Membership:

Dean of Faculty (Chair)
Relevant Course Leader (or nominee)
2 members of academic staff (not connected with the course for which the application is being considered)
Quality Manager

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

A member of Academic Registry Administrative Office will act as convening Secretary to the Panel.

3.2   Appeals Committee

3.2.1   Terms of Reference

- To meet as appropriate to consider appeals against assessment decisions.

- To meet as appropriate to consider appeals against decisions to terminate students' studies on academic grounds.

- To meet as appropriate to consider appeals against the decision of the Student Conduct Committee.

- To hear representations from the student, their representative and appropriate staff in consideration of the appeal.

   To decide on the outcome of the appeal and to make recommendations on the action to be taken.

3.2.2   Membership:

Dean of Faculty not representing the appellant's course (Chair)
Two (2) academic staff members of the Senate (neither of whom shall be involved or connected to the course which is subject to the appeal)
Academic Registrar

A member of the Academic Support Office will attend in an advisory capacity to the Committee

The Chair may co-opt an external independent member to the committee.
This may be an external examiner not involved with the appellant's course, or it may be another external advisor with relevant expertise. The Chair exercises discretion when considering (a) whether an external member of the Committee is required, and (b) whether it is necessary to involve external examiner(s) from the appellant's course in the appeals procedure.

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

The Administrator for the Academic Registrar will act as convening secretary to the Committee

3.3 Coordinated Support Group

3.3.1 Terms of Reference

- To develop and coordinate the provision of support for students across the University

- To consider the support needs of, and implement support for, individual students where a co-ordinated approach is required

3.3.2 Membership:

Assistant Registrar: Academic Support (alternate Chair)
Student Support Manager (alternate Chair)
Deans of Faculty
Associate Dean – Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards
Head of Library and Learning Support
Faculty Administration Manager
Senior Academic Support Officer
Student Support Advisor
Student Support Officer
Academic Support Officer

3.4   Course Assessment Board *(undergraduate)*

3.4.1   Terms of Reference:

- To consider the performance of full- and part-time students on the course at the end-of-year, including final assessment.

- To agree the marks for course units at the end-of-year.

- To agree the marks for course units which contribute to final assessment, for forwarding to the Final Award Board.

- To agree the award of credit.

- To receive recommendations from the Extenuating Circumstances Panel and to determine any provision for mitigation in accordance with the *Student Regulations and Procedures.*

- To take decisions and agree actions and conditions in respect of failure, marginal failure, cheating and plagiarism, or any other circumstances in which the award of a Pass mark or grade is not possible.

- To decide on the terms of Referral and Resubmission and to determine conditions to be imposed in cases of monitoring periods (for undergraduate courses) or academic intermission.

- To receive verbal reports from external examiners

3.4.2   Membership:

Dean of Faculty (Chair)
Course Leader(s)
Unit Leaders
External examiner(s)
Academic Registrar or representative
A Course Assessment Board is held for each undergraduate award.
The quorum for the Course Assessment Board will be three members plus the
Chair, except where the Board consists of six members or fewer, in which case
the quorum will be two members plus the Chair.
*A nominated Course Administrator will act as convening secretary to the
Committee*

3.5   Course Committees (undergraduate courses)

3.5.1   Terms of Reference:

- To advise the Faculty Board about matters relating to:

    o course organisation and management

    o resource planning.

- To discuss University business and other matters delegated from the Senior Management Team, Faculty Board, or proposed by members of the group.

- To undertake tasks and projects in line with the aims of the University's Strategic Plan and QME procedures.

- To report to the Faculty Board of Studies.

3.5.2   Membership

Course Leader (Chair)
Substantive and hourly-paid staff teaching on the course
Representative of technical staff
Student Representatives
Dean of Faculty (ex officio)
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (ex officio)
SU President (by invitation – to receive all agendas, papers and minutes)
Librarian (by invitation – to receive all agendas, papers and minutes)

The quorum for the committee will be three members plus the Chair

A member of the Course Administration Team will act as convening secretary to the Committee

3.6   **Disability Support Group**

3.6.1   Terms of Reference

- To meet as appropriate to consider applicants who have declared a disability and establish appropriate support arrangements for their study needs.

3.6.2   Membership:

Academic Registrar (Chair)
Deans of Faculty
Student Support Manager
Estates Manager
Health and Safety Officer
Resources Manager

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

A member of Student Support will convene the meeting

3.7   Equality and Diversity Committee

3.7.1   Terms of Reference:

- To monitor the implementation of the University policies relating to equality and diversity, ensuring that these reflect the aims and targets of the Strategic Plan.

- To work towards ensuring equality of opportunity for all staff and students.

- To increase awareness of equality and diversity issues throughout the University.

- To promote equality of regard throughout management, staffing, curriculum and teaching in the University.

- To encourage recruitment, admissions and employment procedures which demonstrate adequate representation of different social and cultural groupings.

- To recommend provision of support and advice to staff and students regarding unwelcome comment or actions relating to each of the equality strands, age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership, maternity and pregnancy, race, religion or belief (including lack of belief), sex and sexual orientation.

- To promote attitudes discouraging hurtful or discriminating behaviour to include the use of stereotyping and the exercise of prejudice of any kind.

- To promote equality of regard throughout management, staffing, curriculum and teaching in the University.

- To recommend strategies relating to access opportunities and student support.

- To monitor relevant external developments, consider their implications for the University, and make recommendations for refinements to University policy and practice to Senate sub-committees and/or the Senior Management Team.

- To report to the Senate.

3.7.2   Membership:

Director of Human Resources (Chair)
Head of Library and Learning Support or their representative
Academic Registrar or their representative
Two (2) members of academic staff
One (1) member of professional services staff
Estates Manager
Students' Union President

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

A member of the Senior Management Team Secretariat will act as convening secretary to the Committee.

3.8   Extenuating Circumstances Panel

3.8.1   Terms of Reference

- To meet prior to the Course Assessment Boards to consider individual claims for Extenuating Circumstances.

- To consider the appropriate documentary evidence for each claim and where appropriate representations from relevant course staff.

- To decide on whether an individual claim for Extenuating Circumstances should be upheld and, if so, to make a judgment on the severity of the circumstances presented.

- To report to the relevant Course Assessment Board the decision of the Panel.

- To maintain the strictest confidentiality in the consideration of each claim.

3.8.2   Membership:

Academic Registrar or nominee (Chair)
Assistant Registrar (Academic Support)
2 Course Leaders not connected to the course(s) for which claims are
being considered (or nominees)

The quorum for the panel will be two members plus the Chair.

A member of the Academic Support Office will act as convening secretary to the Panel

3.9 Faculty Board of Studies

Faculty Boards for undergraduate courses will be joint meetings, except for consideration of the Annual Course Reviews, where separate Faculty Boards may be convened to accommodate the volume of business.

3.9.1 Terms of Reference:

- To assure at Faculty level the academic quality and standards of provision by reviewing reports from Course Committees, Annual Monitoring, External Examiners, PSRBs, Approvals and Periodic Review and making recommendations to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee as appropriate.

- To approve and monitor the content, progress and effectiveness of course enhancement plans.

- To engage with the student body through representation and consideration of feedback, in support of the academic quality of provision and associated student satisfaction.

- To advise on any resource issues which may have a direct impact on the courses for which the Board of Studies is responsible.

- To report to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.

3.9.2 Membership:

Deans of Faculty (alternating Chairs)
Undergraduate Course Leaders (all)
Year 0 Course Leader
Academic Registrar or their representative
Associate Dean/Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards
Head of Learning & Teaching
Resources Manager
Student representatives (2 (1 from each faculty) for Undergraduate Year 0, Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3
Representative of the Library
Students' Union President (ex officio)
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (ex-officio)

The quorum for the committee will be three members plus the Chair

A Deans' Administrator will act as convening secretary to the Board.

3.10   Board of Studies for Postgraduate Taught provision

3.10.1 Terms of Reference

- To assure the academic quality and standards of provision by reviewing reports from Annual Monitoring, External Examiners, PSRBs, Approvals and Periodic Review and making recommendations to the Quality and Standards Committee as appropriate.

- To approve and monitor the content, progress and effectiveness of the enhancement plans for PGT and PG Cert in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ADAM).

- To engage with the student body through representation and consideration of feedback, in support of the academic quality of provision and associated student satisfaction.

- To advise on course organisation and management, resource planning and any resource issues which have a direct impact on the courses for which the Board of Studies is responsible.

- To discuss University business and other matters delegated from the Senior Management Team, and undertake tasks and projects in line with the aims of the University's Strategic Plan.

- To report to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.

3.10.2   Membership:

Associate Dean/Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards (Chair)
Substantive and hourly-paid staff teaching on MA courses
Head of Learning and Teaching
Academic Registrar or their representative
Resources Manager
MA Student representatives (1 from each year group and one from the PGCHE)
Representative of the Library
Students' Union President *(ex officio)*
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) *(ex-officio)*
Deans of Faculty *(ex-officio)*

The quorum for the committee will be three members plus the Chair

A Course Administrator will act as convening secretary for the Board.

3.11   Final Award Board *(undergraduate)*

3.11.1 Terms of Reference:

- To consider the whole student profile of final marks from all components of the award.

- To approve final aggregated marks and agree final awards.

- To agree the award of exit qualifications as appropriate.

- To receive a verbal report from the external examiner.

3.11.2 Membership:

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair)
Deans of Faculty
Undergraduate Course Leaders
Academic Registrar or their representative
One (1) undergraduate external examiner (to be identified by the University and agreed with the examiner at the commencement of the academic year)

The quorum for the committee will be three members plus the Chair

A Course Administrator will act as convening secretary to the Board.

3.12   Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (LTQC)

3.12.1 Terms of Reference:

- To take responsibility delegated from the Senate for the development and operation of the University's systems and procedures for quality management and enhancement, and ensure that these procedures meet the expectations of external regulators, professional statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs), validating institutions, and accreditation bodies.

- To monitor the implementation of the Strategy for Learning and achievement of targets, ensuring that developments in learning and teaching reflect the aims and targets of the Strategic Plan.

- To promote innovation and continuous enhancement in learning and teaching and the student experience.

- To monitor and report annually on the quality of the University's taught provision including the HEA accredited PGCertHE.

- To monitor and report on the operation of the University's HEA accredited CPD route to professional recognition.

- To monitor the external indictors and metrics that will be used to inform external assessments of quality assurance and teaching excellence and advise the Senate of action which should be taken to maintain and enhance the quality of the student experience.

- To monitor relevant external developments, consider their implications for the University, and make recommendations for refinements to University policy and practice to the Senate and/or the Senior Management Team.

- To report to the Senate.

3.12.2 Membership:

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair)
Academic Registrar
Deans of Faculty
Director of Research
Director of Innovation and Engagement
Quality Manager
Associate Dean/Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards
Head of Learning & Teaching
Assistant Registrar (Academic Support)
Head of Library and Learning Support
Students' Union President.

The quorum for the committee will be three members plus the Chair
The QME Office will act as the secretariat for the Committee

3.13   LTQC Sub-groups

3.13.1 Internal Verification Sub-group

Terms of Reference:

- To review the completed Internal Verification Checklists for all undergraduate and taught postgraduate courses.

- To identify significant trends and issues (positive and/or negative) within and across courses, bringing these to the attention of Course Leaders, other relevant staff and – where necessary – external examiners.

- To report to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.

Membership:
Academic Registrar (Lead)
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Dean of Design and Architecture
Dean of Arts and Media
Quality Manager
Academic members of LTQC to be co-opted as necessary

3.13.2 Digital Enhancement Group

Terms of Reference:

- To engage relevant stakeholders in enhancing the University's digital learning and teaching environment.

- To conduct impact assessments of actions taken under their remit, or wider impact assessments as required by LTQC to inform future decision making

  Key areas of activity covered:

  - Intranet, VLE & Moodle

  - E:Vision

  - *NSS – Learning Resources, Course Delivery*

Membership:
Dean of Faculty of Design and Architecture (Lead)
Up to 4 academic staff representing each Faculty (nominated by the Deans)
IT Manger or representatives
Web Developer and Administrator
Representation from Registry Services (identified by the Deputy Registrar)
A representative from the Library (nominated by the Head of Library and Learning Support)
Faculty Administration Manager
Head of Learning and Teaching

3.13.3 Employability Group

Terms of Reference:

- To action instructions or directions passed to it by LTQC

- To consider the implications of sector developments on University policies and procedures, as directed by LTQC, and make evidence-based recommendation

- To conduct impact assessments of actions taken under their remit, or wider impact assessments as required by LTQC to inform future decision making.

  Key areas of activity covered:

  - Destination of Leavers from Higher Education Survey (DLHE)

  - Employability Service

  - Ideas Factory – live briefs

  - Employer engagement

  - *NSS – Careers, Course Delivery*

Membership:

Director of Innovation and Engagement (Lead)
Business Innovation Manager
Employability Adviser
Up to six (6) members of academic staff to represent each Faculty, to include at least 1 Course Leader (3 each to be nominated by the Deans)
Alumni Officer
A representative from the Library (nominated by the Head of Library and Learning Support)
One (1) PGT and two (2) UG student representatives (to be recruited from the Student Reps Group)

3.13.4   Learning and Teaching Group

Terms of Reference:

- To action instructions or directions passed to it by LTQC;

- To consider the implications of sector developments on University policies and procedures, as directed by LTQC, and make evidence-based recommendation

- To conduct impact assessments of actions taken under their remit, or wider impact assessments as required by LTQC to inform future decision making.

- To monitor progress towards aims of the Learning and Teaching Strategy

   Key areas of activity covered:

   - HEA annual monitoring / professional recognition scheme (PRS-ADAM)

   - PGCertHE Learning and Teaching

   - POPPS evaluation of effectiveness

   - Learning resources and student support

   - University Development Days and staff CPD programme (making recommendations for activities/themes)

   - *NSS – Teaching on my course, Learning opportunities, Assessment and Feedback, Academic Support, Learning Resources, Learning Community, Course Delivery*

Membership:

Head of Learning and Teaching (Lead)
Head of Library and Learning Support (or their representative)
One (1) HEA accredited member of staff
Up to six (6) members of academic staff to represent each Faculty, to include at least 1 Course Leader (3 each to be nominated by the Deans)
Resources Manager (or their representative)
IT Manager (or their representative)
A representative from Registry Services (nominated by the Academic Registrar)

Student Support Manager (or their representative)
Senior Quality Officer
SU President

Ex officio members
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Deans of Faculty
Academic Registrar

3.13.5   Quality Group

Terms of Reference:

- To action instructions or directions passed to it by LTQC;

- To consider the implications of sector developments on University policies and procedures, as directed by LTQC, and make evidence-based recommendation

- To conduct impact assessments of actions taken under their remit, or wider impact assessments as required by LTQC to inform future decision making.

  Key areas of activity covered:

  - Approval and review events – monitoring outcomes

  - Annual Course Review – monitoring outcomes and making recommendations on process

  - External examining – monitoring effectiveness of external examining system

  - Student voice

  - *NSS – Organisation and Management, Student Voice*

Membership:

Quality Manager (Lead)
Compliance Manager
Up to four (4) members of academic staff to represent each Faculty, to include at least 1 Course Leader (2 each to be nominated by the Deans)
Resources Manager (or their representative)
Business Intelligence Analyst
Head of Library and Learning Support (or their representative)
Marketing and Recruitment Representative (nominated by the Director of External Relations)
A representative from Registry Services (nominated by the Academic Registrar)
Student Support Manager (or their representative)
Senior Quality Officer
Faculty Administration Manager (or their representative)
One (1) PGT and two (2) UG student representatives (to be recruited from the Student Reps)

Ex officio members
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Deans of Faculty
Students' Union President

3.13.6   Student Representatives Group

Terms of Reference:

- To discuss matters relating to the quality of the student experience, making recommendations as appropriate to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.

- To promote the continual enhancement of the student experience.

- To undertake tasks and projects in line with the aims of the University's Strategic Plan and QME procedures.

- To report to the Quality and Standards Committee.

Membership:

Academic Registrar (Lead)
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Students' Union President
Elected Student Representatives
Resource Manager (or their representative)
Student Support Manager (or their representative)

3.14 MA Assessment and Award Board

3.14.1 Terms of Reference

- To consider the performance of full- and part-time students on the course at the end-of-year, including final assessment.

- To agree the marks for course units at the end-of-year.

- To agree the marks for course units which contribute to final assessment.

- To agree the award of credit.

- To receive recommendations from the Extenuating Circumstances Panel and to determine any provision for mitigation in accordance with the Student Regulations and Procedures.

- To take decisions and agree actions and conditions in respect of failure, marginal failure, cheating and plagiarism, or any other circumstances in which the award of a Pass mark or grade is not possible.

- To decide on the terms of Referral and Resubmission and to determine conditions to be imposed in cases of monitoring periods (for undergraduate courses) or academic intermission.

- To approve final marks and agree final awards.

- To agree the award of exit qualifications as appropriate.

- To receive verbal reports from external examiners.

3.14.2 Membership

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair)
Associate Dean/Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards
Academic staff approved by the Senate as members of the MA Assessment and Award Board
External examiners
Academic Registrar or their representative

The quorum for the committee will be three members plus the Chair

A member of the Course Administration Team will act as convening secretary to the Board

3.15   PGCertHE Assessment and Award Board

3.15.1 Terms of Reference

- To consider the performance of full- and part-time students on the course at the end-of-year, including final assessment.

- To agree the marks for course units at the end-of-year.

- To agree the marks for course units which contribute to final assessment.

- To agree the award of credit.

- To receive recommendations from the Extenuating Circumstances Panel and to determine any provision for mitigation in accordance with the Student Regulations and Procedures.

- To take decisions and agree actions and conditions in respect of failure, marginal failure, cheating and plagiarism, or any other circumstances in which the award of a Pass mark or grade is not possible.

- To decide on the terms of Referral and Resubmission and to determine conditions to be imposed in cases of monitoring periods (for undergraduate courses) or academic intermission.

- To approve final marks and agree final awards.

- To agree the award of exit qualifications as appropriate.

- To receive verbal reports from external examiners.

3.15.2   Membership

Pro-Vice Chancellor (Academic) (Chair);
Associate Dean/Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards
Head of Learning and Teaching
Academic Registrar (or nominee)
Unit Leader(s)
A suitably qualified and experienced External Examiner approved by the University's Learning, Teaching & Quality Committee (LTQC) and University Senate. *(An external Examiner for this award will normally hold a recognised teaching qualification and/or SFHEA or PFHEA).*

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

A member of Academic Registry QME Office will act as convening Secretary to the Panel.

3.16 Professional Recognition Panel [HEA accredited Professional Recognition Scheme (PRS-ADAM)]

3.16.1 Terms of Reference

- To consider reviewers recognition decisions under the University's HEA accredited CPD Scheme

- To seek explicit assurance from internal and external members that the requirements for professional recognition have been satisfactorily met by claimants before confirmation of recognition at any level

- To consider the quality of evidence provided for each claimant against HEA descriptors and the UKPSF

- To agree summary feedback statements for applicants

- To decide on terms of Resubmission

- To make recommendations for improvement to guidance and/or programme development

3.16.2 Membership

Head of Learning and Teaching (Chair)
Associate Dean Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards
Two suitably qualified and recognised Academic or Professional Services
staff (at D2 or D3 – must be D3 in the case of claims for SF)
External Examiner

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

A member of Academic Registry QME Office will act as convening Secretary to the Panel.

3.17 Professorial and Honorary Awards Committee

3.17.1 Terms of Reference

- To consider applications and make decisions on the conferment of the titles of Professor, Visiting Professor and Emeritus Professor.

- To consider nominations for the award of Honorary Doctorate to be conferred by the University of the Arts London.

- To advise the Vice-Chancellor, the Senate, and the University Council on any matters relating to the conferment of the titles of Professor, Visiting Professor or Emeritus Professor.

3.17.2 Membership

Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Director of Research
At least 2 senior academic staff (normally with a Professorial title)
At least one and up to two external assessors (Professors or equivalent)
appointed by the Vice-Chancellor (external meeting only)

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

The Academic Registrar shall act as convening secretary to the Committee

3.18   Progress Review Boards

3.18.1 Terms of Reference:

- To review mid-year progress of students.

- To refer students at academic risk to Supportive Monitoring and/or to relevant University professional services, e.g. Academic Support, Student Support.

- To take decisions about course terminations in cases of: (a) non-submission without extenuating circumstances; and/or (b) unsatisfactory student attendance.

3.18.2 Membership:

Undergraduate Board (Year 0, Year 1 & Year 2):

Deans of Faculty (Chair)
Undergraduate Course Leaders (all)
Year 0 Course Leader
Representative from Academic Registry

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

A Course Administrator will act as convening secretary to the Boards

Postgraduate Taught Board (not PGCertHE):

Associate Dean/Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards (Chair)
MA Subject Leaders
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (ex-officio)
Representative from Academic Registry

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

A Course Administrator will act as convening secretary to the Boards

3.19   Research Committee

3.19.1   Terms of Reference:

- To promote and encourage research (as defined in the Research Strategy, 2015-2020) throughout the University.

- To consider applications received to the University's Research Fellowship and Research and Innovation Fellows' programmes and to apply the relevant Assessment Criteria in making award decisions. To monitor applications by staff for external research funding, with final approval to be given by Vice-Chancellor or chosen nominee.

- To monitor the development of the research environment, the development of funding applications to support research activity, and the standard and volume of research activity within the University.

- To monitor and evaluate staff research and advise Deans of Faculty about the development of research within the Faculties.

- To lead the implementation of relevant sections of the Research Strategy, 2015-2020, including those concerned with the Research Excellence Framework (REF), ensuring that developments reflect the aims and targets of the University Strategic Plan.

- To receive updates on the annual programme of events and monitor its impact on the research environment.

- To develop and promote the University's research profile locally, regionally, nationally and internationally.

- To report to the Senate.

3.19.2   Membership:
Director of Research (Chair)
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) *(ex officio)*
Research Champion Leads from each of the research themes
Associate Dean/Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards
Head of Learning and Teaching
5 members of academic staff (each Faculty to be represented)
Director of Innovation and Engagement
Head of Library and Learning Support or their representative
NB Research-active members of academic staff may be co-opted as required by the Chair

The quorum for the committee will be three members plus the Chair

The Research Administrator will act as convening secretary to the Committee.

3.20   Research Degrees Committee

3.20.1 Terms of Reference:

- To consider applications to the Norwich University of the Arts (NUA) research degree programme using the NUA Research Degrees Admissions and Selection Criteria.

- To offer places to study on the NUA research degree programme.

- To ensure that research degree proposals reflect NUA's academic policies, the Research Strategy, and conform to the University of the Arts London's *Research Degree Regulations.*

- To ensure that applications to register on the research degrees programme adhere to the University of the Arts London's *Code of Practice on Research Ethics.*

- To ensure that NUA's research degree provision meets the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B11: *Research degrees* (June 2012).

- To monitor the progress and completion rates of research degree students.

- To monitor and oversee the delivery of training for research degree students and supervisors.

- To ensure that research degree supervision is appropriate.

- To nominate examination teams for MPhil and PhD examinations.

- To report to the NUA Research Committee and UAL's Research Degrees Sub-Committee.

3.20.2 Membership:

Director of Research (Chair)
Up to 4 Directors of Studies (appointed for a renewable 3 year period)
Associate Dean Head of Taught Postgraduate Awards
Head of Library and Learning Support or their representative
Relevant research active members of academic staff to be co-opted as required
Quality Manager
A member of Academic Registry
Representative of the University of the Arts London
Research degrees student representative (for identified agenda items only)
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) *(ex officio)*

The quorum for the committee will be three members plus the Chair

The Research Administrator will act as convening secretary to the Committee.

3.21   Resubmission Board (all undergraduate and postgraduate awards)

3.21.1   Terms of Reference:

- To consider the performance of students in all components of the course at Resubmission (and Referral if appropriate).

- To agree the marks for all components of the course which contribute to unit, level or final assessment at Resubmission (and Referral if appropriate).

- To recommend, where appropriate, progression to the next stage of the course.

- To agree final awards where appropriate.

- To recommend, where appropriate, termination of a course due to failure at Resubmission.

- To receive recommendations from the Extenuating Circumstances Panel (where appropriate).

- To decide on the terms of Referral and Resubmission and to determine conditions to be imposed in cases of monitoring periods (for undergraduate courses) or academic intermission.

- To approve final marks and agree final awards as appropriate.

- To agree the award of exit qualifications as appropriate.

3.21.2   Membership

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair)
Deans of Faculty
Undergraduate Course Leaders
For MA awards: Academic staff approved by the Senate as members of the MA Assessment and Award Board
Academic Registrar or their representative
One (1) undergraduate external examiner (to be identified by the University and agreed with the examiner at the commencement of the academic year)
One (1) MA external examiner (to be identified by the University and agreed with the examiner at the commencement of the academic year)

The quorum for the committee will be three members plus the Chair

A Course Administrator will act as convening secretary to the Committee

3.22   Student Conduct Committee

3.22.1   Terms of Reference:

- To investigate cases of academic misconduct including cheating and plagiarism where the student has denied any form of academic misconduct at an informal meeting; or the matter has not been resolved at the informal meeting; or where the student is no longer registered at the University at the time the allegation is made.

- To investigate complaints or concerns about student behaviour where the behaviour of the student is perceived to be antisocial as defined in paragraph 2.6.2 in the *Student Regulations and Procedures* and/or where behaviour conflicts with the University's Equality and Diversity Policy as set out in paragraph 1.5 in the *Student Regulations and Procedures*.

- To investigate reported incidents of damage to University property including student residences and to recover damages incurred as a result of damage where the student is found to be responsible.

- To investigate matters regarding the conduct of students where this constitutes a criminal offence and has taken place on University property or where the conduct or work of the student has caused offence.

- To take appropriate action where a student is found to be in breach of the Student Regulations and Procedures, including terminating the student's studies.

3.22.2   Membership:

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair)
Academic Registrar
Dean of Faculty or their nominee (not related to the student's course or area of study)

The quorum for the committee will be two members plus the Chair

A member of the Senior Management Team Secretariat will act as convening secretary to the Committee

4. Management Groups

4.1 Senior Management Team

4.1.1 Terms of Reference

- To take overall responsibility for the strategic and operational management of the University.

- To discuss University business and other matters proposed by members of the group.

- To make decisions concerning the University's management and development including the planning and allocation of resources.

- To discuss national policy, legislative changes and initiatives relating to the Higher Education sector and consider the implications for the University.

- To consider and resolve issues affecting the operation of the University.

- To approve guidelines and procedures to support the delivery of policy.

4.1.2 Membership:

Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Dean of Design and Architecture
Dean of Arts and Media
Academic Registrar
Director of Human Resources
Director of External Relations
Director of Finance
Director of Innovation and Engagement

4.2 Other Operational Groups

The University has the following task groups which meet to address specific areas of work:

- Exhibition Working Group

- Risk Management Groups.

- Gallery Working Group

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

Membership of Course Assessment and Final Award Boards

Approved by Faculty of Design & Architecture Board of Studies

Professor Hilary Carlisle

Dean of Design & Architecture	Signed	Date

Approved by Faculty of Arts & Media Board of Studies

Professor Richard Sawdon Smith

Dean of Arts & Media	Signed	Date

Approved by Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee

Professor Neil Powell

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	Signed	Date

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

Membership of Course Assessment and Final Award Boards

(NB: Include job titles for all staff, eg Dr Jane Bloggs, 0.5 Senior Lecturer, BA Hons Fine Art. Include job titles and institutions of external examiners, eg Dr Mick Bliggs, Senior Lecturer, BA Hons Fine Art, University of Wisbech)

Title of Board:

Time and Date of Meeting: *(eg 2.00pm 14th June 2017)*

Chair

Internal Examiners	**Name**	**Job title**

External Examiner(s)	**Name**	**Title and Institution**

Francis House
3-7 Redwell Street
Norwich NR2 4SN

Vice-Chancellor: Professor John Last

EXTERNAL EXAMINER NOMINATION FORM

Proposed External Examiner

Instructions for completion:

1)   **Please email the completed form to the QME Office at QME@nua.ac.uk**

2)   **Proposed External Examiners should complete Section B in full. If you have no information to put in one section, write "none".**

3)   **You may attach a CV to supplement the information provided and where your CV includes information required, please state in the boxes where this information can be located on your CV.**

4)   **Once completed, please send the form to the following address:**

QME Officer
Academic Registry
Norwich University of the Arts
Francis House
3-7 Redwell Street
Norwich
NR2 4SN

Or alternatively, email a copy to the QME Office at qme@nua.ac.uk.

Please note that, in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, the information contained on this form may be held on computer files for administration purposes only.

SECTION A

*To be completed by the QME Office **before** being sent to the proposed External Examiner*

Details of Appointment

1. Name of course(s) of study which the
    External Examiner is to cover:

2. Proposed period of appointment
    Normally 4 years, 1 January to 31 December

3. Details of any duties specific to the proposed External Examiner:

4. Details of existing External Examiners (if any) appointed to the same course:

Name(s)	Institution	Course	Any specific duties	Period of Appointment

SECTION B

To be completed by the proposed External Examiner

5. Title: [ ] Surname: [ ] Forename(s): [ ]

6. Address for correspondence: [ ]

7. Daytime telephone number: [ ]

8. Mobile number: [ ]

9. Email address: [ ]

11. Present or most recent employment:

Employer's name	Position held	Period of appointment

12. Employment history:

Employer's name	Position held	Period of appointment

13. Current and/or previous external examining experience:

University/College	Awards and subject areas examined	From - To

14. Higher Education:

University/College	Qualification – title and subject	From – To

15. Other professional qualifications:
Including membership of professional bodies

Institution/professional body	Qualification	Date obtained

16. Knowledge and understanding of UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality:
In line with the relevant section of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Chapter B7: External examining, Indicator 5), please evaluate your knowledge and understanding of these aspects of quality and standards

17. Research, professional practice, consultancy, and related activities:
Including exhibitions, performances, productions, books, refereed articles and conference papers

18. Any current/previous association with Norwich University of the Arts
Please indicate below if you are a current or previous employee of Norwich University of the Arts or one of its collaborative partners; or if you have a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with either a member of staff and/or a student involved with the course named at 1 above

Nature of the link	From - To

SECTION C

19. Authorisation:

Data Protection Act 1998

I consent to Norwich University of the Arts processing the above data and any such other data as it shall obtain from me for legitimate purposes associated with my appointment or possible appointment as an External Examiner.

Signature: |_____| **Date:** |_____|

Please return this form as indicated on page 1.

SECTION D

- This nominee will be the only external examiner from this institution to be appointed to the Faculty of Arts and Media/Faculty of Design and Architecture (edit as appropriate)

- No members of the University's staff are currently serving as External Examiner to awards in the same department or unit of this nominee's institution.

Quality Manager to sign to confirm the above checks have been carried out.

Signature: | | **Date:** |

SECTION E

To be completed by Norwich University of the Arts

QME Office – send completed form to Dean of Faculty for signature

20. Dean of Faculty of Arts and Media

If no previous external examining experience is indicated in section 13 above, the Dean of Faculty should outline the ways in which the Faculty will induct and support the new External Examiner.

| |
| |

| **Signature:** | | **Date:** | |

Dean of Faculty to return signed form to the QME Office

To be completed by QME Office:

21. Date of Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee:

22. Chair of Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee

This nomination has been approved by Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee Chair's Action

| **Signature:** | | **Date:** | |

Signed form to be returned to the QME Office

Chair of Senate

This nomination has been approved by Senate.

Signature:		Date:	

Signed form to be returned to the QME Office

Francis House
3-7 Redwell Street
Norwich NR2 4SN

Vice-Chancellor: Professor John Last

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT

Please complete electronic form which should be returned to h.shaw@nua.ac.uk

Please note that in the formal process for Responses to External Examiners' Reports, the University will ONLY respond to matters noted in Section 5.3.

Please do not refer to staff or students by name. This report, once completed, will be made available in full to students at the University.

Date: | Click here to enter text.

Course: | Click here to enter text.

Name of External Examiner: | Click here to enter text.

Institutional/Business Address: | Click here to enter text.

SECTION 1   INFORMATION AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR EXAMINING

1.1   *Newly appointed examiners only*

Was the briefing which you received prior to acting as an external examiner satisfactory?
Select
Please comment below.
Click here to enter text.

1.2   *All examiners*

Course information

Were you given access to:

a.   The relevant Course Guide(s)?   Select
b.   Unit Handbooks, including Unit Outlines, teaching schedules, timetables, Project Briefs, assessment schedules, and grading matrices?   Select
c.   The *Student Regulations and Procedures*?   Select

Coursework/continuously assessed work

a.   Was sufficient coursework made available to you?   Select
b.   Was the method, consistency and general standard of assessment satisfactory?   Select

Research Reports

a.   Was the choice of subjects for Research Reports appropriate? Select
b.   Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate? Select

Meetings with students

a.   Were suitable arrangements made for you to meet with students individually and/or in groups?   Select

Course Assessment Board

a.   Were you able to attend the meeting? Select
b.   Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction? Select
c.   Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board? Select

Final Award Board *(NB Examiners' Representative only)*

a.   Were you able to attend the meeting? Select
b.   Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction? Select
c.   Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board? Select

1.3   Was any information missing which you would have liked to have had?
Select

If so, please give details below.

Click here to enter text.

SECTION 2   ASSESSMENT AND STANDARDS

Please do not refer to staff or students by name.

External Examiners are asked to comment on 2.1 to 2.3 below. External examiner(s) for BA (Hons) Architecture are also invited to comment on students' fulfilment of the ARB and RIBA General Criteria and Graduate Attributes

2.1   Processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards

In the view of the examiner, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are fairly conducted and rigorous.

Is the above statement correct? Select

If you have stated 'No', or if you wish to provide additional information, please do so below. You may include comments on, for example: the quality of preliminary information; arrangements for viewing/reading students' work; access to tutorial and assessment records; methods of assessment including the use of grading matrices; arrangements for classification; the consistency, fairness and appropriateness of internal assessment; whether the overall assessment and examination process was carried out properly.

Click here to enter text.

2.2   Standards set for the award

In the view of the examiner, the standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level in this subject.

Is the above statement correct?   Select

If you have stated 'No', or if you wish to provide additional information, please do so below. You may include comments on, for example: whether the course of study is coherent; whether the level of study meets the expectations of the Framework for HE Qualifications.

Click here to enter text.

2.3   Comparability of standards

In the view of the examiner, the standards of student performance are comparable with similar courses or subjects in other institutions with which he/she is familiar.

Is the above statement correct?   Select

If you have stated 'No', or if you wish to provide additional information, please do so below.

Click here to enter text.

SECTION 3   TEACHING AND LEARNING

Please do not refer to staff or students by name

External Examiners are asked to comment on the following:

3.1   Teaching and learning methods

Click here to enter text.

3.2   Appropriateness of curriculum content

Click here to enter text.

3.3   Professional preparation and employability

Please comment on the preparation of students for professional life, including business and professional skills, work-related aspects of the curriculum, work placements, etc.

Click here to enter text.

3.4   Resources to support teaching and learning

Click here to enter text.

3.5   Good practice in teaching, learning and assessment

Click here to enter text.

SECTION 4   STUDENT FEEDBACK

Please do not refer to staff or students by name.

Please comment on student feedback about, for example: teaching, learning, assessment, curriculum, resources.

Click here to enter text.

SECTION 5 KEY STRENGTHS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Please do not refer to staff or students by name.

5.1   Particular strengths

Please provide a description or bullet point list of any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes. Please include strengths evidenced in students work.

Click here to enter text.

5.2   The response of the University and the course team to recommendations made in your previous report

Please comment on the responses contained in the relevant "Responses to External Examiners' Reports" pro forma, which will have been completed and sent to you during the academic year following your last report.

Click here to enter text.

5.3   Recommendations for action by the Course Team or the University

*Please provide a description or bullet point list of recommended actions to be taken by the Course Team or the University. This should summarise any issues identified in earlier sections of the report. **Please note that the University will only respond to matters noted in Section 5.3.***

Click here to enter text.

5.4   For external examiners in the final year of their term of office only: Overview

Please provide an overview of your term of office.

Click here to enter text.

Signed: Click here to enter electronic signature.   **Date:** Click here to enter text.

Print name:

Please return your report as an email attachment to h.shaw@nua.ac.uk or as hard copy to:

The Vice-Chancellor, Norwich University of the Arts, Francis House, 3-7 Redwell Street, Norwich NR2 4SN

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS CAN WRITE TO THE VICE-CHANCELLOR IN CONFIDENCE ON ANY MATTER; ANY SUCH CORRESPONDENCE WILL NOT BE MADE AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY. THE UNIVERSITY WILL CONSIDER SUCH CORRESPONDENCE AND RESPOND IN WRITING TO THE EXAMINER.

Norwich University of the Arts
Quality Management and Enhancement

Responses to External Examiners' Reports

The University considers external examiners' reports thoroughly within its annual monitoring procedures. Responses to external examiners' reports are outlined on the template in this file as follows:

Key:

ACR	*Annual Course Review*
PVCA	*Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)*
DFAM	*Dean of Faculty of Arts & Media*
DFDA	*Dean of Faculty of Design & Architecture*
AR	*Academic Registrar*
QM	*Quality Manager*
CL	*Course Leader*

1. July - Examiner's Report received by NUA - Report with comments passed from Vice-Chancellor to relevant Dean and CL and copied to PVCA, AR, QM and QME Officer

2. QME Officer logs the report into the system, transfers the Recommendations from section 5.3 onto the Responses template, and sends the link to the AR and QM

3. For Recommendations to the University - QM identifies the relevant staff who need to respond to the Recommendation(s), in discussion with the AR and PVCA where appropriate

4. QM sends Responses template to the relevant Dean and CL, copying it to pvca@nua.ac.uk

5. For Recommendations to the course and/or Faculty – Dean identifies the relevant staff who need to respond to the Recommendation(s) and circulates the Responses template to the CL and other course staff as appropriate

6.   July to early October – CL prepares Annual Course Review (ACR), including comments on examiner's report as appropriate, and the Responses template – these are submitted to the Dean by the 13 October 2018.

7.   October – Faculty Board of Studies review ACRs, identifying any "early warning" items from Enhancement Plans and requesting revisions to ACRs by Course Leaders as appropriate by 12 November 2018. Deans also edit/amend Responses templates as appropriate.

8.   By 13 October 2018 – Responses templates returned by Deans to QME Office for AR/NP to complete sections on University Recommendations

9.   Early November – QM co-ordinates final completion of Response templates for LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting.

July 2018

Norwich University of the Arts
Quality Management and Enhancement

RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

This table, containing a summary or where necessary verbatim extracts from External Examiners' reports, focuses on issues for which a response is required from the University. It also enables tracking of responses by key committees and through the University's annual monitoring procedures.

COURSE:

External Examiner & Institution/Practice	Item No.	Recommendations for action (from section 5.3 of Examiner's Report)	Actioned to	Response	Approval by PVCA *(date)*	Approval by Learning, Teaching and Quality and Committee *(date)*

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

COURSE SPECIFICATIONS, COURSE GUIDES, UNIT HANDBOOKS and PROJECT BRIEFS

This Annex provides guidance on the format of Course Specifications, Course Guides, Unit Handbooks and Project Briefs. See Annex G for Proposals for Amendments to these.

CONTENTS

1.   Course Specifications - Background*:*
Programme Specifications were originally introduced as a feature of the QAA Academic Infrastructure (now replaced by the UK Quality Code). As statements about course aims and learning outcomes, curriculum content, entry requirements etc. they bear similarity with our Course Guides.

Until September 2012 the University had separate Programme Sp5ecifications and Course Guides, creating potential – and in some cases actual - confusion. In September 2012 the University adopted a single format.

As part of its review of the Undergraduate provision of the Award and Credit Scheme and the UK Quality Code Part C, Quality and Standards Committee considered the role of the Programme Specification as the vehicle to disseminate key course information to applicants and potential applicants. The University has previously published the Course Guides on its web-pages to meet this need. However, the Course Guide by necessity makes various references to information published on the Virtual Learning Environment which is not available to applicants or public visitors. It was therefore requested that the University consider re-introducing a programme specification or similar document for publication.

In addition, the publication of the guidance issued by the Competition and Markets Authority has recommended that a standard set of information for each course is available in *a durable format* for prospective students to access, download and keep.

A proposed course specification template that would meet both the QAA guidance for programme specifications and the recommendations of the Competition and Markets Authority was approved by QSC in April 2016.

Since September 2016 Course specifications using the approved template are published on the internet. **The approved template is provided on pages 5-8 of this Annex.**

2.   Course Guides
Course Guides are currently under review by the University and this section will be updated following this review.

3.   Unit Handbooks
The accuracy of the information contained in Unit Handbooks is reviewed regularly by the University. It falls within the scope of Part C of the UK Quality Code. The provision of information is regulated by the Competition and Markets Authority and CMA Consumer protection law which sets out minimum standards that apply to various aspects of an HE provider's dealings with students, for example in relation to information provision.

Unit Handbooks are intended to provide students with information which builds upon that available in Course Guides – e.g. concerning learning activities, curriculum areas, and submission requirements. Unit Handbooks are published in PDF format on course Moodle pages.

The following should be used by staff involved in the preparation of Unit Handbooks.

i.   Approved Unit Outline – Approved Unit Outlines are common to levels of study, and master copies are held by the QME Office. Please refer to the University Award and Credit Scheme as appropriate for lists of required information contained within Unit Outlines.
ii.   Indicative learning and teaching activities, and information on assessment feedback times.
iii.   Lists of relevant course-specific unit and project reference material. Please refer to the University Guidance on compiling 'Useful sources of information' (this is attached and is included within the NUA Library Collection Policy 2017 Appendix A
iv.   Additional relevant content and materials may be included as required.
v.   The University 'Career Planning at NUA'.

Project Briefs
i.   Project Briefs are approved at course level by Course Leaders and Deans who review these at least annually. Changes to Project Briefs are subject to written approval from the relevant Dean of Faculty before they are implemented within the course of study.

ii.   Project Briefs at NUA exist to allow courses the flexibility to exploit opportunities for students to engage with live projects and organic engagement with creative industries. Project Briefs meet the needs of courses and students in terms of defining a wide range of learning activities and opportunities as both fixed course assets and/or responsive briefs addressing specific learning opportunities for cohorts or smaller working groups of students.

iii.   The format for Project Briefs is determined locally, but an Approved Project Brief will normally contain an outline of learning to be undertaken and references and resources appropriate to the defined learning activity or opportunity. Refer to Section 4 below Guidelines for Project Briefs.

iv.   Project Briefs will normally be published on course Moodle pages and made available to students through taught sessions.

Guidelines for Project Briefs
These guidelines are intended to provide guidance for Project Briefs.

The University's intention is that Project Briefs remain a flexible learning vehicle that reflect the nature of the course and related creative industries in terms of design and context. Readability should be considered, type face, size, use of images etc. but there is not a set style. For clarification of difference between a validated Unit Handbook and the Project Briefs, the guidance is to avoid repetition from, or looking too much like, the Unit Handbooks.

This means:

- No NUA logo required;
- Details about the three key curriculum areas (Creative Practice, Research, Professional Practice) are not required;
- Boxes mapping which Learning Outcomes the Project Brief covers are not required (although a sentence/narrative saying this brief will support LOX can be included.

The idea is that project briefs are brief-like and not handbook like.

Timeline

Project Briefs need to be approved by the Dean of Faculty early. The date to be advised by QME.

Heading
Norwich University of the Arts
BA (Hons) [course name]: Year [0,1,2,3] – 2017/18
Unit: [code] – [title]

Project: [title] – [number i.e. 1/3, 2/3 etc.]

Key Information required:
- Start and end date
- Unit end date if different
- Indication of expected time spent on the brief (i.e. 2 weeks, every Friday etc.)
- Briefing date
- Final critique or submission date
- If forms part of mid-unit review
- Description – the brief itself (if a number of tasks lie within the brief, these should be broken down task-by-task and an indication given in which weeks they take place)
- Intended outcomes in terms of work produced - this can be indicated by the phrase:

By the end of this project you should have the following work completed and which will become part of your assessment submission at the end of the unit:

Any additional reference material not indicated in the Unit Handbook (confirmed with Library if in stock)

Heading

Norwich University of the Arts
BA (Hons) [course name]: Year [0,1,2,3] – 2017/18
Unit: [code] – [title]

Project: [title] – [number i.e. 1/3, 2/3 etc.]

Key Information required:
- Start and end date
- Unit end date if different
- Indication of expected time spent on the brief (i.e. 2 weeks, every Friday etc.)
- Briefing date
- Final critique or submission date
- If forms part of mid-unit review
- Description – the brief itself (if a number of tasks lie within the brief, these should be broken down task-by-task and an indication given in which weeks they take place)
- Intended outcomes in terms of work produced - this can be indicated by the phrase:

By the end of this project you should have the following work completed and which will become part of your assessment submission at the end of the unit:

Any additional reference material not indicated in the Unit Handbook (confirmed with Library if in stock). Please refer to the University Guidance on compiling 'Useful sources of information' (this is attached and is included within the NUA Library Collection Policy 2017 Appendix A

5. UNDERGRADUATE COURSE SPECIFICTION TEMPLATE

Course Specification

Awarding body:	**Norwich University of the Arts** The University is a recognised body with taught degree awarding powers. The University is subject to regulation by the Higher Education Funding Council for England. Please see the Higher Education Funding Council Register of Providers at: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/reg/register/search/Provider/10004775
Course title	BA/BSc (Hons) …
Level of study	Level 6 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England (FHEQ). For further information see [add link]
Award	Bachelor Degree with Honours (BA (Hons)) / Bachelor of Science Degree with Honours (BSc (Hons))
Mode of Study	Full-time
Duration of course	3 years
Language of study	English
Course Accreditation	*Delete if not appropriate or state 'none'*
Relevant QAA Subject Benchmarks	e.g. Art and Design (2017) - *QAA specify this is included* Subject Benchmark Statements set out expectations about standards of degrees in a range of subject areas. They describe what gives a discipline its coherence and identity, and define what can be expected of a graduate in terms of the abilities and skills needed to develop understanding or competence in the subject. For further information see: http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements
Tuition Fees	For details of tuition fees see: http://www.nua.ac.uk/study/finance/
Other course costs	The cost of materials for producing course work is not included in the tuition fee. Due to the choice and diversity it is not possible to generalise about the costs that you might incur. On average students of arts, design and media courses spend around £250 in their first year rising to £375 in their second year and £600 in their graduating year.

The course may also offer an opportunity to attend one or more study visits. These visits are not compulsory and costs vary depending on the location and duration of the study visit.

Please see:
http://www.nua.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Student-Experience-at-NUA.pdf

Admission requirements

Interview/portfolio *(from www.nua.ac.uk)*

Minimum entry requirements *(from www.nua.ac.uk)*

Non-standard entry *(from www.nua.ac.uk)*

Aims and outcomes of undergraduate study *(from Award and Credit Scheme)*

Generic Skills *(from Award and Credit Scheme)*

Course diagram

Units

Year 0 (4 year courses)

Unit 1
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Unit 2
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Unit 3 (Architecture)
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Year 1

Unit 1
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Unit 2
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Unit 3 (Architecture)
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Year 2

Unit 1
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Unit 2
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Unit 3 (Architecture)
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Year 3

Unit 1
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Unit 2
What you will be doing on this unit *(from Unit Handbook)*
Unit Outline

Learning and Teaching (*as per information published on the web-pages)*

Assessment (*as per information published on the web-pages)*

Requirements for progression on the course *(new section summarising the relevant sections of the Student Regulations and Procedures)*
The general requirements for progression are as follows:

Progression from Year 0 to Year 1 of an Honours Degree:
A student must pass all Year 0 units

Progression to Year 2 (Honours degree):
A student must pass all Year 1 units and be awarded 120 credits (FHEQ Level 4)

Progression to Year 3: (Honours degree):
A student must pass all Year 2 units and be awarded 120 credits (FHEQ Level 5)

Students who do not pass a unit at first attempt will normally be offered at least one further attempt to pass the unit through resubmission. Students who do not pass the unit after a resubmission attempt will not be allowed to progress to the next stage of study and may have their course terminated.
See the University's Student Regulations and Procedures [add link].

Students who fail all 120 credits in a year of study will not normally be offered resubmission and may have their course terminated.

Students who do not attend for timetabled sessions may be withdrawn from the course through non-attendance.

Requirements for the award of a qualification
To qualify for the award of BA/BSc (Hons) a student must have achieved a pass in all units and be awarded 360 credits.

Students who do not complete the award may qualify for an exit award as follows:
Completion of Year 1 – Certificate of Higher Education (120 credits at Level 4 (FHEQ))
Completion of Year 2 – Diploma of Higher Education (240 credits with 120 credits at Level 5 (FHEQ))
Partial completion of Year 3 – BA Degree (Unclassified) (300 credits with 60 credits at Level 6 (FHEQ)) - not *to be included on Course Specification for BA (Hons) Architecture*

Quality assurance *(to be completed when future arrangements are known – currently this would state that the University is quality assured by the QAA with a link to the report and to our own QME Handbook on the internet).*

Date of Course Specification:

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

COURSE DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND REVIEW

PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS TO COURSE UNIT OUTLINES, UNIT HANDBOOKS AND PROJECT BRIEFS

1. **Unit Outlines**

Unit Outlines are approved through the Approval and Review of the Award and Credit Scheme or through Approval and Review Events. In exceptional circumstances e.g. for changes to courses which do not use generic course units this procedure should be used.

The submission of proposals for amendments to **Unit Outlines** are prepared by Course Leaders under advice from the relevant Dean of Faculty. Proposals (as agreed by the Course Leader and Dean) are then considered by the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee which will make the appropriate recommendation to the Senate. Proposed amendments must be approved by the Senate no later than the summer term prior to the proposed year of implementation.

Proposals for amendments to unit outlines should be prepared by the Dean of Faculty and should include the following:

    a.   Title of **unit outline**

    b.   Proposed date of implementation

    c.   The existing unit outline, plus its proposed replacement and a version of the original with tracked changes

    d.   Rationale for the proposed amendment, including evidence from the following:

- Student feedback
- Employer feedback
- External examiners' reports
- Annual monitoring
- Other

    e.   A narrative outline of:

- The anticipated benefits of the proposed amendments for the learning experience of students
- Outline of revisions which will be necessary to the Unit Handbook
- Resource implications (if any) *(accommodation, equipment, staffing)*

All proposals will be considered with reference to the University's academic infrastructure in the form of the Award and Credit Scheme and relevant sections of the *Aims and Outcomes of Undergraduate/Taught Postgraduate Study.*

2.   New Unit Handbooks or Amendments to Unit Handbooks

Proposals for new Unit Handbooks or amendments to Unit Handbooks are scrutinised by the Quality Sub-group which will report to Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (LTQC).

Prior to submitting revised Unit Handbooks to the Quality Sub-group proposals should be submitted by Course Leaders for approval by the Deans. Deans are responsible for checking that the amended Unit Handbooks meet the relevant unit aims and learning outcomes. Any changes to the content of the Unit Handbooks will need to be accompanied by a brief rationale for the change and should be submitted with track changes to the Dean for review.

The QME Office will maintain a database of amendments to Unit Outlines and Unit Handbooks since initial course approval or the most recent periodic review.

3.   New Project Briefs or Amendments to Project Briefs

Proposals for new project briefs or amendments to project briefs may be submitted by Course Leaders for approval by the Deans, who are responsible for checking that the new or amended project brief meets the relevant unit aims and learning outcomes. Please refer to Annex F for Guidelines for Project Briefs.

Deans Support to send final approved versions to the QME Office and Course Leaders by 14 September 2018. The QME Office will maintain a database of amendments to Project Briefs.

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

COURSE DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND REVIEW: APPROVAL EVENT GUIDANCE

This Annex sets out the requirements (including documentation) for the validation of a new award or academic course. It includes guidance on documentation requirements, indicative itineraries, Course Philosophy and Rationale and responding to Conditions and Recommendations.

CONTENTS

1. Documentation Requirements

Documentation and itinerary for course approval events:

Internal approval events

Documentation for advance circulation to the Internal Course Approval Panel

i.	List of Panel and Course Team members
ii.	Itinerary for the event
iii.	Paper on the purposes of approval/periodic review; conditions and recommendations; and possible event outcomes
iv.	Briefing note for external panel members on key features of the NUA Award and Credit Scheme
v.	Checklist of issues for the consideration of approval and periodic review panels
vi.	Course Rationale and Course Philosophy and Unit Handbooks in the format specified in *Annex F*
viii.	Annex 4 Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) Unit Map – Undergraduate Awards/Taught Postgraduate
ix.	*(Undergraduate courses)* QAA *Subject Benchmark Statement for Art and Design* (and any other relevant Subject Benchmark Statements, e.g. Architecture), (*Postgraduate courses QAA Master's Degree Characteristics Statement)*
x.	The NUA Award and Credit Scheme (website link provided)
xi.	Student Regulations and Procedures (website link provided)
xii.	Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) Handbook (website link provided)
xiii.	Professional accreditation requirements where course has accreditation or is seeking accreditation. (link to information provided)

1

Indicative Itinerary for internal course approval events

NB times may vary depending on start time.

- Private meeting of the panel *(1 hour)*
- Meeting of the Panel with the Dean, Course Leader and course team *(1 hour)*
- Break *(15 minutes)*
- Continuation of meeting of the Panel with the Dean, Course Leader and course team *(1 hour)*
- Private meeting of the Panel *(30 minutes)*
- Panel report conclusions to Dean, Course Leader and course team *(15 minutes)*
- Close

Panel composition for internal course approval events

- Chair
- 2 academic members of staff who have appropriate teaching experience at the level of the course under consideration
- 1 student representative
- Head of Library and Learning Support or representative
- Quality Manager
- Deputy Registrar or Academic Registry representative
- Event Officer (in attendance)

External approval events

Documentation for advance circulation to the External Course Approval Panel

The documentation required for advance circulation to the Panel is the same as for the internal event plus the following:

i.   Formal report and minutes from the internal course approval event
ii.   Course team's report on responses to conditions and recommendations from the internal approval event
iii. A sample of Project Briefs

Indicative Itinerary for external course approval events

The Day 2 itinerary for external course approval events include two 90 minute meetings between the event panel and the course team. The second meeting may be shortened or removed at the discretion of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and/or the Event Chair.

Day 1: (External panel members check in to hotel prior to first meeting)

17.30   Private meeting of the Panel

18.00	Presentation by Dean and Course Leader about the rationale and key features of the course
19.00	Close
19.30	Dinner for the external members of the Panel with the Chair, Dean and Course Leader

Day 2:

9.00	Arrival/coffee
9.15	Private meeting of the Panel to agree pre-prepared agenda
10.15	Tour of resources
11.45	Break
12.00	Meeting with Dean, Course Leader and course team
13.30	Lunch for Panel
14.00	Continuation of meeting with Dean, Course Leader and course team
15.30	Private meeting of Panel to formulate conclusions
16.45	Panel report conclusions to Dean, Course Leader and course team
17.00	Close

Panel composition for external course approval events

- *Chair: This will normally be one of the following:* Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Dean of Design and Architecture *(for approval of courses in Arts & Media)* or Dean of Arts and Media *(for approval of courses in Design & Architecture)*
- 2 members of academic staff who have appropriate teaching experience at the level of the course under consideration
- Head of Library and Learning Support or representative
- Quality Manager
- Deputy Registrar or Academic Registry representative
- 1 student representative
- 1 external academic
- 1 external panel member drawn from the creative and cultural sectors
- Event Officer (in attendance)

2. CHECKLIST OF ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY COURSE APPROVAL PANELS

This checklist is provided to the Course Approval Panel and informs discussion at the event. It is included in this Annex to show how the documentation feeds into the Panels considerations.

<u>Please Note</u>   The following checklist is not exhaustive. Rather, it is intended as a starting-point for the formulation of agendas for meetings between approval/review panels and proposal teams.

1. *Course rationale and philosophy*

2. *Structure diagrams:*

For example:

- Whether the diagrams clearly demonstrate the sequence and combination of units for each teaching block and year of the course

3. *Curriculum design and content*

For example:

- Whether the course satisfies the general expectations about academic standards contained in the relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statements

- Evidence of the extent to which the curriculum is informed by staff research, scholarly activity and professional practice

- Evidence of involvement of employers/industry in (a) course design, (b) delivery

- The relevance of the curriculum to graduate employability

- Transferable skills

- Whether appropriate opportunities exist for work placement/work-based learning, student volunteering activities and Erasmus or other overseas exchange

4. *Learning outcomes:*

For example:

- Whether the Learning Outcomes are consistent with the appropriate qualification descriptor within QAA's *Framework for HE Qualifications (England)* and requirements of any relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB).

5. *Learning, teaching and assessment:*

    For example:

- Whether the learning and teaching methods/strategies are appropriate, enabling students to achieve the Learning Outcomes

- Whether the assessment methods/strategies are appropriate, enabling students to demonstrate their achievement of the Learning Outcomes

- Proposed arrangements for providing students with written and verbal feedback on their assessed work

6. *Assessment pattern and loading:*

For example:

- Whether the project briefs contain adequate statements of the assessment methods used to evaluate student achievement, drawing attention to any features in the pattern or loading of assessment

- Whether the volume of assessments is appropriate and manageable for students and staff

7. *Resources (space, workshops, equipment, IT provision, Student Support, Library)*

For example:

- The learning and teaching resources that will be available to students and staff

- The suitability of the learning and teaching resources for students with disabilities

8. *Resources (staffing)*

9. *Quality management and enhancement*

For example:

- Proposed mechanisms for obtaining student views (e.g. unit evaluations, annual course evaluation), the use to be made of feedback from students and how students will be informed of the outcomes

- Proposed mechanisms for obtaining industry/professional feedback and the use to be made of this

- Opportunities for ongoing continuing professional development for staff

10. *Equality and diversity*

11. *Health and safety*

3. GUIDANCE ON WRITING COURSE PHILOSOPHY AND RATIONALE FOR COURSE APPROVAL

The following guidance is intended as a reference for Course Teams in producing Course Rationale section of documentation required for new academic provision.

The guidance below is intended to be indicative rather than comprehensive, but does include the key areas that will be subject to scrutiny as part of the Course Approval process as defined within the University' Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) Handbook. In developing these sections, course teams should also refer to relevant external reference points such as QAA Subject Benchmark Statements and guidance from relevant industry bodies as appropriate.

Course Approval

A course approval event to validate *new* course provision includes the requirement of a Course Rationale *and* a Course Philosophy as described below. The Course Approval event will consider the requirement for the course in relation to sector-wide or subject application trends and UCAS data in gauging applicant demand for the provision over the preceding 3 - 5 year period, where this is available.

Course Rationale (750-1000 words)

The Course Rationale should articulate why the course team believe there is a need for the course in the subject or field proposed and should provide commentary on the following key areas:

- *Why offer a course in <INSERT COURSE TITLE>?'*

- *Whose needs will the Course meet in terms of employers, applicants, society etc?*

- *How does the Course fit with the current and future University and Faculty academic portfolio?*

- *What is the current or developing market for this course and what is the evidence of demand to support this? (UCAS, industry, employer or creative industries/government data).*

- *Is the course targeted at particular participant group or groups? (e.g. those studying particular types of pre-degree level courses, those with particular career aspirations or BAME or adult learners)*

- *What is the international, national or regional relevance of this Course?*

- *What are the Unique Selling Points (USPs) of the Course offer?*

- *Who are the existing and emerging competitors?*

Course Philosophy (1000-1200 words)

The Course Philosophy is required to articulate the distinctive approach to teaching and learning of the subject as it is positioned within the context of the Faculty and University. The Course Philosophy should provide commentary on the following key areas:

- *How the specialist skills, knowledge and experience of the course team will enable delivery of the award?*

- *How the course intends to engage students with specialist teaching and learning of the subject?*

- *What is distinctive about the course curriculum and its design and how will its effectiveness be assured in providing intellectually stimulating content for students?*

- *What is the proposed balance between contact time and independent study time for creative practice, professional practice and research? (n.b. A breakdown of hours is <u>not</u> sought in this section, but the role and relationships of taught study and independent practice should be provided as part of the reason for the pattern of study and curriculum content).*

- *How will staff research and scholarly activity contribute to the quality of teaching on the Course?*

- *How will students' knowledge, skills and career readiness be enhanced by the course?*

- *What special features does the course propose to have in terms of learning events and activities? (This might include VLE, online learning, work placements, live projects, symposia, employability events or other events that add value to the study of the subject)*

- *How will the Course's approach to teaching, learning and assessment support progression to employment or further study?*

- *What are the predicted future career destinations for course graduates?*

4. RESPONDING TO CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING COURSE APPROVAL EVENTS

Following the Course Approval event a summary of the commendations, conditions and recommendations will be issued by QME, usually within one week of the event. Dates by which this must be completed are set QME in advance of the internal and external stages of approval and review. This will be followed by a full report outlining the areas discussed by the Panel and the outcomes.

The course team is required to provide a formal response to the Course Approval report, by the agreed deadlines, using the *Responses to Conditions and Recommendations* template, which will be provided by the QME Office. This should evidence how specific conditions have been met and address any recommendations that were made. The Responses to Conditions and Recommendations, and revisions to documentation is submitted to the relevant Dean to approve and is forwarded by QME to the Chair of the Panel for sign off.

It is a requirement that all Conditions are met prior to the commencement. It is a requirement that all Recommendations are considered by the course team or the University, with the outcomes outlined on the Responses to Conditions and Recommendations template. However, it is also recognised that work in response to certain types of Recommendation may be ongoing. Ongoing actions are reported on through Annual Course Review. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee will monitor work undertaken in response to such Recommendations for one academic year following the approval/periodic review event.

The *Responses to Conditions and Recommendations* from the course team should include:

- amended documents (using tracked changes to highlight any amendments);
- a brief summary of how each condition has been met with reference to the amended documents;
- how each recommendation and/or development in progress has been considered and any action that will be taken.

    An example of a completed *Responses to Conditions and Recommendations template* is provided on pages 9-14 of this Annex.

When the Chair of the Course Approval Event is satisfied that all conditions have been met and that all recommendations have been responded to appropriately, confirmation is emailed to QME. A summary report of Course Approval and Review Outcomes is produced by QME for Approval by Chair of Senate.

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM APPROVAL EVENT

Event: **BSc Awards External Approval Event**

Meeting Date: **27 and 28 April 2017**

Panel Chair: **Professor Neil Powell**

Proposal Team Leader: **Professor Richard Sawdon Smith**

CONDITION		Response *(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)*	Approved by QSC (date)
1.1	That the Useful Sources of Information sections are addressed in all Unit Handbooks.	Completed and additional reading project by project will be included once the new Lecturer in post.	19-7-2017
1.2	That within the Scientific Practice sections of the Unit Handbooks, to ensure some clarity about Social Sciences and primary research.	All Unit handbooks have been reviewed and edited where appropriate – with track changes for identification of additions.	19-7-2017

RECOMMENDATIONS		Response *(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)*	Approved by QSC (date)
2.1	That the Course Team considers the introduction of a single Unit Handbook for Year 1 across all three awards.	Completed, new Unit Handbooks have been created – this has also allowed us to address many of the conditions and recommendations by redesigning the Year 1 Handbooks (C1.1, 1.2, R2.4, 2.10)	19-7-2017

9

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response *(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)*	Approved by QSC (date)
2.2	That the Course Team considers the introduction of a single set of project briefs for Year 1 in terms of the shared curriculum.	In progress – we have recently appointed a lecturer in Creative Computer Science who starts 14th August, they have been briefed on this and supplied with relevant information, and their first task will be to prepare the project briefs to be signed off by the Dean in September as part of the normal process.	19-7-2017
2.3	To revise the Syllabus Map to ensure it is referenced correctly to the Subject Benchmark Statement for Computing, and to produce a separate, more user friendly version for students.	Revised Syllabus Map (SM) completed, however, after intensive discussion and looking at parity with the BA courses – where the first iteration of a SM was introduced – the team felt that the SM should remain as staff information and a development tool.	19-7-2017
2.4	To review the terminology within the documentation to reflect the Subject Benchmark Statement for Computing, e.g. software engineering, artificial intelligence and new technologies.	Terminology has been reviewed and amended where appropriate, this includes the course philosophies, and 'new' changed to 'emerging' technologies.	19-7-2017
2.5	To revise the Philosophy to incorporate more regional narrative articulated in the discussion including 'Tech City UK' and the proposed 'Cambridge to Norwich Tech Corridor'.	A section has been added to all the course philosophies: *The course has been developed in response to industry need, and will be delivered in a way that offers the chance for you to develop a highly employable skillset. The course team have worked with businesses that place digital creative skills at the heart of their operations, to design a curriculum relevant to the needs of the sector. There is a large skill gap within the UK for these skills and by creating a new cohort of practitioners this will contribute to the regional and UK digital economy. Norwich is itself a Tech City with the TechNation report of 2016 stating that 75% of digital tech jobs are outside of London with the East of England as the fastest growing region. The 2017 report also highlights that in Norwich*	19-7-2017

RECOMMENDATIONS		Response *(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)*	Approved by QSC (date)
		alone the number of jobs in the sector increased by 43% and salaries 11% in one year alone. The region is experience a massive growth in this sector with further plans to develop a tech corridor between Norwich and Cambridge with £500m worth of investment over the coming years. With these developments NUA and the course can be seen at the centre of a digital revolution in the local area.	
2.6	To expand on the production of 'serious' games mentioned in the Course Philosophy, within the relevant Unit Handbook for BSc (Hons) Games Development.	This has been further emphasised in the philosophy and highlighted in particular in Units BSc2a and BSc3a but will also be included in the project briefs in more detail: Philosophy *Games and play are fundamental to the human experience and the largest entertainment industry in the world. Games are indeed a serious business but not just in terms of entertainment. As a course we are interested in serious games, those designed for social good. It is one of the primary ways that children develop their intellectual, emotional, social and moral capacity. In adults productive game playing can encourage insightful reasoning, high-level problem solving and relaxation. For example, beyond the recreational dimension games are used to enhance the cognitive abilities of individuals with Alzheimer's disease, to prepare the military & emergency services for disasters and, via gamification, to motivate individuals.*	19-7-2017

11

RECOMMENDATIONS		Response *(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)*	Approved by QSC (date)
		BSc2a *You will use these concepts to develop a game that is for social good. This might be highlighting something you perceive to be a problem in society in an entertaining way but challenging way, or it could be creating a game aimed at a certain group within the populace.* BSc3a You will be encouraged to think about issues of accessibility when you create your game, and you might want to consider creating a game that might aid someone with a particular condition or disability - after careful consultation and research. Identifying your audience is strongly recommended and will focus the development of your work.	
2.7	To provide a broader narrative on the dynamics of collaboration and the scope and range of audiences which could be involved.	Unit BSc2b has been updated to reflect the comments from the panel. *This unit focuses on collaboration and presents further opportunity to work with others, internally in the Game Development cohort, cross-discipline in partnership with other course(s) in the institution, and where appropriate, external partners. A range of collaborative projects will take place, enabling you to develop essential interpersonal skills in communication, team-working and project management. You will join students from disciplines that either complement or contrast that of your own, and engage with audiences that could include professional clients, other subject specialists or the general public, with whom you will need to communicate your ideas concisely. Emphasis will be placed on professionalism, a team spirit, engagement with others*	19-7-2017

12

RECOMMENDATIONS		Response *(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)*	Approved by QSC (date)
		and a constructive outlook and positive attitude. Collaboration works at its best when the combined efforts of the team result in something greater than the individual input to create unexpected and not predetermined outcomes.	
2.8	To articulate the support for project management roles in the BSc (Hons) Games Development Unit Handbook for BA2a.	Unit BSc2a has been updated to reflect the comments from the panel. *Methodologies will be introduced in this unit to bind all aspects of development and facilitate the organisation and management of your working practice during production…* *You will also gain experience of working both individually and in groups, employing project management methodologies (such as Lean, Agile, Waterfall or Scrum) to sustain both independent and group work. Group work is an important part the gaming sector and the organisational challenges it brings will be managed through the use of version control and a select range of project management tools, as introduced by the course team.*	19-7-2017
2.9	To articulate the process of 'negotiation' referred to in the Course Philosophy, within the BSc (Hons) Games Development Unit Handbook for BA3a.	Unit BSc3a has been updated to reflect the comments from the panel. *You will be encouraged to think about issues of accessibility when you create your game, and you might want to consider creating a game that might aid someone with a particular condition or disability - after careful consultation and research. Identifying your audience is strongly recommended and will focus the development of*	19-7-2017

RECOMMENDATIONS		Response *(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)*	Approved by QSC (date)
		your work. Following a consultation period with the course team, game proposals are to be pitched, and subsequently signed-off, prior to work commencing. Advice and guidance will be given where continued negotiation is required.	
2.10	To expand on issues of inclusive design and accessibility throughout the Unit Handbooks for BSc (Hons) Games Development.	This has been combined with Condition 1.2 while updating the Scientific Practice curriculum areas of the Unit Handbooks, and will appear in more detail in the Project Briefs as to how they are delivered.	19-7-2017

Approved by Panel Chair

Name: Professor Neil Powell

Position: Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Signature:

Date: **16 June 2017**

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

COURSE DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND REVIEW: PERIODIC REVIEW GUIDANCE

This Annex sets out the requirements (including documentation) for the review of an existing course. It includes guidance on documentation requirements, indicative itineraries, Critical Evaluation, Course Philosophy and responding to Conditions and Recommendations.

CONTENTS

DOCUMENTATION AND ITINERARY FOR PERIODIC REVIEW EVENTS:

REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERNAL COURSE PERIODIC REVIEW EVENTS

Documentation for advance circulation to the Internal Periodic Review Panel

   i.   List of panel and course team members
   ii.   Itinerary for the event
   iii.   Paper on the purposes of periodic review; conditions and recommendations; and event outcomes
   iv.   Briefing note for external panel members on key features of the NUA Award and Credit Scheme
   viii. Checklist of issues for the consideration of approval and review panels
   ix.   Critical Evaluation of the course *(Annex I)*
   vii.   Proposed amendments (as tracked changes) to the following sections of the Course Guide: Course Philosophy and Unit Handbooks (Re. formats of Unit Handbooks and Project Briefs, please refer to *Annex G*)
   viii. Annex 4 Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) Unit Map – Undergraduate Awards/Taught Postgraduate
   ii.   *(Undergraduate courses) QAA Subject Benchmark Statement for Art and Design* (and any other relevant Subject Benchmark Statements, e.g. Architecture), (*Postgraduate courses QAA Master's Degree Characteristics Statement)*
   iii.   The NUA Award and Credit Scheme (website link provided)
   iv.   Student Regulations and Procedures (website link provided)
   v.   Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) Handbook (website link provided)

1

ix. Professional accreditation requirements where course has accreditation or is seeking accreditation. (link to information provided)

Indicative Itinerary for internal periodic review events

- Private meeting of the panel *(1 hour)*
- Meeting of the Panel with the Dean, Course Leader and course team *(1 hour)*
- Break *(15 minutes)*
- Continuation of meeting of the Panel with the Dean, Course Leader and course team *(1 hour)*
- Private meeting of the Panel *(30 minutes)*
- Panel report conclusions to Dean, Course Leader and course team *(15 minutes)*
- Close

Panel composition for internal periodic review events

- Chair
- 2 academic members of staff who have appropriate teaching experience at the level of the course under consideration
- 1 student representative
- Head of Library and Learning Support or representative
- Quality Manager
- Deputy Registrar or Academic Registry representative
- Event Officer (in attendance)

REQUIREMENTS FOR EXTERNAL COURSE PERIODIC REVIEW EVENTS

Documentation to be available to the Panel at the external course periodic review event

The documentation to be available to the panel is the same as for internal periodic review events plus the following:

i. Formal report and minutes from the internal event, together with a report on responses made to Conditions and Recommendations set by the Internal Review Panel
ii. Course team's report on responses to conditions and recommendations from the internal review event
iii. A sample of Project Briefs
iv. Annual Course Reviews for preceding 3 years
v. External examiners' reports and University responses for the preceding 3 years

INDICATIVE ITINERARY FOR EXTERNAL PERIODIC REVIEW EVENT

Day 1:

17.30	*Private meeting of the Panel to formulate agenda for meeting with alumni*
17.45	*Meeting of the panel with alumni*
18.45	*Close - external panel members check in to hotel*
19.30	*Dinner for the external members of the Panel with the Chair, Dean and Course Leader*

Day 2:

8.45	*Arrival and refreshments*
9.00	*Presentation by Dean and Course Leader – overview of Critical Evaluation and key features of the course including proposed changes*
10.00	*Private meeting of the Panel to review itinerary and emerging issues*
11.00	*Panel meeting with students*
12.00	*Tour of resources*
12.45	*Meeting of the Panel to include lunch*
13.45	*Meeting of the Panel with Course Leader and course team*
15.15	*Break and private meeting of Panel to formulate conclusions*
15.45	*Panel reports conclusions to Dean and Course Leader*
16.00	*Close*

Panel composition for external course periodic review events

- *Chair: This will normally be one of the following:* Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Dean of Design and Architecture *(for periodic review of courses in Arts & Media)* or Dean of Arts and Media *(for periodic review of courses in Design & Architecture)*
- 2 members of academic staff who have appropriate teaching experience at the level of the course under consideration
- 1 student representative
- Head of Library and Learning Support or representative
- Quality Manager
- Deputy Registrar or Academic Registry representative
- 1 external academic
- 1 external panel member drawn from the creative and cultural sectors Quality Manager
- Event Officer (in attendance)

EXTERNAL REVIEW EVENTS: AWARD AND CREDIT SCHEME

Documentation for advance circulation to the Panel to be made available electronically

i. List of panel and course team members
ii. Itinerary for the event
iii. Paper on the purposes of periodic review; conditions and recommendations; and event outcomes

3

iv. Briefing note for external panel members on revisions / developments to the NUA Award and Credit Scheme

viii. Checklist of issues for the consideration of approval and review panels

ix. Outcomes from the internal stage of review: consultation

viii. Proposed amendments (as tracked changes) to the Award and Credit Scheme and any associated documentation

<u>Documentation to be available to the panel at the external review event</u>

The documentation to be available to the panel is the same as for internal periodic review events.

<u>Indicative Itinerary for Award and Credit Scheme external review events</u>

09.00	External Panel members arrive and are met by QME

Day 1:

09.15	Private meeting of the Panel
10.00	Presentation of proposed amendments to the Undergraduate component of the University Award and Credit Scheme by Deans of Faculty
10.45	Break
11.00	Tour of resources with the Resources Manager
12.30	Working lunch for Panel and undergraduate Student Representatives
13.15	Private meeting of the Panel
14.00	Meeting with the Deans and Course Leaders
14.45	Comfort break
15.00	Continuation of meeting with the Deans and Course Leaders
16.15	Comfort break
16.30	Private meeting of the Panel to review Day 1
17.00	Close
18.30	Dinner for panel members with Chair and Deans of Faculty

Day 2:

09.15	Private meeting of the Panel
10.00	Meeting with academic staff
11.00	Break
11.20	Meeting with Deans of Faculty
12.30	Lunch for Panel

4

13.00	Private meeting of the Panel to formulate event outcome and conclusions
13.45	Panel Chair reports event outcome and draft conclusions to Deans of Faculty
14.00	Close

Panel composition for Award & Credit Scheme review events

- *Chair:* Pro-Vice Chancellor (Academic)
- Academic Registrar
- Quality Manager
- Deputy Registrar
- SU President
- 2 external academics
- Event Officer (in attendance)

2. CHECKLIST OF ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY COURSE PERIODIC REVIEW PANELS

This checklist is provided to the Course Periodic Review Panel and informs the discussion at the event. It is included in this Annex to show how the documentation feeds into the Panel's considerations.

Please Note **The following checklist is not exhaustive. Rather, it is intended as a starting-point for the formulation of agendas for meetings between review panels and course teams.**

1. *Response to conditions and recommendations from internal event* (external event only)

2. *Course philosophy*

3. *Structure diagrams:*

For example:
- Whether the diagrams clearly demonstrate the sequence and combination of units for each teaching block and year of the course

4. *Curriculum design and content*

For example:
- Whether the course satisfies the general expectations about academic standards contained in the relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statements

- Evidence of the extent to which the curriculum is informed by staff research, scholarly activity and professional practice

- Evidence of involvement of employers/industry in (a) course design, (b) delivery

- The relevance of the curriculum to graduate employability

- Transferable skills

- Whether appropriate opportunities exist for work placement/work-based learning, student volunteering activities and Erasmus or other overseas exchange

5. *Learning outcomes:*

For example:
- Whether the Learning Outcomes are consistent with the appropriate qualification descriptor within QAA's *Framework for HE Qualifications (England)* and requirements of any relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB).

6. *Learning, teaching and assessment:*

For example:
- Whether the learning and teaching methods/strategies are appropriate, enabling students to achieve the Learning Outcomes

- Whether the assessment methods/strategies are appropriate, enabling students to demonstrate their achievement of the Learning Outcomes

- Proposed arrangements for providing students with written and verbal feedback on their assessed work

7. *Assessment pattern and loading:*

For example:
- Whether the unit handbooks contain adequate statements of the assessment methods used to evaluate student achievement, drawing attention to any features in the pattern or loading of assessment

- Whether the volume of assessments is appropriate and manageable for students and staff

8. *Resources (space, workshops, equipment, IT provision, Library)*

For example:
- The learning and teaching resources that will be available to students and staff

- The suitability of the learning and teaching resources for students with disabilities

9. *Resources (staffing)*

10. *Quality management and enhancement*

For example:
- Proposed mechanisms for obtaining student views (e.g. unit evaluations, annual course evaluation), the use to be made of feedback from students and how students will be informed of the outcomes

- Proposed mechanisms for obtaining industry/professional feedback and the use to be made of this

- Opportunities for ongoing continuing professional development for staff

11. *Equality and diversity*

12. *Health and safety*

7

3. CRITICAL EVALUATION FOR COURSE PERIODIC REVIEW

The Critical Evaluation (a) is an overview of key aspects of delivery of the course since initial approval/the most recent periodic review (whichever is the most recent) and (b) sets the scene for the revised Course Guide. All sections must be completed.

Documentation required for preparation of Critical Evaluation:

The following data/information will be provided to you either on the QME Annual Monitoring Outcomes or directly from QME:

- Student Profile data:
    - Formal entry qualifications
    - Geographical origin
    - Age profile
    - Gender profile
    - Ethnicity
    - Disability
- Retention and Progression data
- Award Profile data
- Graduate Outcomes – % in employment and % in further study, % in professional and managerial jobs
- Data on applications, offers, acceptances and enrolment
- NSS and survey data (ISS/UKES/PTES)
- Annual Course Reviews
- External Examiners' reports and NUA responses
- Table summarising changes and additions to unit handbooks and project briefs for each unit during the preceding three years

1. **Overview**

    Summary of the key features and history of the course since the last periodic review.

    Include information on:

    - examples of good practice identified and implemented during the period of review (refer to ACRs Good Practice section)
    - Student and course successes (awards, competitions, prizes)
    - Staff successes.

2. **Student entry, progression and employability**

    The emphasis in this section is on evaluation of the data rather than its description:

    - To what extent has your student profile changed in the past 3 years?
    - What implications do the changes have for your course and what actions should be taken?

8

- Consider issues relating to recruitment, retention, progression and employability and strategies to address these, where appropriate.

3.   Staff profiles

Include a short summary for each course member summarising research interests, practice and responsibilities.

4.   Course Rationale and Evidence for Demand

4.1   How has curriculum currency been maintained and enhanced? For example, through industry links; staff research, scholarly activity and professional practice; other mechanisms.

4.2   Evaluate the ongoing demand for the course with reference to application data for the past 3 years and developments in (a) the discipline and (b) the creative industries.

5.   Aims and Learning Outcomes

The *Aims and Outcomes of Undergraduate Study* and Unit Aims and Learning Outcomes are generic to all undergraduate awards at the University. Please evaluate and comment on the following:

5.1   The continuing relevance of the *Aims and Outcomes of Undergraduate Study* to your course;

5.2   The continuing relevance of the generic Unit Aims and Learning Outcomes to your course.

Note: Where changes are required which cannot be considered at the Periodic Review because they would involve changes to the Award and Credit Scheme (ACS), these will need to be considered at the next review of the ACS.

6.   Course Delivery

6.1   The emphasis of this section is to evaluate the effectiveness of the delivery of your course and the quality of the Student Experience through analysis of key outcomes. This section should consider student feedback including NSS data, survey data and feedback from student representatives.

6.2   How will you build on experience since the course Approval or Periodic Review to ensure that course delivery, organisation and management are as effective as possible?

9

7.   Curriculum development

      7.1   Describe changes which are proposed, under the periodic review process, to curriculum content, Unit Handbooks etc, together with reasons for these. You should cite evidence in support of changes (eg curriculum developments influenced by staff research, scholarly activity and professional practice; destination data, feedback from industry, student feedback, etc).

      7.2   Describe changes which are proposed, under the periodic review process, to teaching, learning and assessment methods, together with reasons for these. You should cite evidence in support of changes (eg curriculum developments destination data; feedback from industry; student feedback, etc).

8.   Resource development

The University operates centralised processes for resource planning. Looking ahead 3-5 years, are there any emerging longer-term resource requirements in respect of staffing, teaching accommodation and/or specialist equipment? If so, please summarise these.

9.   Appendix 1: summary of approved changes to the curriculum
QME will provide a table summarising changes and additions to unit handbooks and project briefs for each unit during the preceding three years.

4. GUIDANCE ON WRITING COURSE PHILOSOPHY FOR PERIODIC REVIEW

The following guidance is intended as a reference for Course Teams in revising Course Philosophy sections of documentation required for internal and external review of existing academic provision.

The guidance below is intended to be indicative rather than comprehensive, but does include the key areas that will be subject to scrutiny as part of the Course Approval and Periodic Review processes as defined within the University' Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) Handbook. In developing these sections, course teams should also refer to relevant external reference points such as QAA Subject Benchmark Statements and guidance from relevant industry bodies as appropriate.

Periodic Review
A periodic review event for *existing* course provision includes the requirement of a renewed statement of the Course Philosophy.

The Periodic Review will also consider the continued requirement for the course if, for instance, application trends or UCAS data indicate significant variations in applicant demand for the provision over the preceding 5 year period (+15% or -15%).

Course Philosophy (1000-1200 words)
The Course Philosophy is required to articulate the distinctive approach to teaching and learning of the subject as it is positioned within the context of the Faculty and University. The Course Philosophy should provide commentary on the following key areas:

- *How do the specialist skills, knowledge and experience of the course team continue to enable delivery of the award?*

- *What professional development activities have been undertaken by staff since the last periodic review or approval of the provision and how have these impacted on the students' experience of the course?*

- *What evidence is there that the course successfully engages students with specialist teaching and learning of the subject?*

- *What is distinctive about the course curriculum and its design and how will its effectiveness continue to be assured in providing intellectually stimulating content for students?*

- *What is the current balance between contact time and independent study time for creative practice, professional practice and research? (n.b. A breakdown of hours is <u>not</u> sought in this section, but the role and relationships of taught study and independent practice should be provided as part of the reason for the pattern of study and curriculum content).*

- *What evidence is there that staff research and scholarly activity contribute to the quality of teaching on the Course?*

11

- *What evidence is there that students' knowledge, skills and career readiness are enhanced by the course?*

- *What special features does the course deliver in terms of learning events and activities? (This might include VLE, online learning, work placements, live projects, symposia, employability events or other activities that add value to the study of the subject).*

- *What evidence is there that the Course's approach to teaching, learning and assessment effectively support progression to employment or further study?*

- *How will the Course's approach to teaching, learning and assessment support progression to employment or further study? (Provide past and current examples as appropriate).*

- *What are the past and possible future career destinations for graduates?*

5.   RESPONDING TO CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING COURSE PERIODIC REVIEW EVENTS

Following the Periodic Review event a summary of the commendations, conditions and recommendations will be issued by QME, usually within one week of the event. Dates by which this must be completed are set QME in advance of the internal and external stages of approval and review. This will be followed by a full report outlining the areas discussed by the Panel and the outcomes.

The course team is required to provide a formal response to the Periodic Review report, by the agreed deadlines, using the *Responses to Conditions and Recommendations* template, which will be provided by the QME Office. This should evidence how specific conditions have been met and address any recommendations that were made. The Responses to Conditions and Recommendations, and revisions to documentation is submitted to the relevant Dean to approve and is forwarded by QME to the Chair of the Panel for sign off.

It is a requirement that all Conditions are met prior to continuation of the course. It is a requirement that all Recommendations are considered by the course team or the University, with the outcomes outlined on the Responses to Conditions and Recommendations template. However, it is also recognised that work in response to certain types of Recommendation may be ongoing. Ongoing actions are reported on through Annual Course Review. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee will monitor work undertaken in response to such Recommendations for one academic year following the approval/periodic review event.

The *Responses to Conditions and Recommendations* from the course team should include:

- amended documents (using tracked changes to highlight any amendments);
- a brief summary of how each condition has been met with reference to the amended documents;
- how each recommendation and/or development in progress has been considered and any action that will be taken.

12

An example of a completed *Responses to Conditions and Recommendations template* is provided on pages 14-15 of this Annex.

When the Chair of the Periodic Review Panel is satisfied that all conditions have been met and that all recommendations have been responded to appropriately, confirmation is emailed to QME. A summary report of Course Approval and Review Outcomes is produced by QME for Approval by Chair of Senate.

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PERIODIC REVIEW EVENT

Event: **MA Curation External Periodic Review Event**

Meeting Date: **18 and 19 April 2016**

Panel Chair: Professor Richard Sawdon Smith

Proposal Team Leader: Paul Fieldsend-Danks

	CONDITION	Response *(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)*	Date approved by QSC
1.1	Evidence more clearly where national and international policy and funding structures are articulated in the Units.	Student Experience Page 1/ Final set of bullets: This is now inserted in the correct place underneath the paragraph about the East Gallery and the associated training programme. This aspect of the course will be formally delivered as part of the East Gallery[NUA] Training programme, and not through Units of study. Knowledge gained will provide generic understanding of issues identified. We acknowledge that these themes may also form part of general discussion within units, should these arise as a natural consequence of taught sessions. Appendix 2: MA Curation: East Gallery[NUA] Training Programme: addition to indicative content of "Exploring national and international policy, funding structures and applications" within programme. Student Experience Page 2/ Para 2: adjustment to paragraph to add: "and opportunities to develop funding applications where appropriate."	13 July 2016

14

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response *(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)*	Date approved by QSC
2.1	To expand the potential for collaboration between MA Curation and MA Fine Art to BA Fine Art in the Rationale and remove reference to other courses and key competitors.	Rationale Pg. 1/Para 2: Additional statement added re. potential for collaboration with MA Fine Art. Rationale Pg. 1/Para 3: Reference to key competitors removed.	13 July 2016
2.2	To provide an assessment diagram/timetable which includes the key points of contact within the Units where the Training Programme, Mentoring Scheme and collaborative opportunities exist.	New Curation Diagrams produced (year one and year two), with information on modes of study, including relative position of units to assessment, training, mentoring, and collaborative opportunities. To be included in the Course Handbook.	13 July 2016
2.3	Unpack and clarify the added value and type of activities included in the collaboration with the MA Fine Art Interim Show in ASU1.	ASU1 Unit Brief: Page 1/Para 4: Additional statement added clarifying types of activity and potential collaboration.	13 July 2016
2.4	To provide Marketing with information that clearly articulates the strengths of the course; the differences between MA Curation and MA Fine Art and considers potential targeted international audiences.	Marketing have received new copy for the MA Curation NUA website, and this has been uploaded as live content. This articulates the course aims and approaches, indicating strengths and international context/scope for study. Both the Marketing team and the International office have been briefed on the changes, to provide clarity on the offer for prospective students, and the differences between MA Curation and MA Fine Art. As part of this, a presentation about the course to International agents visiting NUA (1.6.16) will initiate further dissemination of the revised aims to an international audience, via the International office. All material for MA Open Days has been revised to reflect strengths of the course, explicit difference between MA Curation and MA Fine Art courses, and the focus on hands-on experience and related training.	13 July 2016

Approved by Panel Chair

Name: Professor Richard Sawdon Smith
Position: Dean of Arts and Media

Signature: *[signature]*   **Date:** 17/06/16

15

NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

COURSE DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND REVIEW: GUIDANCE ON ANNUAL COURSE REVIEW (ACR) REPORTING 2017-18

Aim

The aim of Annual Course Review at NUA is to ensure course quality and enhance the student experience in the context of internal and external indicators of quality.

Annual Course Review at NUA is founded on the following principles:
1. A risk-based approach – warning system re: course quality
2. Continuous enhancement – identification and dissemination of good practice
3. Information for Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) and/or Accrediting organisations
4. Collection of key contextual information to feed into Course Periodic Review

Wider Purpose:
- To review and evaluate the course for the purposes of quality assurance and enhancement
- To develop action plans that ensure enhancement through the annual review process
- To ensure excellence in the quality of education and learning opportunities for students
- To identify and share good practice

UK Quality Code expectations

The UK Quality Code for Higher Education covers annual monitoring in Chapter B3: Learning and Teaching, Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement, Chapter B5: Student Engagement and Chapter B8: Programme monitoring and review.

The UK Quality Code for Higher Education - Chapter B8: Programme monitoring and review
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/quality-code-part-b
states the following expectation:

 "Higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review of programmes."

The University's annual monitoring process enables the University to meet the expectations of the Code.

Requirements

The Annual Course Review (ACR) is authored by the Course Leader in agreement with the relevant Dean and should involve student representatives in the approval process.

From an external point of view, an effective ACR is central to our ability to demonstrate to external reviewers the currency, security and validity of our awards.

In order to be effective, the ACR needs to act as a focus for reflective evaluation of curriculum, delivery, student experience and the achievements of students. Annual Course Reviews also need to look forward to the next delivery of the course, building on the experience and evidence of the past year, and facilitating the active enhancement of quality and standards.

LTQC will receive the minutes of the Faculty Board of Studies and Board of Studies for PGT Annual Monitoring meeting and the final versions of BA (Hons) Architecture, MA and PG Cert ACRs along with Critical Friend Reports.

Nature of the Annual Course Review

The ACR should be an evaluative document, reflecting on the previous academic year (2017-18) and identifying actions for the current and future years which will lead to the enhancement of quality and academic standards. This report should be written after the course team/faculty has considered all the different components of evidence set out below.

Content of the Annual Course Review (ACR)

The content of the ACR and enhancement plan is informed by student feedback data, external examiner reports, periodic review, achievement against NUA benchmarks and course management and staffing arrangements.

The ACR should routinely monitor and appraise the following:

- External examiner reports
- Any reports from accrediting or other external bodies
- Staff and student feedback
- Feedback from graduates and their employers
- Student progress, progression and other relevant data
- Performance Indicators
- Course material made available to students such as course guides and websites.

What to include in the report

Use the previous enhancement plan as a starting point. The ACR should indicate clearly what progress has been made on the actions identified in the enhancement plan, and indicate any further action that is still required. The ACR template provides guidance on the supporting data and evidence that should be considered.

Care should be taken to ensure that any issues raised in the ACR and enhancement plan are clearly cross-referenced.

Section One: Review of the Year

This section requires an update on progress from the previous year's enhancement plan:

- You should indicate clearly what progress has been made on each action identified and state if the action has been completed and whether any associated targets have been achieved. Where possible provide evidence using data or state the impact that the action taken has had.
- If an action has not been completed or the target set has not been achieved you should consider if the action should be carried forward to the following years Course Enhancement Plan or replaced by a new action.

- If the action has been partially completed you should consider whether any parts of the action should be carried forward to the following years Course Enhancement Plan.
- If the action is still required, state that the action is being carried forward to the enhancement plan for the year ahead (Section three). To facilitate cross-referencing and future monitoring, each action should be numbered.

Section Two: Overview of Strengths and Enhancements

This section provides an opportunity for Course Leaders to evaluate all data relating to their student cohort and identify strengths, areas of good practice and areas for enhancement. Data will be provided by Registry and QME and any areas which require specific comment will be identified through a flagging exercise undertaken by Registry/QME.

Data to be provided:
- ISS/UKES/PTES outcomes
- Unit Results (average mark, no. of fails, failure rate, mark distribution)
- Continuation and completion data
- Degree Outcomes – Award Profiles
- Student numbers and characteristics profile (age, gender, BME profile, disability and qualifications on entry)
- Graduate Outcomes (% in employment and % in further study, % in professional & managerial jobs, salary range)
- NSS outcomes

When completing this section authors should also include written responses to internal and external influences and factors which impact on the course. Consider actions arising/good practice identified from course committee meetings alongside areas identified by Internal Verification processes, External Examiners, Industry Liaison, Employers, Approval and Review outcomes and Professional Accreditation bodies to fully evaluate your Course. Triangulating this evidence should present a clear overview of the course strengths, good practice and areas for enhancement.

2.1 Successes

You are asked to highlight any aspects of the data which indicate positive data outcomes.

2.2 Good practice

We define "good practice" as a process, a practice, a way of doing or managing things which, in the context of the University, is improving or leading to the improvement of quality and/or academic standards, learning, teaching or the wider student experience. "Good practice" may not be "best practice" or "sector- leading good practice." It is practice here at the University which is improving or leading to improvements for us and for our students. As part of your course evaluation you should identify up to three areas of good practice which will be shared with the wider University community through the intranet and University Development Days.

You should provide a short paragraph for each area of identified good practice which summarises what it is and the evidence which confirms this, see the following example:

> *Studio Days – Students (at Course Committee) requested more 'informal' contact with tutors, to complement 1-1 tutorials. Since 2015, the course has implemented*

Studio Days, where staff will be freely available to spend 5 or 50 minutes with any student from any year group. It is such a simple thing, but has proved very popular with students and has been picked-up by an External Examiner this year as an example of good practice which "enriches the students' learning experience".

2.3 Issues/Risks arising

You are asked to highlight any aspects of the data which give you cause for concern. If there are issues which require enhancement these should be reflected in the Course Enhancement Plan. All items recommended for action in Section 5.3 of the External Examiners Report should be considered in this section and actions arising should be reflected in the Course Enhancement Plan

2.4 Industry Engagement – please provide a summary of all activities undertaken by the Course which involve Industry.

Section Three: Course Enhancement Plan

This section requires an enhancement plan for the year ahead:

- This should summarise actions the course team need to take over the coming year to address areas identified in the report as being in need of enhancement.
- Items recommended for action in Section 5.3 of the External Examiners Report should be included.
- This section should also include any actions which could not be fully completed and need to be carried forward from the previous year. When deciding on actions to carry forward consider if the original action was appropriate and achievable or whether a new action needs to replace it.
- The enhancement plan should clearly identify the issue, evidence, actions, responsibilities, timescale.

There needs to be an effective means of measuring the impact of actions, and each action needs to have a timescale and someone responsible for overseeing that the action will be completed. Where possible actions should be identified against a number of metrics e.g. NSS/DLHE/Recruitment/Retention.

All actions need to be SMART	
Specific	All actions should be clear to people with a basic knowledge of the issue, programme or initiative and clearly articulated, well defined and focused. Actions should state the exact level of performance expected.
Measurable	All actions should be able to determine when the action has been completed and the degree to which the action has been achieved. Using the same (Ideally quantifiable) methodology and information, findings should be able to be replicated. Can a quantitative or qualitative attribute be applied to create a metric?
Achievable	All actions should be realistic, practical and attainable within operational constraints dependent upon availability of resources, knowledge and timeframe.
Relevant	All actions should be relevant to institutional priorities and help to contribute to the bringing about of the desired outcome of the institutions strategic plan
Timebound	All actions should have clear deadlines expressed and regular review periods.

Section 4 – Note this section is removed before publication of the ACR

4.1 Potential items for University enhancement

The purpose of this table is to capture potential items for University enhancement. Any actions identified which cannot be dealt with at Course level should be included in the section for potential items for University Enhancement Strategy for consideration at the Faculty Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting in October. The Faculty Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting will reflect and conclude on items for Enhancement to feed into the University Enhancement Strategy which is considered at LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting and which is approved by Senate.

4.2 Changes to Resources

This table should be completed by Courses with Creative Skillset Accreditation. Creative Skillset require a set of information to be provided for accredited courses on an annual basis which includes information on structural changes. The questions are from the Creative Skillset Course Monitoring requirements and responses will be used to provide our annual update.

4.3 Resource requests

This table should be used to identify replacement or additional/new resources, including subject-specific on-line resources which the Library does not currently subscribe to. Each request should be supported by a summary rationale.

Please note that Capital Expenditure is approved by SMT in April/May each year for purchase by September of that year. Therefore any requests included in this table will be considered by SMT if agreed in April/May 2019 for purchase by September 2019.

How the reports are considered by the University

Appendix 1 provides the Annual Monitoring 2018 Key Dates and Processes.

Undergraduate Annual Course Reviews

The UG ACR reports are considered at the Faculty Board of Studies Annual Monitoring Meeting. In advance of this meeting each ACR will be allocated to a Critical Friend who will read and report on the quality of the ACR by completing the Critical Friend Report (see Appendix 2). The Critical Friend Report will identify changes required which will be confirmed by the Faculty Board of Studies Annual Monitoring Meeting. Final versions of ACRs will be presented to the Dean for approval.

Postgraduate Annual Course Reviews

The PG ACR reports are considered at the Board of Studies for Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Annual Monitoring Meeting. In advance of the meeting each ACR will be allocated to a Critical Friend who will read and report on the quality of the ACR by completing the Critical Friend Report (see Appendix 2). The Critical Friend Report will identify changes required which will be confirmed by the Board of Studies for Postgraduate Taught (PGT). Final versions of PG ACRs will be presented to LTQC for approval.

<u>LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting</u>

The LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting in November will receive minutes of the Faculty Board of Studies/ Board of Studies for Postgraduate Taught Annual Monitoring meeting and the good practice summary. LTQC will confirm the quality of the Critical Friend process.

The LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting in November will capture key issues and good practice as well as key themes from ACR reports. The minutes of LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting will be considered by Senate at its Annual Monitoring meeting. The revised Institutional Enhancement Strategy is agreed following the Annual Monitoring Meetings.

Follow-up Activity
- The ACRs are sent to External Examiners following approval.
- The Faculty Board of Studies/Board of Studies for Postgraduate Taught (PGT) is responsible for monitoring progress with Course Enhancement Plans and reports to LTQC.
- Progress on Course Enhancement Plans should be reported to and considered by Faculty Board of Studies in spring 2019.
- Actions taken should be reported on and evaluated in the following year's ACR report.
- The University Enhancement Strategy is monitored through LTQC and Senate with progress against actions reported on.

Table 1: Annual Monitoring Data Flags

The following table indicates where data or information will be notified or "flagged" to Course Leaders when commentary is required. Coloured flags will indicate where course results are either +/- 5% of the NUA mean for the reporting year with red indicating a below NUA mean result and green indicating an above NUA mean result. Course Leaders will be asked to comment on areas of improvement/good performance or areas where there are potential issues or trends to consider.

Annual Monitoring Data Flags	
Retention Flag	NUA average + / - 5%
Achievement Flag	Passes at first attempt
Degree Classification Profiles Flag	Changes in profile.
IV Process Outcomes	Any areas indicated by IV Panel as an issue will be notified to Course Leaders via QME
Student Profile Data Supplied for Comment Flag	Anything unusual and request comment. Age, gender, BME, disability, qualifications on entry vs. degree outcomes.
Employability	Any data requiring comment will be notified to Course Leaders via QME.
NSS Flags	For sudden increase or decrease in score and satisfaction levels below 90%.
External Examiner Reports	Any negative responses to the questions relating to Assessment and Standards will be notified to Course Leaders via QME

Annual Monitoring 2018 Key Dates and Processes: Reporting on 2017-18

This document describes the key dates and processes for NUA's Annual Monitoring. The first section shows the stages, activities and deadlines for each element of the Annual Course Review. The second section describes the process for receiving and responding to External Examiners' Reports.

ANNUAL COURSE REVIEW TIMELINE			
Stage	**Activity**	**Description**	**Date**
Drafting ACRs	UG and PG Data Packs Available for drafting ACRs	Including; • External Examiner Reports • National Student Surveys • Internal Student Surveys • HEA Surveys • DLHE Data • Unit Results • Award Profile	By the end of July
	UG and PG ACR Templates Available	Pre-populated with; • Student Successes • Previous Year Enhancement Plan • Periodic Review and Accreditation Conditions and Recommendations where relevant	By first week of August
	UG and PG Data Packs Available	Including; • Retention and Award Profiles (including resubmission results) • Student Profile data	4-7 September
	ACR Support Meeting for Course Teams	QME Office to meet with Course Teams to discuss data and reportable items for ACR	6-14 September
	UG ACR Final Drafts	Final draft Undergraduate ACRs completed and uploaded to the QME Working Folder ready for review by an allocated Critical Friend.	By 3 October
	PGR ACR Final Draft	Final draft of PGR AMR submitted to RDC convening secretary.	By 26 September
	PG ACR Final Drafts	Final draft of PG ACRs completed and uploaded to the QME Working Folder ready for review by an allocated Critical Friend.	By 15 October

DRAFTING ACRS - COURSE LEADER ACTIONS	
QME will arrange a Support Meeting for Course Teams during the period 6-14 September when the final data set is available following resits. At this meeting we will discuss metrics, data and reportable items. In the meantime the following actions can be undertaken during August 2018. (refer to pages 2-4 of Annex J for further guidance)	
Data Pack	Review data pack this includes External Examiner Report, National Student Surveys, Internal Student Surveys, HEA Survey, DLHE data, first time pass rates and award breakdown. Identify successes and issues.
Course Committee Minutes	Review Course Committee minutes
Course Enhancement Plan 2017-18	Update the pre-populated Course Enhancement Plan for 2017-18 to record progress made and identify if actions are complete/partially complete or needs to be carried forward to the 2018-19 Course Enhancement Plan.
Industry Engagement	Collate Industry Engagement activities e.g. Key speakers, Visits, Live Projects undertaken in 2017-18 – this information is recorded in section 2.4 of the ACR.
External Examiner Report	Read the External Examiner Report and consider good practice identified, successes and issues raised. These can feed into Section 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of the ACR. Complete the External Examiner Response template where action is allocated to Course Leader.
Good Practice	Identify areas of Good Practice and complete Section 2.2 of the ACR.
Resources	Consider what resources are required for 2019-20 and complete Section 4.3 of the ACR. This section informs the capital expenditure plans. If your course is **accredited** complete Section 4.2 to identify Changes to Resources
Update on recommendations arising from Periodic Review and Accreditation	If Course has been through a Periodic Review or Accreditation process in 2017-18 complete Annex 1/Annex 2 to provide an update.

ANNUAL COURSE REVIEW TIMELINE			
Stage	**Activity**	**Description**	**Date**
Review of ACRs	Research Degrees Committee	Research Degrees Committee considers final draft of PGR AMR.	10 October
	UG ACR Critical Friend Reviews	Critical Friend reports completed and uploaded to the QME Working Folder ready for Faculty Board of Studies.	By 11 October
	Faculty Board of Studies Arts and Media/ Faculty Board of Studies Design and Architecture	Considers final draft of ACRs and Critical Friend Reports.	17 October
	PG ACR Critical Friend Reviews	Postgraduate critical friend reports uploaded to the QME Working Folder ready for Postgraduate Board of Studies.	By 18 October
	Postgraduate Board of Studies	Considers final draft of ACRs and Critical Friend Reports.	25 October 2018
	PG ACR Final amends	Associate Dean Head of Taught Postgraduate and Head of Learning and Teaching considers Critical Friend reports and feedback from the Postgraduate Board of Studies and completes final amends to ACRs and uploads final versions to QME Working Folder ready for LTQC approval.	By 2 November
	UG ACR Final amends	Course Leaders consider Critical Friend Reports and feedback from the Faculty Board of Studies and completes final amends to ACRs and uploads final versions to QME Working Folder ready for approval by Deans.	By 12 November
	Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee	Considers final draft of BA (Hons) Architecture ACR and Critical Friend Report.	14 November
	BA(hons) Architecture ACR Final amends	BA (Hons) Architecture Course Leader considers feedback from LTQC and completes final amends to the ACR and uploads the final version to QME Working Folder ready for approval by Senate.	By 23 November

ANNUAL COURSE REVIEW TIMELINE			
Stage	**Activity**	**Description**	**Date**
Approval of ACRs	Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee	Approves final versions of PG ACRs.	14 November
	Deans Approval	Approve final versions of UG ACRs.	By 23 November
	Senate	Approves the final version of the BA (Hons) Architecture ACR for submission to the Architects Registration Board.	5 December
	Senate	Approves the final version of PGR AMR for submission to the University of the Arts London.	5 December

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORTS TIMELINE		
Activity	**Deadline**	**Staff responsible**
Receipt of UG Examiners' reports by NUA	1 August 2018	Received by Vice Chancellor and passed – with comments – to relevant Dean and Course Leader, copied to Pro Vice- Chancellor (Academic), Academic Registrar
Receipt of PG Examiners' reports by NUA	28 September 2018	Received by Vice Chancellor and passed – with comments – to relevant Dean and Course Leader, copied to Pro Vice- Chancellor (Academic), Academic Registrar
Logging of reports and drawing up of Response templates	As reports received	QME Officer
UG Response templates sent to relevant Dean and Course Leader, copied to PVCA and Deans Support	As soon as available	QME Officer via Academic Registrar if query over responsibility for response to recommendations
PG Response templates sent to Associate Dean (Head of PGT Awards) and copied to PVCA and Deans Support		
Identification of UG staff who need to respond to recommendations	As soon as possible	Deans
Identification of PG staff who need to respond to recommendations		Associate Dean (Head of PGT Awards)
Responses to External Examiners' recommendations feed into Annual Course Reviews		
Completed UG responses templates returned to qme@nua.ac.uk	13 October 2018, or as soon as possible after Reports received	Deans
Completed PG responses templates returned to qme@nua.ac.uk	13 October 2018, or as soon as possible after Reports received	Associate Dean (Head of PGT Awards)
Responses to University wide recommendations completed	13 October 2018, or as soon as possible after Reports received	Pro Vice- Chancellor (Academic)
Final completion of response templates and overview for LTQC Annual Monitoring meeting	31 October 2018	Quality Manager

UG/PG Annual Course Review (ACR) 2017-18 – Critical Friend Report

- The final ACR reports will go through a Critical Friend process, the outcomes of which are reported in this report template.
- This Critical Friend process should assess the evaluation of the data and the conclusions being drawn.
- Critical Friends will be allocated an UG ACR to scrutinise; these will be available on the shared drive by 3 October 2018.
- Please read the ACR carefully and assign at least 2 hours' preparation time to the task before the Faculty Board of Studies meeting on 17 October 2018 (Undergraduate Courses): At this meeting you will be asked to report key findings.
- PGT and PG Cert reports will be allocated to a Critical Friend and considered by Board of Studies for PGT on 25 October, these will be subject to final approval by LTQC 14 November 2018.

The link to the ACRs is here: S:\General_Shares\QME Working\Annual Course Reviews 2017-18

Academic Year: 2016-17	Course:		
	Yes	No	N/A
1 Section One			
Has the progress against this year's enhancement plan been fully reported on?			
2 Section Two			
Does Section 2.1 identify the key strengths and successes?			
Does Section 2.2 identify up to 3 areas of good practice and do you think this practice *is improving or leading to improvements for us and for our students?*			
Have the key issues and risks been captured appropriately within Section 2.3 with evidence of solutions?			
Does Section 2.4 capture the range of links with Industry?			
3 Section Three			
Does the 2018-19 Enhancement Plan sufficiently address the key issues and risks identified in Section 2.3?			
Are the actions in the 2018-19 Enhancement Plan appropriate and SMART?			
4 Section Four			
For Courses which are accredited by Creative Skillset - does Section 4 capture details of changes and is the information provided clear.			
5 Overall			
Does the ACR use and fully reference the full range of evidence base available? (Student progress, progression and other relevant data, DLHE/NSS/ISS/UKES/PTES, External examiner reports, any reports from accrediting or other external bodies, IV process outcomes, Course Committees, feedback from graduates and their employers) i.e. check data against claims.			
Is the ACR clear / well written / proof read?			
Is everything included which needs to be?			
Is the report accurate?			
Have annexes been completed where appropriate?			

Where No has been indicated above, additional commentary should be provided below

Appendix 2: Annual Course Review Critical Friend Report

```

```

Is the document fit for publication? If No please provide additional commentary

Critical Friend's name	
Date	

Norwich University of the Arts

Quality Management and Enhancement

Annual Course Review for the Academic Year 2017-18

[Course Title]

15

Purpose:

- To review and evaluate the course for the purposes of quality assurance and enhancement

- To develop action plans that ensure enhancement through the annual review process

- To ensure excellence in the quality of education and learning opportunities for students

- To identify and share good practice

The Annual Course Review (ACR) should be evaluative and the contents of it should be drawn from the reporting period 2017-18. Sections which refer to data provided via the annual monitoring page of the intranet should address the reporting period and the two preceding years.

It is not a requirement that the ACR must be anonymised, however Course Leaders and other contributing staff are advised to keep in mind that external audiences (e.g. QA Reviewers, PSBRs) will have sight of ACRs. It is therefore essential to consider whether it is always necessary to refer to staff and, in particular, students by name.

Course Performance Dashboard 2017-18

A Performance Dashboard will be provided which includes the following measures

- Unit Results (average mark, no. of fails, failure rate, mark distribution)

- Continuation and completion data

- Degree Outcomes – Award Profiles

- Student numbers and characteristics profile (age, gender, BME profile, disability and qualifications on entry)

- Graduate Outcomes (% in employment and % in further study, % in professional & managerial jobs, salary range)

- Survey Outcomes – NSS/ISS/UKES/PTES

Celebrating Success – Student Successes
QME will request this information from Marketing. This section should provide a list of student and staff achievements from the past year (including any notable alumni successes, which should be appropriately identified). It may include examples of teaching and learning activities which have been led by staff research and professional activities.
Student Success

Section one: How we have strengthened the course this year – review of this year's Enhancement Plan (2017-18)								
This section should include a review and evaluation of the Course Enhancement Plan for 2017-18 and the Action taken column should be completed to Include where possible, evidence of impact. Examples can be from increases in NSS scores, feedback from students through ISS, Course Committees or other fora, assessment results, DLHE data etc.								
Item no.	**Issue identified for action/ enhancement** (Please identify where the evidence for action arises from by cross-referencing to sections of your ACR and other relevant sources, for example External Examiner reports/recommendations)	**Target** (identify an appropriate target for the action e.g. NSS/DLHE)	**Action required**	**Action required by whom**	**Action required by when**	**Action taken** (Indicate the status of the action. Is it Completed, Partially completed or Not completed? Include an evaluation of impact possible)	**Target achieved** (State whether Yes Partially achieved Not achieved)	**Is this action being carried forward Yes*/No** (*If yes please ensure that action is included in the beginning of the Enhancement Plan Section 3)

Were there any other enhancements that you implemented that were not part of your enhancement plan?

Item no.	Issue identified for action/enhancement	Action taken *Include where possible, evidence of impact. Examples can be from increases in NSS scores, feedback from students through ISS, Course Committees or other fora, assessment results, DLHE data etc.*

Section two

Overview of strengths and areas for enhancement

Where you have indicated that a strength or enhancement requires further work, an action should be generated in the Course Enhancement Plan. If this action cannot be implemented by the Course team it should be added to the potential items for University enhancement (Section 4.1). Please indicate in brackets e.g. (Item no 1.) where comments link to the enhancement plans.

Following discussion within your department please comment on the following ▪ *Use as evidence all of the data/information available including relevant NUA benchmarks, NSS, ISS, Course Committee meetings, DLHE, admissions, progression, retention and achievement data, External Examiner reports, Successes – staff, students, alumni, and any other Faculty or University monitoring systems in place such as Internal Verification (IV).* ▪ *Please consider Internal and external influences (e.g. PRSB, employers, other NUA departments – indicator 6 UKHEQC Chapter 8)* ▪ *Please also reflect on methods of obtaining student feedback and levels of student engagement, for example through attendance at Course Committees or other meetings.* ▪ *Please ensure you consider issues relating to Equality and Diversity and Health and Safety when completing this section.*
2.1 What has been successful this year?
Use bullet points
2.2 Identify up to three areas of good practice that could be shared? *We define "good practice" as a process, a practice, a way of doing or managing things which, <u>in the context of the University,</u> is improving or leading to the improvement of quality and/or academic standards, learning, teaching or the wider student experience. "Good practice" may not be "best practice" or "sector-leading good practice." It is practice here at the University which is improving or leading to improvements for us and for our students.*
Use bullet points

2.3 What issues/risks have arisen this year, and what will require monitoring in the forthcoming year?   • *Please ensure that this section captures Items recommended for action in Section 5.3 of the External Examiners Report.*   • *Please indicate the corresponding action in the Enhancement Plan using brackets e.g. (Item no 1.)*
Use bullet points
2.4 Industry Engagement   *Please provide a list of all activities involving Industry to include Key Speakers, Visits, Live Projects*
Use bullet points

Section three

Norwich University of the Arts Annual Course Review – Course Enhancement Plan 2018-19

Course title:

Please complete this plan which should reflect issues from preceding sections which may need to be given further consideration, such as external examiner comments and recommendations, student data, NSS, ISS, UKES, PTES or DLHE results, feedback from Internal Verification team or student or employer's feedback.

If you have identified actions which you think cannot be dealt with at Course level, please note these in the section **Potential items for University enhancement** for discussion at the Faculty Board of Studies (FBOS) Meeting.

Item no.	Issue identified for action/ enhancement (Please identify where the evidence for action arises from by cross-referencing to sections of your ACR and other relevant sources, for example External Examiner reports/recommendations)	Target (identify an appropriate target for the action e.g. NSS/DLHE)	Action required	Action required by whom	Action required by when	Action taken (This section to be updated for consideration by FBOS and Course Committee. Please indicate the status of the action. Is it Completed/ Partially Completed/ Not completed? Include an evaluation of impact)	Target achieved (State whether Yes Partially achieved Not achieved)	Is this action being carried forward **Yes*/No** (*If yes please ensure that action is included in the beginning of the Enhancement Plan Section 3)

Section four: Note this section will not be published as part of the ACR.

4.1 Potential items for University enhancement
The purpose of this section is to capture potential actions for consideration at the Faculty Board of Studies Annual Monitoring meeting where they can be discussed and where appropriate feed into the University Enhancement Strategy which is approved by Senate.

Appendix 3: Annual Course Review

Item no.	Issue identified for action/enhancement (Please identify where the evidence for action arises from by cross-referencing to sections of your ACR and other relevant sources, for example External Examiner reports/recommendations)	Action required	Action taken

4.2 Changes to Resources – this Section should be completed by Courses which have Creative Skillset Accreditation. The questions are from the Creative Skillset Course Monitoring requirements and responses will be used to provide our annual update.

a) Staffing Please provide a summary of all changes to staffing that have taken place within the previous academic year (September 2017-July 2018), for example if any members of staff have joined or left since the previous accreditation visit, or if there have been any changes to staff roles etc.
b) Course Changes Please provide details of all changes to course delivery that have taken place in the previous academic year (September 2017-July 2018), for example changes to who is delivering the course units, additional practical delivery within course units/enhanced team working etc
c) Course Resources/Equipment Please provide details of all changes to course resources/equipment that have taken place in the previous academic year (September 2017-July 2018); for example, any changes or improvements to course equipment, changes to budgets for visiting lecturers or budgets in general etc

4.3 Resource requests

Please use this table to identify replacement or additional/new resources, including subject-specific on-line resources which the Library does not currently subscribe to. Each request should be supported by a summary rationale.

Please note that Capital Expenditure is approved by SMG in April/May each year for purchase by September of that year. Therefore any requests made in this template will be considered by SMG if agreed in April/May 2019 for purchase by September 2019.

Resource requested – Identify item/item type	Rationale This needs to be supported by evidence. (E.g. curriculum delivery, assessment requirement industry, student feedback). Identify student usage and numbers of users who would benefit.	Is this a replacement, and upgrade to existing resources, or a new resource?	Quantity requested	Estimated unit price	Estimated total cost	Source of funding e.g. course budget

Annexes

Annexes only need to be completed if the following apply:

Annex 1 Periodic Review and Course Approval Update

Annex 1 should be completed by course teams that have undergone periodic review/approval in the last 12 months. In subsequent years updates on ongoing action should be integrated into the ACR. Annex 1 should include an update on action taken in response to periodic review/approval.

Annex 2: Accreditation Update

Annex 2 should be completed by course teams that have conditions/recommendations arising from Accreditation visits to provide an update on action taken in response to these.

If neither of these updates are required then you do not need to complete an Annex and this section will be removed when the ACR is published.

Has your course has been subject to Periodic Review or Course Approval during this reporting period? If yes you are required to respond to provide your approved response to each r*ecommendation and responses to conditions along with an update where applicable.*		
Condition/ Recommendation	**Final Approved Response as sent to Panel**	**Update on further actions taken**

Is your course externally accredited or has your course been through an accreditation process during this reporting period?

If 'Yes' you are required to respond to provide and update to any r*ecommendation or conditions arising from this accreditation process.*

Condition/ Recommendation	Update on further actions taken