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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.

August 2019
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 four 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 The University is regulated by the Office for Students (OfS). Information about the University's status can be found on the OfS Register and on the list of recognised bodies published on the UK Government (GOV.UK) website. The OfS regulatory framework came fully into force from 1 August 2019. As part of its registration with the OfS the University is required to satisfy a number of conditions that relate to quality and standards, these are provided in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions that relate to standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conditions that relate to quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>The provider has a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>The provider has sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources and student support services to deliver a high-quality academic experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Where the provider offers research degrees, it delivers these in appropriate and supportive research environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. ScreenSkills, Advance HE, 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 University works with the following accrediting bodies:

- ScreenSkills: (BA (Hons) Film & Moving Image Production and BA (Hons) Games Art & Design
- The Independent Game Developers' Association (TIGA): BA (Hons) Games Art and Design.
- Advance HE: 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. 3.15.1 – 3.15.2)
5. Reference to the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (paras. 3.13.1 – 3.13.9) in the University’s QME systems and procedures, including those for:
   a. course development, approval and periodic review (section 4; Annex H and I)
   b. annual monitoring (section 5 and Annex J)
6. 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)
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 for Higher Education.
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 for Higher Education.

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 Faculty/Postgraduate Taught Board of Studies, 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 for Higher Education* (external), including the Framework for HE Qualifications and relevant Subject Benchmark Statements

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

### 2.4 Student Voice

2.4.1 We are committed to working in partnership with our students to enhance all aspects of student experience and this partnership as set out in the Student Agreement recognises that students have rights and responsibilities to voice their opinions and that the University has obligations to respond to them.

2.4.2 The Student Voice is a partnership between the Students’ Union and the University to ensure students’ views are heard at all levels of academic life. Students volunteer to become Student Representatives to further the interests of their student group. Training is provided by the Students’ Union. Student Representatives attend committees and meetings with University staff to ensure that student feedback is utilised to enhance courses, facilities and services.

2.4.3 It is essential that all of our students have sufficient opportunities to voice opinions about their studies and the wider student experience and that the student voice is listened to and taken seriously. Importantly, it is also recognised that timely action is taken in response to valid issues and justifiable concerns raised through Student Voice opportunities.

2.4.4 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.

2.4.5 The primary purposes of student feedback are to:

- Inform all aspects of the student experience that have scope for enhancement
- Help improve the quality of learning, teaching and assessment
- Ensure that quality management takes full account of student views.

2.4.6 There is no single mechanism by which students might share their views and the University provides a range of opportunities both informal and formal. Informal mechanisms include opportunities for students to provide feedback to staff, to discuss issues, and to resolve difficulties, for example via contact on campus with University/Students’ Union staff via the informal feedback form located [here](#) 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.

2.4.7 The University also enables students to participate and provide feedback through the following formal mechanisms:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal feedback mechanism</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership of Deans’ Forum</td>
<td>Deans’ Forums are convened by the Deans and meet a minimum of two times in each academic year. These provide a forum for staff and students exchange views, discuss what is working and what is not and agree actions to resolve local issues or forward actions at Faculty or University level to the relevant Committees. Each forum comprises a cluster of Undergraduate* Courses and is attended by the relevant Course Leaders and Student Representatives. * Postgraduate Student Representatives are members of the Board of Studies for Postgraduate taught Provision which provides a similar opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of the Student Representatives Group</td>
<td>Student Representatives Group meets three times a year and considers University wide issues. Student Representatives Group reports to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee via a synoptic report and notes of meetings are published on the VLE. The Student Representatives Group is chaired by the Academic Registrar and is normally attended by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic). The Student Representatives Group is a key forum where the University (via the PVCA) feeds back directly to Representatives on a range of issues, actions and outcomes identified through the University’s dialogues with the student body. Action taken in response to issues and to items in the Institutional Enhancement Strategy, are reported back and monitored by the Student Representatives Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of other University committees e.g. Post Graduate Board of Studies and Faculty Board of Studies</td>
<td>Faculty Board of Studies and Board of Studies for Postgraduate Taught Provision are chaired by a Dean and report to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee. They assure at Faculty level the academic quality and standards of provision and engage with the student body through representation and consideration of feedback. Boards meet three times a year and consider reports from external examiners, results from the National Student Survey, student survey and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality-enhancement activities such as Periodic Review, Course Approval and PSRB engagement. Minutes from Faculty Board of Studies and Board of Studies for Postgraduate Taught Provision are disseminated through the Convening Secretary and published on the VLE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of the University’s Internal Student Surveys (ISS), other internal evaluations (e.g. for workshops), the National Student Survey and Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES). The University utilises results from the National Student Survey; Internal Student Survey and Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey to inform enhancement themes and act on Feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints and Appeals The University analyses these in an annual report which is presented to Senate to identify any emerging themes and concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with external examiners External examiners meet with a group of students during their visits. Feedback from these meetings is reported through External Examiner Reports. Matters raised by students are taken forward by the Course Leader through discussions with relevant staff and through the Annual Monitoring process, in which student representatives are involved through their membership of Faculty/Postgraduate Taught Board of Studies. Response to external examiner reports are published to students on the VLE along with Course Enhancement Plans which include actions taken to address issues raised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings between panels and student groups at course periodic reviews Course periodic reviews include a meeting with a representative group of students. This provides an opportunity for the Panel to explore issues and areas of good practice with students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of panels for course periodic review and course approval events Course periodic review and approval Events include student membership on the Panel which ensures contribution to course Development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 The framework for Student Voice

2.5.1 Every student at every level and on every course within the University should have the opportunity to engage as or with a Student Representative.

2.5.2 Student Representatives are volunteers who are nominated by their peers to represent their cohort on matters relating to the development of their course. Representatives are elected through QME/Student Union. The main point of contact for Student Representatives should be their Course Leader or Dean of Faculty.

2.5.3 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.

2.5.4 It is the University's responsibility, through the Faculties and in conjunction with the Student Union, to promote, engage and support course representatives.

2.5.5 In the committee structure, 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 Deans’ Forums this will be to students in their groups, in the case of Boards of Study, this will be to the students in their faculty; in the case of other committees, this is to the Students’ Union President, who arranges for dissemination to the student body.

2.5.6 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 Monitoring process, in which student representatives are involved through their membership of the Faculty Board.

2.5.7 Student feedback emailed from the feedback links on the Workshops’ intranet ‘Welcome’ pages is addressed by the Resources Manager and the Workshop Managers. Feedback is responded to promptly, with an initial response within seven working days. In addition to the individual workshops’ intranet ‘Welcome’ pages student feedback links can be found at the Workshops & Resources Home page at https://my.nua.ac.uk/Interact/Pages/Section/Default.aspx?section=3163

2.5.8 Institutional issues, together with matters identified in the National Student Survey, 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.

Useful links and associated documents:

- Annex A University Committee Terms of Reference and Membership
- Student Agreement
- Link to the Student Representatives information including Handbook – published by the Students’ Union
- Links to further details of the Student Voice system published by the Students’ Union
- Link to the QAA Quality Code Theme: Student Engagement
- Link to NUA mapping to the QAA Quality Code Theme: Student Engagement

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 reported to the Senate and its sub-committees. Student outcomes are considered by course teams through the Annual Monitoring 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), and Faculty/Postgraduate Taught 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. Student Representatives attend Deans’ Forum and Faculty Board of Studies/ Postgraduate Taught Board of Studies. The committee
structure also includes the Student Representatives Group, which is chaired by the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Academic) 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.

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 for Convening Secretaries published on the Governance section 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. The University considers the guidance provided in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Advice and Guidance on External Expertise and Advance HE Fundamentals of External Examining as key reference points.

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 in September.

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 (see para 3.3.14)

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 Procedures and criteria for the nomination and appointment of External Examiners for accredited provision

3.4.1 Advance HE requires that all External appointees are:

- HEA Senior or Principal Fellow
- Suitably experienced in making HEA Fellowship judgements and current in their knowledge and understanding of the requirements of the relevant category(s) of Fellowship

3.5 Briefing of external examiners

3.5.1 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 Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy

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/Course Enhancement Plans from the previous two years

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

3.5.2 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

iii. *Undergraduate awards*: Units BA3a/BSc3a and BA3b/BSc3b and ARCH3b – including submission, assessment and feedback
procedures; Marginal Fail or Fail of Unit BA3a/BSc3a. The role of the QME Office.

3.6 Terms of reference of external examiners

Please refer also to the paragraphs below on Guidelines on Sampling and Verification by External Examiners (section 3.8 below), and Moderation and Adjustment of Marks by External Examiners (section 3.9 below).

3.6.1 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 and tutorial records.

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.

3.6.2 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.

3.6.3 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.**

3.6.4 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.

3.6.5 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.

3.6.6 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.

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

3.6.8 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.
3.7 **Rights and responsibilities of external examiners**

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

3.7.2 To see any assessment material relating to the course.

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

3.7.4 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.

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

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

3.7.7 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.

3.7.8 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.

3.8 **Guidelines on sampling and verification by external examiners**

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

3.8.1 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.

3.8.2 At **undergraduate** level, the unit sample selected by the Course Leader must include the following:
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3.8.3 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.

3.9 Moderation and adjustment of marks by external examiners

3.9.1 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.

3.9.2 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.

3.9.3 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.

3.9.4 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.

3.10 External examiners' reports

3.10.1 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.

3.10.2 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.

3.10.3 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. Faculty/Postgraduate Taught Board of Studies Annual Monitoring Meeting (October)
iii. Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee annual monitoring meeting (November).

3.10.4 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.

3.10.5 The completed Responses to External Examiners' Reports are circulated to external examiners with Course Enhancement Plans.

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

3.10.7 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.

3.11 **Externality Advance HE**

3.11.1 It is a 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.

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

3.11.3 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 Advance HE.

3.11.4 External reports relating to CPD schemes will be summarised in the Annual Report to Advance HE.

3.12 **External advisers**

3.12.1 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).

3.13 **External information used by the University**

3.13.1 UK Quality Code for Higher Education

The University actively engages with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (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 expectations of the UKQC. Each section of the University’s UKQC mapping will be reviewed by the Quality Management Group every two years.
3.13.2 Framework for HE Qualifications (FHEQ)

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.

3.13.4 Subject Benchmark Statements

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. In addition to these Subject Benchmark Statements, courses may reference other subjects, for example Communication, Media, Film and Cultural Studies and Dance, Drama and Performance. The University’s development of new provision will be informed by other Subject Benchmark Statements as appropriate.

3.13.6 Master’s Degree Characteristics Statement

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.

3.13.8 Programme Specifications

The University produces a definitive Course Specification for each undergraduate and taught postgraduate course. These are made available to prospective applicants and other external audiences via the NUA website, (Please refer to Annex F).

3.14 Quantitative external information used by the University

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 OfS, UCAS and other organisations.
3.15 Qualitative external information used by the University

3.15.1 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.

3.15.2 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.

3.16 Internal information used by the University

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

3.17 Quantitative internal information used by the University

3.17.1 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 the Annual Monitoring Process; analysis of the reasons why some students terminate their studies between academic years; and revisions to the postgraduate course application form.

3.18 Qualitative internal information used by the University

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

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

3.19.1 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.

3.19.2 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.

3.19.3 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.

3.19.4 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:

- Student views from the National Student Survey
- UCAS tariff points and entry information for current students (derived from HESA data)
- The degree classifications of graduates (derived from HESA data)
- Graduate destinations and salary from the Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey
- The percentage of students continuing on the course after a year
- The tariff points held by students who have entered the course previously
- Accreditation or professional recognition of the course
- Links to university website pages for information on course content, how the course is structured, taught and assessed and course costs.

3.19.5 The wider information set 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 and Course Specifications.
• 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.

3.19.6 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.

3.19.7 Complying with Data Protection Legislation

The University takes individuals' privacy very seriously and is committed to compliance with its obligations under data protection law. The University’s Data Protection policy sets out its obligations under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA 2018), the actions it will take to fulfil those obligations and the responsibilities of staff, students and third party agents in relation to personal data. The link to the policy is https://www.nua.ac.uk/about-nua/data-protection/

Advice and guidance on aspects of data protection is available from our Data Protection Officer at dataprotection@nua.ac.uk.
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 guidance on course approval and review events which provide detailed guidance for staff involved in the process and/or as panel members. This is included in Annex H and I.

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 an external approval event. 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 course units – Course units in the NUA Award and Credit Scheme 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 amendments to Unit Handbooks – Guidance on proposals for amendments to Unit Handbooks can be found in *Annex G.* Proposals are subject to approval by Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee or where course is undergoing Periodic Review subject to approval of the External Periodic Review Panel.

4.2.4 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 or amendments to project briefs can be found in Annex L.

4.2.5 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).

4.2.6 It is recognised that under certain circumstances it may be necessary to introduce amendments to Unit Handbooks 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 Course Periodic review process takes place in two stages: internal and external. The internal scrutiny panel meeting considers documentation prior to the external periodic review event and may require amendments to be made to the Critical Evaluation and other documentation 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 changes to courses, through their membership of Deans’ Forum, Faculty Board of Studies and Postgraduate Taught 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 and responses to Conditions and Recommendations. 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. Stage 1: Internal Scrutiny Panel
   ii. Stage 2: External course approval event.

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

   i. Stage 1: Internal Scrutiny Panel
   ii. Stage 2: 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 Scrutiny Panel meetings conduct a rigorous review of course documentation and set out in an action plan required revisions and amendments prior to the course approval or course periodic review event. Internal Scrutiny Panels can decide that the extent of revisions required cannot be addressed within the time available prior to the External Event. In such cases, 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 Scrutiny Panel meeting, in which case the external approval event will normally be postponed.

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. 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 approval events and 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, learning and assessment 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. 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. In such cases, the Chair of the panel shall alert the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and the Academic Registrar to the panel’s recommendations prior to the conclusion of the event.

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 QME Office in advance of the approval or review event.

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 the following annual review meeting and Course Enhancement Plans as appropriate). 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 **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 scrutiny and external approval events and Annex I sets out the normal requirements for internal scrutiny 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 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 approval or review event.

4.8.2 The Event Chair is responsible for signing off the draft report including Conditions and Recommendations following the Event. The Event Officer will be responsible
for circulating draft reports of the event to panel members, the Dean and course team.

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

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. 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 requirements of its Student Protection Plan as approved by the OfS.

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 Advice and Guidance: Partnerships.
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 discussions of Course Enhancement Plans through Faculty/Postgraduate Taught Board of Studies. 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/PTES outcomes are provided as available and any issues arising feed into the Annual Monitoring process.
- Unit Results (average mark, no. of fails, failure rate, mark distribution)
  Progression/Retention data
- Award Profiles
- Student Profile/Equality & Diversity
- Graduate Outcomes data (formerly 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.

- External Examiners are provided with the opportunity to identify examples of good practice through Annual Reports.
- Course Leaders identify examples of good practice through annual monitoring meetings; these are 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.
• Course Approval and Periodic Review events identify good practice through commendations; these are included in reports published on the intranet.
• The University’s programme of Development Days incorporate staff presentations and workshops on good practice identified in the most recent annual monitoring cycle and through Advance HE Accredited provision.
• The good practice of individual staff is recognised through the University’s Student Experience Awards scheme.

5.5 Annual Monitoring

5.5.1 Annual Monitoring is concerned with the capacity of courses to deliver the stated aims and learning outcomes and a high quality student experience. The outputs of annual monitoring 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 Faculty Board/Postgraduate Taught Board meetings. Annual monitoring 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 Faculty/Postgraduate Taught Board of Studies, 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 Course Enhancement Plan no later than the beginning of January.

5.6 Faculty/Postgraduate Taught Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting

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

5.6.2 At the end of the Faculty/Postgraduate Taught Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting, the Deans agree upon the items to be carried forward into the Institutional Quality Enhancement Strategy to support the ongoing development of the quality of learning opportunities in the Faculties. The minutes of the Faculty/Postgraduate Taught 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 e.g Internal Student Survey, National Student Survey External Examiners’ Reports.

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 Quality Enhancement Strategy**

5.9.1 In 2018-19, the Senate approved a three-year Quality Enhancement Strategy to replace the one year Institutional Enhancement Strategy. 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 Annual Monitoring. As noted above (para. 5.6.2), at the end of the Faculty/Postgraduate Taught Board of Studies Annual Review Meeting, the Deans agree upon items to be fed into the review of the Institutional Quality 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,
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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 Advance HE accredited PG CertHE
xii. To monitor and report on the operation of the University’s Advance HE 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 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 Quality Enhancement Strategy for the 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 Quality Enhancement Strategy

v. Good Practice

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

5.12 Outcomes from annual monitoring

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


ii. Good Practice document - disseminated to all staff via the Learning and Teaching pages of intranet by end of December (with link to this document from QME pages of intranet)

iii. External Examiners’ Responses, and Review of previous year’s Institutional Quality Enhancement Strategy – disseminated to students via the intranet by end of January

iv. Course Enhancement Plans 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) The Peer Observation of Professional Practice Scheme
(vi) The QME Handbook
(vii) The Student Regulations and Procedures
(viii) Strategy for Learning
(ix) 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
xi. Work Placements - Guidance for staff, students and employers

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 and student-facing professionals and technical staff are expected to participate in the Scheme. 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 monitored and reviewed by 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 and Knowledge Exchange 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. to 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 is published on the Learning and Teaching pages of the University intranet.

6.6 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.

6.7 **Advance HE Accredited Provision**

6.7.1 Advance HE accredit Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programmes which are delivered by higher education providers and provides external confirmation that accredited provision is aligned with the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF); a comprehensive set of professional standards and guidelines for teaching and learning support roles within Higher Education.

Upon successful completion of an Advance HE accredited CPD programme, individuals will have demonstrated they meet the appropriate standards in teaching and supporting learning in higher education and are eligible for the award of HEA Fellowship; global recognition of the professional practice carried out by individuals who teach and/or support learning in higher education. The UKPSF is at the core of the University’s accredited provision and develops the concept of professional recognition for the institution. Further information can be found in the Guide to Making Fellowship Judgements and supporting documentation.

6.7.2 The University is accredited to award professional recognition through the following CPD Programmes:

(i) Professional Recognition Scheme; Art, Design, Architecture and Media (PRS: ADAM) (Experiential Route)

(ii) Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education: Art, Design, Architecture and Media (PGCHE: ADAM) (Taught Route)

6.7.3 The PGCHE: ADAM will be subject to the guidelines published in the Guide to Making Fellowship Judgements and quality management and enhancement (QME) arrangements applicable to all taught courses and outlined in Sections 3, 4 and 5 of this Handbook:

6.7.4 The PRS: ADAM is subject to the guidelines published in the Guide to Making Fellowship Judgements. The PRS: ADAM Award Board makes recognition decisions under the PRS: ADAM and The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee is responsible for approving the composition of the panel.
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.
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
Course Leader Taught Postgraduate
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 2019-20:
1. The committee structure ................................................................. 1
2. Senate .............................................................................................. 1
3. Senate sub-committees ................................................................. 3
3.1 Accreditation of Prior Learning Panel .............................................. 3
3.2 Appeals Committee ............................................................... 4
3.3 Assessment Sub-Group ............................................................... 5
3.4 Coordinated Support Group ........................................................... 5
3.5 Course Assessment Board (undergraduate) ....................................... 6
3.6 Dean’s Forum ............................................................................... 7
3.7 Disability Support Group ............................................................. 7
3.8 Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee .................................... 8
3.9 Extenuating Circumstances Panel .................................................. 9
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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 Assessment Sub-Group

3.3.1 Terms of Reference:

- To identify significant trends and issues in assessment results (positive and/or negative) within and across courses, bringing these to the attention of Course Leaders and other relevant staff.
- To consider whether there are correlations between Internal Student Survey (ISS) results and assessment results following each ISS survey and assessment point.
- To report to the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.

3.3.2 Membership:

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair)
Dean of Design and Architecture
Dean of Arts and Media
Academic Registrar

Quality Manager
Academic members of LTQC to be co-opted as necessary

3.4 Coordinated Support Group

3.4.1 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

3.4.2 Membership:

Assistant Registrar: Academic Support (alternate Chair)
Student Support Manager (alternate Chair)
Deans of Faculty

Head of Library and Learning Support
Faculty Administration Manager
Senior Academic Support Officer
Student Support Advisor
Student Support Officer
Academic Support Officer
3.5 Course Assessment Board *(undergraduate)*

3.5.1 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

3.5.2 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*
3.6 **Dean's Forum**

3.6.1 Terms of Reference:

- To engage Student Reps as partners in shaping their learning experience
- To provide a forum for staff and students to exchange views and discuss what is working and what is not.
- To agree actions that can be taken to resolve local issues, and those that need to be carried forward at Faculty or University level
- To provide a forum to share practice between courses

3.6.2 Membership

Dean of Faculty (Chair) (Chair)
Course Leader and/or Course Team Representatives
Student Representatives
Workshop Representative
QME Representative
Library and Learning Support Representative
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (ex officio)
SU President (ex officio – to receive all agendas, papers and minutes)
Academic Registrar (ex officio)

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 Forum*

3.7 **Disability Support Group**

3.7.1 Terms of Reference

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

3.7.2 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*
3.8 Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee

3.8.1 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 the Senate sub-committees and/or the Senior Management Team.
- To report to the Senate.

3.8.2 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.
3.9 Extenuating Circumstances Panel

3.9.1 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.

3.9.2 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
3.10 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.

3.10.1 Terms of Reference:

- To assure at Faculty level the academic quality and standards of provision by considering actions arising from Dean’s Forum, 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.

3.10.2 Membership:

Deans of Faculty (alternating Chairs)
Undergraduate Course Leaders (all)
Leader Year 0 Pathways
Academic Registrar or their representative
Course Leader Taught Postgraduate

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.*
3.11 Board of Studies for Postgraduate Taught provision

3.11.1 Terms of Reference

- To assure the academic quality and standards of provision by considering actions arising from 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 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.

3.11.2 Membership:

Dean of Design and Architecture (Chair)
Course Leader Taught Postgraduate
MA Subject Leaders
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.*
3.12 Final Award Board (undergraduate)

3.12.1 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.

3.12.2 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.
3.13 Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (LTQC)

3.13.1 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
- To monitor the external indicators 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.

3.13.2 Membership:

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair)
Academic Registrar
Deans of Faculty
Director of Research to be co-opted as required
Director of Innovation and Engagement
Quality Manager
2 Course Leaders, 1 from each Faculty (nominated by the Deans)
Course Leader Taught Postgraduate
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 Convening Secretary for the Committee
3.14 LTQC Sub-groups

3.14.1 Internal Verification 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

3.14.2 Digital Enhancement Group

Terms of Reference:

- To act as project or task and finish groups for items passed to it from LTQC
- To make recommendations to LTQC on sector developments which impact on University policies and procedures
- To identify significant trends and emerging developments and bring these to the attention of LTQC to inform future decision making

*Key areas of activity covered:*

- Intranet, VLE & Moodle
- E:Vision
- NSS – Learning Resources, Course Delivery

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

One (1) PGT and two (2) UG student representatives (to be recruited from the Student Reps Group)
3.14.3 **Employability Group**

Terms of Reference:

- To act as project or task and finish groups for items passed to it from LTQC
- To make recommendations to LTQC on sector developments which impact on University policies and procedures
- To identify significant trends and emerging developments and bring these to the attention of 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)
3.14.4 Learning and Teaching Group

Terms of Reference:

- To act as project or task and finish groups for items passed to it from LTQC
- To make recommendations to LTQC on sector developments which impact on University policies and procedures
- To identify significant trends and emerging developments and bring these to the attention of LTQC to inform future decision making

Key areas of activity covered:

- Advance HE Accredited Provision
- PGCHE: ADAM Learning and Teaching
- Reporting outcomes from LTF applications
- POPPS evaluation of effectiveness
- Learning resources and student support
- University Development Days and staff CPD programme (identify good practice in Learning and Teaching and make recommendations for activities/themes)
- **NSS – Teaching on my course, Learning opportunities, Assessment and Feedback, Academic Support, Learning Resources, Learning Community, Course Delivery**

Membership:

Dean of Design and Architecture (Lead)
Head of Library and Learning Support (or their representative)
One (1) member of staff with HEA Fellowship status
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

3.14.5 Quality Group

Terms of Reference:

- To act as project or task and finish groups for items passed to it from LTQC
• To make recommendations to LTQC on sector developments which impact on University policies and procedures
• To identify significant trends and emerging developments and bring these to the attention of 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:
Dean of Arts and Media (Lead)
Quality 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)

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)

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)
In addition to the membership above the following members will be co-opted as required:
Compliance Manager
Student Support Manager (or their representative)
Resources Manager (or their representative)

Ex officio members
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Dean of Design and Architecture
Students’ Union President
3.14.6 **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 Learning Teaching and Quality Committee.

Membership:

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Lead)
Academic Registrar (Lead)
Students’ Union President
Elected Student Representatives
Resource Manager (or their representative)
Quality Manager (or their representative)
Student Support Manager (or their representative)
### 3.15 MA 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)
Dean of Design and Architecture
Course Leader Taught Postgraduate
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*
3.16 MA Ed: ADAM Course Assessment and Award Board

3.16.1 Terms of Reference

- To consider the performance of 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 award the appropriate category of HEA Fellowship on behalf of Advance HE.
- 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.

3.16.2 Membership

Pro-Vice Chancellor (Academic) (Chair);

Dean of Design and Architecture
Academic Registrar (or nominee)
Course Leader(s)
Internal Moderator
External Examiner

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

_A member of Academic Registry will act as convening Secretary to the Board._
3.17 Professional Recognition Scheme: Art, Design, Architecture and Media Award Board (PRS: ADAM Award Board)

3.17.1 Terms of Reference

- To seek explicit assurance from internal and external members that the requirements of the Professional Recognition Scheme: Art, Design, Architecture and Media (PRS: ADAM) have been adhered to as accredited by Advance HE
- To consider fellowship judgements and confirm the requirements for professional recognition have been addressed by Internal Reviewers for participants who have submitted an application through the PRS: ADAM
- To award the appropriate category of HEA Fellowship on behalf of Advance HE
- To agree summary feedback statements for applicants
- To decide on terms of referred applications
- To consider improvements to guidance and/or programme development and make recommendations to LTQC for consideration and approval
- To plan for future Continuing Professional Development for the Professional Recognition Team
- To identify good practice and advise on dissemination to the wider community
- Reports to LTQC

3.17.2 Membership

Dean of Design and Architecture (Chair)
Internal Reviewers
Senior Quality Officer
HR Manager (or nominee) co-opted as required by the Chair

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 Board.*
3.18 Professorial and Honorary Awards Committee

3.18.1 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.

3.18.2 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
3.19 Progress Review Boards

3.19.1 Terms of Reference:

- To review mid-year progress of students.
- To refer students deemed to be at academic risk for 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/engagement.

3.19.2 Membership:

Undergraduate Board (Year 0, Year 1 & Year 2, Year 3):

- Deans of Faculty (Chair)
- Undergraduate Course Leaders (all)
- Leader Year 0 Pathways
- 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):

- Dean of Design and Architecture (Chair)
- Course Leader Taught Postgraduate
- 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_
3.20 Research Committee

3.20.1 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.

3.20.2 Membership:

Director of Research (Chair)
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (ex officio)
Research Champion Leads from each of the research themes
Course Leader Taught Postgraduate
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.
3.21 Research Degrees Committee

3.21.1 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.

3.21.2 Membership:

Director of Research (Chair)
Up to 4 Directors of Studies (appointed for a renewable 3 year period)
Course Leader Taught Postgraduate
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.*
3.22 Resubmission Board (all undergraduate and postgraduate awards)

3.22.1 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.

3.22.2 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
3.23  Student Conduct Committee

3.23.1 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.

3.23.2 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signed</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Hilary Carlisle</td>
<td>Dean of Design &amp; Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by Faculty of Arts & Media Board of Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signed</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Richard Sawdon Smith</td>
<td>Dean of Arts &amp; Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signed</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Neil Powell</td>
<td>Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Examiners</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Job title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Examiner(s)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Francis House
3-7 Redwell Street
Norwich NR2 4SN

Vice-Chancellor: Professor John Last

EXTERNAL EXAMINER NOMINATION FORM

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 gme@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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Any specific duties</th>
<th>Period of Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   |         |             |        |                     |                      |
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:  

10. Present or most recent employment:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer's name</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Period of appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Employment history:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer's name</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Period of appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Higher Education:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>Qualification – title and subject</th>
<th>From – To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Research, professional practice, consultancy, and related activities:  

Including exhibitions, performances, productions, books, refereed articles and conference papers
14. Current and/or previous external examining experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>Awards and subject areas examined</th>
<th>From - To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Other professional qualifications:

Including membership of professional bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/professional body</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Date obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the link</th>
<th>From - To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTON C

18. 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**

19. 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:*

20. Date of Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee:

21. 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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Click here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of External Examiner:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Business Address:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
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. AR/ QM identifies the relevant staff who need to respond to the Recommendation(s), in discussion with the PVCA/Deans where appropriate

4. For Recommendations to the course and/or Faculty AR/QM identify if the item should be included in the Course Enhancement Plan

5. QM sends Responses template to the relevant Dean and CL, copying it to pvca@nua.ac.uk
6. September – Annual monitoring meetings take place with course teams and consider comments from examiner’s reports and Response template. Examiner comments are reflected in Draft Course Enhancement Plans as appropriate completed Response templates and Course Enhancement Plans are submitted to the Dean/QME by the 7 October 2019.

7. By 7 October 2019 – University Recommendations completed by PVCA/AR

8. October – Faculty Board of Studies review Course Enhancement Plans and Responses to External Examiners and confirm revisions by 1 November 2019.


June 2019
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Examiner &amp; Institution/Practice</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Recommendations for action (from section 5.3 of Examiner’s Report)</th>
<th>Actioned to</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Item for Course Enhancement Plan (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBC at AMR meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee

Date:
NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

COURSE SPECIFICATIONS AND UNIT HANDBOOKS
This Annex provides guidance on the format of Course Specifications and Unit Handbooks. See Annex G for Proposals for Amendments to Unit Handbooks.

CONTENTS

1. COURSE SPECIFICATIONS
2. UNIT HANDBOOKS
3. UNDERGRADUATE COURSE SPECIFICATION TEMPLATE

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 Specifications 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 3-6 of this Annex.
2. Unit Handbooks

The accuracy of the information contained in Unit Handbooks is reviewed regularly by the University. 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 on how the unit is delivered and assessed. They contextualise the generic Unit Outlines and include an overview of what students will be doing in the unit, how curriculum areas are addressed, assessment submission requirements and how learning outcomes are assessed. 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 and published on the QME intranet. 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’.
3. UNDERGRADUATE COURSE SPECIFICATION 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 [Office for Students](https://www.ofs.gov.uk) (OfS).

Course title: BA/BSc (Hons) …


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: [https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements)

Tuition Fees: For details of tuition fees see: [http://www.nua.ac.uk/study/finance/](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.
For further information please see:

(each course has a specific link to course costs e.g.,
https://www.nua.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Animation-
Indicative-course-costs.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) (280 credits with 40 credits at Level 6 (FHEQ)) - not to be included on Course Specification for BA (Hons) Architecture

Quality assurance
The University was established as an independent higher education institution under Section 121 of the Education Reform Act 1988, and is a recognised body with taught degree awarding powers. The University is regulated by the Office for Students (OfS). Information about the University’s status can be found on the OfS Register and on the list of recognised bodies published on the UK Government (GOV.UK) website. The OfS regulatory framework came fully into force from 1 August 2019. As part of its registration with the OfS the University is required to satisfy a number of conditions that relate to quality and standards.

Prior to 2016, the University was quality assured by the QAA. Read NUA’s latest review.

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.

Date of Course Specification:
APPROVAL OF PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES TO COURSE UNIT OUTLINES AND UNIT HANDBOOKS

Overview

This Annex details the procedure to be followed to propose and gain approval for changes to Course Unit Outlines and Unit Handbooks proportionate to the type of change proposed, the context in which the change is proposed and the requirement to safeguard the student experience when making course changes.

1. Unit Outlines

Approval of and/or changes to Unit Outlines are usually agreed through the Approval and Review of the Award and Credit Scheme or through Course Approval and Review Events. In exceptional circumstances this procedure should be used e.g. for changes to generic units required by Learning Teaching and Quality Committee (LTQC) and changes required to secure professional accreditation.

The submission of proposals for amendments to Unit Outlines are prepared by QME in consultation with Deans, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and Academic Registrar. Proposals are 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 using the template form in Appendix 1.

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 major amendments to Unit Handbooks are approved by LTQC. Proposals for new Unit Handbooks should be made using the template form in Appendix 2 and should be accompanied by the new Unit Handbook. Proposals for amendments to Unit Handbooks should be made using the template form in Appendix 3 the existing Unit Handbook should be submitted with track changes. Minor amendments to Unit Handbooks are approved by the Deans.

Deans are responsible for checking that the amended Unit Handbooks meet the relevant unit aims and learning outcomes prior to consideration by LTQC.
Record of amendments

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.

Approval process

The table below provides a summary of the approval process. QME will hold a meeting with each Course Leader in March to determine whether amendments are Major/Minor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major amendment</th>
<th>Approval process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Unit Handbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major changes to</td>
<td>Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (LTQC) – July meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• what you will be doing in this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how you will address the curriculum areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how the unit will be delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to what you will need to submit for assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major changes to how you will be assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor amendment</th>
<th>Approval process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change to start date, submission date and Unit Leader.</td>
<td>Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor changes to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• what you will be doing in this unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how you will address the curriculum areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how the unit will be delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor changes on how you will be assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor changes to how you will receive feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to useful sources of information</td>
<td>Head of Library and Learning Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Unit Handbooks Timeline

11 March-22 March
• QME meetings with Course Leaders to discuss changes required and confirm the process for these e.g. major/minor

19 June
• Deadline for completion of amends to Unit Handbooks by Course Leaders
• Unit Handbooks with tracked amends to be placed in QME folder to be checked by Deans

3 July
• Deans confirm major amends to Unit Handbooks for consideration by July LTQC

15 July
• LTQC Approves amends/recommends changes to Unit Handbooks

31 July
• Head of Library and Learning Support to confirm changes to Reading Lists

14 Aug
• Deadline for completion of revisions required by LTQC
• All Unit Handbooks to be placed in QME folder to be approved by Deans

28 Aug
• Deans approve revisions required by LTQC and any minor amends

9 Sept
• QME publishes final versions of Unit Handbooks
Appendix 1 Proposal for amendments to Unit Outline
(use one form for each Unit Outline)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Unit code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Unit title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Proposed date of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Duration of the unit – no of weeks, no of hours, term(s) taught in the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Rationale for the proposal (to include evidence e.g from student feedback, External Examiner Reports, Annual Monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Anticipated benefits for the learning experience of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Outline of revisions which will be necessary to the Unit Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Assessment strategy - please describe changes to how the unit will be assessed, cross referencing to the unit outline as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Resource requirements - please outline whether any additional resources are required to deliver the unit (teaching resources, computing resources, library resources)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Approved by the Learning Teaching Quality Committee

Signed:

Date:

Comments:
Appendix 2 Proposal for new Unit Outline and new Unit Handbook
(use one form for each Unit Outline/Unit Handbook)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Unit code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Unit title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>FHEQ Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Credit Value of the Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Date of introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Rationale for the proposal (to include evidence e.g. from student feedback, External Examiner Reports, Annual Monitoring).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Anticipated benefits for the learning experience of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Does the unit replace an existing unit? YES/NO If NO go to Q11 If YES please answer Q9, Q10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Name of unit to be discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Will discontinuing this unit have any impact on students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Duration of the unit – no of weeks, no of hours, term(s) taught in the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Assessment strategy - please describe how the unit will be assessed, cross referencing to the unit outline/unit handbook as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Resource requirements - please outline what additional resources are required to deliver the unit (teaching resources, computing resources, library resources)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attach new Unit Outline and new Unit Handbook(s) to proposal.

Approved by the Learning Teaching Quality Committee

Signed:

Date:

Comments:
## Appendix 3 Proposal for major changes to Unit Handbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Nature of the proposed variation (to include date of implementation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale for the proposed variation (to include evidence e.g from student feedback, External Examiner Reports, Annual Monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipated benefits of the proposed amendments for the learning experience of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delete/add tables as required for each Unit Handbook to which changes are being made.
**Supporting information attached:**
*Updated Unit Handbooks should be attached to the form highlighting the proposed variation(s) via tracked changes.*

**ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRANSITION:**

Please provide details on any delivery and resource implications and how these will be addressed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For major modifications, or those which will impact on current students, how were students consulted? (please insert any comments/feedback)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the proposed changes impact on students with disabilities? (if yes please provide details e.g improvements in inclusive learning)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed variation supported by the relevant Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Signed:

Date:

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved by the Learning Teaching Quality Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Signed:

Date:

Comments:
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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 proposal form is provided below.

Course proposal forms are completed by the Proposer (usually the Dean in liaison with the proposed Course Leader and submitted for consideration by the Senior Management Team (SMT). SMT will review the proposal and decide

- That the course can be included in the Course Approval Schedule
- That the course can be advertised
- That applications be accepted and offers made (applicants will need to be made aware that the course is subject to approval)
- That the course proposal is declined
### PART A: TO BE COMPLETED BY PROPOSER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer: Click here to enter text.</th>
<th>Faculty: Click here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### A1. ABOUT THE COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title: (including award)</th>
<th>Click here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of first student intake/year:</td>
<td>Click here to enter a date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If proposal is replacing existing course(s), please provide course title:</td>
<td>Click here to enter courses being replaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide rationale for the course:</td>
<td>Click here to provide rationale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide broad aims of the course:</td>
<td>Click here to provide aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how this course will complement the University, and outline where there might be an overlap in provision.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the course proposal affect any students on existing courses?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide brief explanation:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a new Subject Area for the University?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the course fit NUA standard term dates?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, you must consult with Academic Registry (Academic Registrar/Deputy Registrar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide details of non-standard term dates:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the course fit NUA standard durations?</td>
<td>Tick all boxes which apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG: 3 year FT</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG: 4 year FT</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG 1 year FT</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG 2 year PT</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the course fit NUA standard entry requirements?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, why?</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the course require Professional Body accreditation?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, name of Professional Body:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the course seek Professional Body accreditation?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, name of Professional Body:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, why?</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the course require an enhanced disclosure DBS check?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A2. MARKET ANALYSIS AND PLANNING – to be completed in conjunction with Marketing/Business Intelligence Analyst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the target market for this course?</th>
<th>Click here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How large is the market? Is it steady or likely to grow or shrink?</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Numbers
Provide an estimate of additional student numbers to be included in student numbers targets (up to and including steady state). Please indicate in the table below what you expect the net increase in student numbers to be during the first four years of operation as a result of introducing this course.

In each year please give new student registrations only; do not include expected student progression numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home/EU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the competitive advantage? Include 4 unique selling points: Click here to enter text.

Who are the direct and indirect competitors? Click here to enter text.

How will the course be marketed and promoted? Click here to enter text.

Provide examples of the likely graduate career and employability prospects. Click here to enter text.

Explain how this course will not impact recruitment on any other course Click here to enter text.

### A3. RESOURCES – to be completed in conjunction with PVCA/Faculty Resource Manager

Staffing - will the course be developed and delivered within the capacity of existing staff? □ Yes □ No
If not, please indicate what new expertise will be required. Click here to enter text.

Facilities - will the course be delivered using existing equipment and accommodation? □ Yes □ No
If not, what additional equipment and/or accommodation will be required? Click here to enter text.

Library - will additional library resources be required? □ Yes □ No
If yes, you must consult with the Head of Library and Learning Support. Click here to enter text.

IT - will there be additional IT requirements? □ Yes □ No
If yes, please comment. Click here to enter text.

### A4. INDICATIVE COURSE STRUCTURE

Will the course fit NUA standard award structure? □ Yes □ No
Undergraduate □ 360
Postgraduate □ 180

Will the course use the existing Award and Credit Scheme? □ Yes □ No
If not, detail variation of non-standard structure. Click here to enter text.

Curriculum Structure/Diagram
Please provide an outline of the curriculum/diagram – include outline project titles and number of weeks for each unit

For example:

**Year 1 Structure**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA1b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year 2 Structure**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA2b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year 3 Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BA3a</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aspects of Course Design

Is there any aspect of this course that might present any difficulties for students with disabilities?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Will the proposed course require any variations to the Student Regulations?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Does the curriculum structure and assessment arrangements conform to those normally operated by the University?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Are there any unusual features of the course that lie outside the typical arrangements of the University?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Are there any other special arrangements upon which the course will depend? (e.g. placement)

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

*If you have answered yes to any of the above questions then please provide further details here:*

Click here to enter text.

---

### A5. BUSINESS CASE

*(You are required to complete a course costings spreadsheet in liaison with the Director of Finance – this must be submitted along with this form)*

Business Case spreadsheet attached?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

*If not, why?* Click here to enter text.

---

### Senior Management Team Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vice Chancellor name and signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex H Approval Event Guidance
2. GUIDANCE FOR PANEL MEMBERS FOR COURSE APPROVAL EVENTS

1. The Approval Event

Approval events are part of the University's quality processes whereby proposals and key information for new courses are scrutinised prior to formal approval by Senate. Approval events report to the University and its stakeholders on matters of course quality and provide assurance that the appropriate academic and technical expertise, experience and resources are available to assure academic standards of proposed provision. As a panel member, your role is to satisfy yourself that the institutional and course documentation are effective in assuring the academic standards and quality of the award(s) to be conferred.

The terms of reference of the approval panel are to ensure that:

- 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
- The course(s) offers a coherent educational experience with relevant subject-specific and generic knowledge and skills
- The teaching and learning methods described in the course documentation will enable students to achieve the learning outcomes
- The course admission requirements and entry qualifications are appropriate and equivalent to those of similar University courses.

The course approval process takes place in two stages:

Stage 1: an internal scrutiny panel meeting takes place prior to the external approval event, this scrutinises the course documentation and sets out the amendments required to the documentation prior to its circulation to the approval panel.

Stage 2: an external approval event is held to enable scrutiny and peer review of documentation by a panel of staff and external advisers. This event concludes with the panel setting out any conditions that the course team are required to meet prior to the commencement of the course, and recommendations for the overall enhancement of the course and the student experience. Students cannot be enrolled on a course that has not been academically confirmed through approval.

2. Conditions and Recommendations are defined as follows:

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. 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 should be rejected. In such cases, the Chair of the panel shall alert the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and the Academic Registrar to the panel’s recommendations prior to the conclusion of the event.
It is a requirement that all conditions are met prior to the commencement 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 QME Office in advance of the approval event.

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.

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. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee will monitor work undertaken in response to such recommendations for one academic year following the approval event.

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.

3. Approval panel membership

The panel for external approval events comprises:

- The Chair, who will be a member of University staff with substantial experience of events;
- Two internal academic members;
- Two external members: one academic from another HE institution and one professional from a relevant industry;
- The Quality Manager;
- Workshop Representative
- Academic Registry Representative;
- A student representative from an existing NUA course.

External panel members are nominated by the relevant Dean of Faculty. It is important to the University that external panel members are independent of the presenting team. (Refer to QME Handbook para 4.6)

5. Approval Event administration

Panel members should receive the necessary documentation three weeks prior to the event and are asked to read this thoroughly in preparation. Panel members should give an indication of the main topics they would like to explore with staff and students at the approval event. This will be required one week prior to the event and will assist the panel in agenda setting on the day of the event.
Documentation will include:

a) Guidance for Panel members for Course Approval Events
b) List of panel and course team members
c) Itinerary for the event
d) Checklist of issues for the consideration of approval panels
e) Course Rationale and Philosophy
f) University Aims and Outcomes
g) Unit Handbooks
h) Project Briefs
i) Unit Outlines

The Award and Credit Scheme, Student Regulations and Procedures and relevant Subject Benchmark Statements will be distributed via appropriate links in an email prior to the events, but can be provided as hard copies on request.

An approval event will normally take place in one day, and will usually commence with a presentation from the presenting team and a tour of relevant resources. Following this there will be a private meeting of the panel. The Chair will consult the ‘checklist of issues for consideration of approval panels’ whilst referring to the documentation and ask panel members for their opinions on the documentation and whether there are any particular issues. The panel will then have the opportunity to question the presenting team on various aspects of the documentation, following which conditions and recommendations will be formulated. The approved conditions and recommendations will be circulated to all participants two to three days after the event.

6. Panel member roles

All panel members are encouraged to take a proactive role in the discussion, and if a member is not satisfied that a particular issue has been addressed or resolved, they should express their concern to the Chair.

An external panel member will provide the panel with an external perspective, whether from other Higher Education institutions or from an appropriate industrial sector. The following issues may be considered in relation to the course under approval:

**Academic external panel member:**

We would be particularly interested in your comments on:

- The standards indicated by the aims and objectives of the provision, and their comparability with those of awards at the same level in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ);
- The alignment of the objectives and learning outcomes with any relevant Subject Benchmarks;
- The planned content, delivery of the syllabus and teaching and assessment methods (including work placements);
• The required learning resources necessary to deliver the specified provision including access to workshop and studio space, Library and IT facilities through a tour of relevant facilities.

Industry external panel member:

We would be particularly interested in your comments on:

• The context of the provision in terms of demand for provision, and the employability of graduates;
• The planned content, delivery of the syllabus and teaching and assessment methods (including work placements);
• The required learning resources necessary to deliver the specified provision including access to workshop and studio space, Library and IT facilities through a tour of relevant facilities.

Student panel member

Student representatives contribute to course development and approval and through their membership of panels for approval events. The student is a full member of the panel and is expected to take part in discussion, and the Chair will offer guidance and support given for this. In preparation for the event, it may be useful to consider the following areas for discussion/scrutiny:

• Are the teaching methods appropriate?
• Are assessment methods appropriate and are student workloads manageable?
• Is there adequate access to the necessary resources (e.g. Media Lab, computers, the Library)?
• Are there adequate resources to support the students in their learning? Do you think there is appropriate use of the VLE?
• Do you feel that the course will prepare students well for future employment or future study?
• Is the student facing documentation (Unit Handbooks, Course Guide) of a high quality, relevant and clear?
• How does this proposal relate to other relevant programmes within the University of which you are aware?

There will be an opportunity to ask questions and clarify issues you may wish to raise at the initial panel meeting.

Workshop Representative

The role of the Workshop Representative is to comment on whether the learning resources proposed are sufficient to deliver the specified provision including access to workshop, studio space and IT facilities.

The Quality Manager

The role of the Quality Manager is to provide advice on the requirements of course approval and ensure that the approval event is operated in line with the University’s QME procedures and that agreed outcomes are appropriate.
**Academic Registry Representative**

The role of the Academic Registry Representative is to consider changes required to Registry systems including those for admission and assessment as a consequence of approving the course and comment on these as appropriate.

**The Event Officer**

The Event Officer is responsible for all administrative aspects of the event, (including convening the panel, circulating the documentation, hospitality and housekeeping), and for writing the report of the event.

**The course team**

The role of the course team is to present the documentation and to respond to all questions from the panel. The entire course team is not required to be present, rather a representative group that is able to provide the panel with answers covering the whole of the course, any particular features and specific unit detail.

**8. The outcome of the approval event**

Following the meeting with the presenting team, the panel must decide:

- To approve the provision subject to any conditions and recommendations;
- To reject the proposal (with or without the possibility of resubmission).

**Post approval event**

On conclusion of the event, a report will be circulated by the event officer to the panel members and presenting team. Panel members will be asked for feedback on the event by means of a brief evaluation form.
3. **DOCUMENTATION AND ITINERARY FOR COURSE APPROVAL EVENTS:**

**REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERNAL SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS**

Documentation for advance circulation to the Internal Scrutiny Panel meeting

- i. Purpose of the Internal Scrutiny Panel
- ii. Annex H Approval Events Guidance
- iii. Course Rationale and Course Philosophy and Unit Handbooks in the format specified in Annex F
- v. *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)*
- vi. The NUA Award and Credit Scheme (website link provided)
- vii. Student Regulations and Procedures (website link provided)
- viii. Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) Handbook (website link provided)
- ix. Professional accreditation requirements - where course has accreditation or is seeking accreditation. (link to information provided)

Panel composition for Internal Scrutiny Panel meeting

- Chair
- 2 academic members of staff who have appropriate teaching experience at the level of the course under consideration
- Quality Manager
- Course Leader* for course subject to approval and Dean are in attendance to respond to panel questions
- Event Officer

*Where the Course Leader is not yet in post a Faculty Representative should attend.*

**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 Scrutiny Panel plus the following:

- i. Guidance for Panel Members for Course Approval Events
- ii. Briefing note for panel members on key features of the NUA Award and Credit Scheme
- iii. Checklist of issues for the consideration of approval and periodic review panels
- iv. A sample of Project Briefs
Indicative Itinerary for external course approval events

The Day 2 itinerary for 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:**

17.15  Arrival and refreshments
17.30  Presentation by Dean and Course Leader about the rationale and key features of the course
19.00  Close – external members of the Panel check into hotel if not done prior to meeting
19.30  Dinner for the external members of the Panel with the Chair, Dean and Course Leader

**Day 2:**

8.45   Arrival/coffee
9.00   Private meeting of the Panel to agree review itinerary and emerging issues
10.15  Tour of resources
11.45  Break
12.00  Meeting with Dean, Course Leader and course team
13.30  Lunch
14.00  Continuation of meeting with Dean, Course Leader and course team
15.30  Private meeting of Panel to formulate conclusions
16.30  Panel report conclusions to Dean, Course Leader and course team
16.45  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
- Workshop 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)
4. 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.

Please Note  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

For example:

- Whether the rationale demonstrate sufficient market demand

2. Course philosophy

For example:

- Whether the philosophy addresses the “Guidance on Writing Course Philosophy” and is it publishable?

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 will be informed by staff research, scholarly activity and professional practice
- Evidence of involvement of employers/industry in course design and planned delivery
- The relevance of the curriculum to graduate employability
- Transferable skills
- Whether appropriate opportunities exist for career preparation, including work placement/work-based learning, student volunteering activities and Erasmus or other overseas exchange

5. Aims and 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 inclusive and appropriate, enabling all students to achieve the Learning Outcomes and demonstrate inclusivity
   
   - Whether the assessment methods/strategies are inclusive and appropriate, enabling all students to demonstrate their achievement of the Learning Outcomes
   
   - Proposed arrangements for providing students with written and verbal feedback on their assessed work
   
   - Consideration of ethics, inclusivity, equality, diversity and health and safety

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, 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

9. *Resources (staffing)*

10. *Quality management and enhancement*

    For example:
    
    - Proposed mechanisms for obtaining industry/professional feedback and the use to be made of this
    
    - Opportunities for ongoing continuing professional development for staff
5. 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 (1000-1200 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).
- How will the course attract applicants from underrepresented groups ensuring the University meets its Access and participation plan? (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 a student-focused document that acts as an introduction to the course. It is also a useful guide to support Marketing and Recruitment in articulating the provision to applicants. As such it should be written in plain English and student friendly (avoid acronyms and use of specialist language). It is appropriate to address the reader directly as ‘you’ rather than as ‘the student’.

You are required to articulate the distinctive approach to learning and teaching 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:

- What is distinctive about the course curriculum and its design and how will its effectiveness be assured in providing intellectually stimulating content for students?
- How the course intends to engage students with specialist teaching and learning of the subject?
- 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)
- What is the proposed balance between teaching and independent study time for creative practice, careers and employability, and research and communication (including scientific practice for BSc course)? (n.b. A breakdown of hours is not sought in this section, but the role and relationships of taught study and independent learning should be provided as part of the reason for the pattern of study and curriculum content).
- How the specialist skills, knowledge, experience, research and scholarly activity of the course team will enable delivery of the award and contribute to the quality of teaching on the Course?
- How will students’ knowledge, skills and career readiness be enhanced by the course?
- 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?
6. RESPONDING TO CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING COURSE APPROVAL EVENTS

QME will issue a summary of the commendations, conditions and recommendations following the event (usually within one week of the event). Dates by which this must be completed are set QME in advance of the approval event. 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 19-24 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</th>
<th>Approved by QSC (date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>That the Course Team considers the introduction of a single Unit Handbook for Year 1 across all three awards.</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</td>
<td>Approved by QSC (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>19-7-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>19-7-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Terminology has been reviewed and amended where appropriate, this includes the course philosophies, and ‘new’ changed to ‘emerging’ technologies.</td>
<td>19-7-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</th>
<th>Approved by QSC (date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>19-7-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>To expand on the production of ‘serious’ games mentioned in the Course Philosophy, within the relevant Unit Handbook for BSc (Hons) Games Development.</td>
<td>19-7-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 &amp; emergency services for disasters and, via gamification, to motivate individuals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>Response <em>(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</em></td>
<td>Approved by QSC (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc2a</td>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc3a</td>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>To provide a broader narrative on the dynamics of collaboration and the scope and range of audiences which could be involved.</td>
<td>Unit BSc2b has been updated to reflect the comments from the panel. <em>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</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</td>
<td>Approved by QSC (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>19-7-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>To articulate the support for project management roles in the BSc (Hons) Games Development Unit Handbook for BA2a.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>To articulate the process of ‘negotiation’ referred to in the Course Philosophy, within the BSc (Hons) Games Development Unit Handbook for BA3a.</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</td>
<td>Approved by QSC (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>19-7-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>To expand on issues of inclusive design and accessibility throughout the Unit Handbooks for BSc (Hons) Games Development.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approved by Panel Chair**

**Name:** Professor Neil Powell  
**Position:** Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic)  
**Signature:**  
**Date:** 16 June 2017
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QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

COURSE DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND REVIEW: PERIODIC REVIEW GUIDANCE

Section 4 of the QME Handbook sets out the Procedures for Course Development, Approval and Periodic Review. This Annex provides additional documents and guidance, which are published separately on the QME Intranet page.
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1. The Periodic Review Event

Courses at NUA 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 and the preparation of a Critical Evaluation by the Course Leader.

The terms of reference of the periodic review panel are to ensure that:

- 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
- The course(s) offers a coherent educational experience with relevant subject-specific and generic knowledge and skills
- The teaching and learning methods described in the course documentation will enable students to achieve the learning outcomes
- The course admission requirements and entry qualifications are appropriate and equivalent to those of similar University courses.

The course periodic review process takes place in two stages:

Stage 1: an internal scrutiny panel takes place prior to the periodic review event, which sets out the amendments required to the documentation prior to its circulation to the review panel.

Stage 2: a course periodic review event takes place to enable scrutiny and peer review of documentation by a panel of staff and external advisers. This event concludes with the panel setting out any conditions that the course team are required to meet prior to the commencement of the course, and recommendations for the overall enhancement of the course and the student experience.

2. Conditions and Recommendations are defined as follows:

**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. A panel shall not normally set more than three conditions. If more than three conditions are set, the panel shall formally consider whether the course should be allowed to continue. In such cases, the Chair of the panel shall alert the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and the Academic Registrar to the panel’s recommendations prior to the conclusion of the event.

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 QME in advance of the periodic review.
**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.

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. The Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee will monitor work undertaken in response to such recommendations for one academic year following the periodic review event.

**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.

2. **Periodic Review panel membership**

The panel for periodic review events comprises:

- The Chair, who will be a member of University staff with substantial experience of events;
- Two internal academic members;
- Two external members: one academic from another HE institution and one professional from a relevant industry;
- The Quality Manager;
- Employability Adviser
- A student representative from an existing NUA course.

External panel members are nominated by the relevant Dean of Faculty. It is important to the University that external panel members are independent of the course team. (Refer to QME Handbook para 4.6)

3. **Periodic Review Event administration**

Panel members should receive the necessary documentation three weeks prior to the event and are asked to read this thoroughly in preparation. Panel members should give an indication of the main topics they would like to explore with staff and students at the review event. This will be required one week prior to the event and will assist the panel in agenda setting on the day of the event.

Documentation will include:

a) Guidance for Panel members for Course Periodic Review Events
b) List of panel and course team members
c) Itinerary for the event
d) Checklist of issues for the consideration of periodic review panels

e) Critical Evaluation

f) Course Philosophy

g) University Aims and Outcomes

h) Unit Handbooks

i) Project Briefs

j) Unit Outlines

The Award and Credit Scheme, Student Regulations and Procedures and relevant Subject Benchmark Statements will be distributed via links in an email prior to the events, but can be provided as hard copies on request.

A periodic review event will normally take place in one day, and will usually commence with a presentation from the presenting team and a tour of relevant resources. Following this there will be a private meeting of the panel. The Chair will consult the ‘checklist of issues for consideration of approval panels’ whilst referring to the documentation and ask panel members for their opinions on the documentation and whether there are any particular issues. The panel will have the opportunity to meet with a group of students and alumni. The panel will then have the opportunity to question the presenting team on various aspects of the documentation, following which conditions and recommendations will be formulated. The approved conditions and recommendations will be circulated to all participants two to three days after the event.

4. External panel member roles

All panel members are encouraged to take a proactive role in the discussion, and if a member is not satisfied that a particular issue has been addressed or resolved, they should express their concern to the Chair.

An external panel member will provide the panel with an external perspective, whether from other Higher Education institutions or from an appropriate industrial sector. The following issues may be considered in relation to the course under periodic review:

**Academic external panel member:**

We would be particularly interested in your comments on:

- The standards indicated by the aims and objectives of the provision, and their comparability with those of awards at the same level in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ);
- The alignment of the objectives and learning outcomes with any relevant Subject Benchmarks;
- The content, delivery of the syllabus and teaching and assessment methods (including work placements);
- The required learning resources necessary to deliver the specified provision including access to workshop and studio space, Library and IT facilities through a tour of relevant facilities.
Industry external panel member:

We would be particularly interested in your comments on:

- The context of the provision in terms of demand for provision, and the employability of graduates;
- The content, delivery of the syllabus and teaching and assessment methods (including work placements);
- The required learning resources necessary to deliver the specified provision including access to workshop and studio space, Library and IT facilities through a tour of relevant facilities.

The Chair may assign specific themes or sections of the Critical Review to individual panel members.

5. The role of the student panel member

Student representatives contribute to course development through their membership of panels for periodic review events. The student is a full member of the panel and is expected to take part in discussion, and the Chair will offer guidance and support for this. In preparation for the event, it may be useful to consider the following areas for discussion/scrutiny:

- Are the teaching methods appropriate?
- Are assessment methods appropriate and are student workloads manageable?
- Is there adequate access to the necessary resources (e.g. Media Lab, computers, the Library)?
- Are there adequate resources to support the students in their learning? Do you think there is appropriate use of the VLE?
- Do you feel that the course prepares students well for future employment or future study?
- Is the student facing documentation (Unit Handbooks, Course Philosophy) of a high quality, relevant and clear?
- How does this award relate to other relevant programmes within the University of which you are aware?

There will be an opportunity to ask questions and clarify issues you may wish to raise at the initial panel meeting.

The Quality Manager

The role of the Quality Manager is to provide advice on the requirements of periodic review and ensure that the event is operated in line with University’s QME procedures and that agreed outcomes are appropriate.

The Employability Adviser

The role of the Employability Adviser is to consider and comment on whether appropriate opportunities exist for career preparation and on data provided in respect of employability outcomes.
**The Event Officer**

The Event Officer is responsible for all administrative aspects of the event, (including convening the panel, circulating the documentation, hospitality and housekeeping), and for writing the report of the event.

**The course team**

The role of the course team is to present the documentation and to respond to all questions from the panel. The entire course team is not required to be present, rather a representative group that is able to provide the panel with answers covering the whole of the course, any particular features and specific unit detail.

6. **The outcome of the periodic review event**

Following the meeting with the course team, the panel must decide:

- To approve the continuation of the provision subject to any conditions and recommendations;
- That the course should not continue.

7. **Post periodic review event**

On conclusion of the event, a report will be circulated by the event officer to the panel members and presenting team. Panel members will be asked for feedback on the event by means of a brief evaluation form.
2. DOCUMENTATION AND ITINERARY FOR PERIODIC REVIEW EVENTS:

REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERNAL SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS

Documentation for advance circulation to the Internal Scrutiny Panel

i. Purpose of the Internal Scrutiny Panel
ii. Annex I Periodic Review Guidance
iii. Critical Evaluation of the course (refer to Annex I)
iv. Proposed amendments (as tracked changes) to the following Course Philosophy and Unit Handbooks (Re. formats of Unit Handbooks please refer to Annex G)
v. Annex 4 Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) Unit Map – Undergraduate Awards/Taught Postgraduate
vi. (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)
vii. The NUA Award and Credit Scheme (website link provided)
viii. Student Regulations and Procedures (website link provided)
in. Quality Management and Enhancement (QME) Handbook (website link provided)
x. Professional accreditation requirements where course has accreditation or is seeking accreditation. (link to information provided)

Internal Scrutiny Panel composition

- Chair
- 2 academic members of staff who have appropriate teaching experience at the level of the course under consideration
- Quality Manager
- Course Leader for course subject to approval and Dean are in attendance to respond to panel questions
- Event Officer

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 the internal scrutiny panel plus the following:

i. Guidance for Panel members for Course Periodic Review Events
ii. Briefing note for panel members on key features of the NUA Award and Credit Scheme
iii. Checklist of issues for the consideration of approval and review panels
iv. A sample of Project Briefs
v. Annual Course Reviews for preceding 2 years
vi. External examiners’ reports and University responses for the preceding 2 years
INDICATIVE ITINERARY FOR EXTERNAL PERIODIC REVIEW EVENT

Day 1:
17.15 Arrival and refreshments
17.30 Presentation by Dean and Course Leader – overview of Critical Evaluation and key features of the course including proposed changes
18.30 Close - external panel members check in to hotel
19.00 Dinner for the external members of the Panel with the Chair, Dean and Course Leader

Day 2:
8.45 Arrival and refreshments
9.00 Private meeting of the Panel to review itinerary and emerging issues
10.30 Break
10.45 Panel meeting with students/alumni
11.45 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
- Quality Manager
- Employability Adviser
- 1 external academic
- 1 external panel member drawn from the creative and cultural sectors
- 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. Guidance for Panel members for Award and Credit Scheme Review Events
iv. Briefing note for 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
Proposed amendments (as tracked changes) to the Award and Credit Scheme and any associated documentation

Indicative Itinerary for Award and Credit Scheme external review events

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

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
3. ALUMNI SURVEY

Periodic Review Events – Alumni input

Course Leaders are asked to nominate alumni who are invited to attend the student meeting on day 2 ‘Panel meeting with students and alumni’.

QME also seek a wider range of alumni input through a questionnaire which Alumni are asked to complete in advance of the Periodic Review Event.

Alumni surveys

A survey of alumni is undertaken for each periodic review. The survey is administered centrally by QME and a standard set of questions are asked which are agreed in September. The survey of alumni is limited to graduates from the last three years.

The following notes provide guidance and recommended practice for carrying out such surveys.

Planning and administering surveys

Survey timing: It is suggested that alumni be surveyed by email in January to provide sufficient time to get responses back ahead of the Periodic Review Event.

Mode of delivery: For reasons of cost and ease of administration, surveys will be delivered online (emailing alumni with a link to a web-based questionnaire). QME will use the JISC on-line survey software for which we have a subscription.

Managing surveys: QME will manage and co-ordinate surveys while the Alumni Officer can also assist with any alumni contacts.

Survey audience: Alumni surveys should normally be sent to any students who completed the programme in the past three years (excluding any who failed, as they are unlikely to appreciate contact).

Contact details: The Alumni Officer can supply lists of alumni names and contact details from Donor.

Reporting survey results: A summary of responses to the questionnaire is provided to the Panel prior to the Event so that this can be considered as part of the discussion.

Feeding back to respondents: QME will contact Alumni who have been surveyed to thank them for their participation and state how the feedback was used in the Review.
4. 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. Course philosophy

2. Critical evaluation
   - Student entry, progression and student outcomes
   - Course rationale and evidence for demand

3. Aims and 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).

4. Course Delivery
   - Effectiveness of delivery and quality of the Student Experience

5. 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 career preparation including work placement/work-based learning, student volunteering activities and Erasmus or other overseas exchange

6. Learning, teaching and assessment:
   For example:
- Whether the learning and teaching methods/strategies are inclusive and appropriate, enabling all students to achieve the Learning Outcomes

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

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

- Consideration of ethics, inclusivity, equality, diversity and health and safety

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. Curriculum Development

- Whether the changes proposed to Curriculum content, Unit Handbooks, together with the reasons for these are appropriate

- Whether the changes proposed to teaching, learning and assessment methods, together with the reasons for these are appropriate

9. 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

10. Resources (staffing)

11. Quality management and enhancement

For example:
- Student Voice e.g. how student feedback is used to inform and enhance the student experience, closing the feedback loop

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

- Opportunities for ongoing continuing professional development for staff
5. GUIDANCE FOR WRITING THE 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 revisions to course documentation and curriculum development. All sections must be completed.

Documentation required for preparation of Critical Evaluation:

QME will provide data tables for inclusion in sections 1 and 2 of the Critical Evaluation and you will have access to the QME Annual Monitoring Outcomes:

- NSS and survey data (ISS/PTES)
- Annual Course Reviews/Course Enhancement Plans
- 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**

Provide a 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 Good Practice confirmed through annual monitoring)
- Student and course successes (awards, competitions, prizes)
- Staff successes.

2. **Student entry, progression and employability**

Data tables to be provided by QME

- Student Profile data:
  - Formal entry qualifications
  - Geographical origin
  - Age profile
  - Gender profile
  - Ethnicity
  - Disability
- Qualifications on entry
- Retention and Progression data
- Student outcomes – unit results
- Student outcomes – degree classifications
- Employability Graduate Outcomes – % in employment and % in further study, % in professional and managerial jobs

Provide an evaluation of the data and consider aspects such as:

- To what extent has your student profile changed in the past 3 years?
- What implications do the changes in student profile have for your course and what actions should be taken?
- Consider issues relating to recruitment, retention, progression, student outcomes including employability and strategies to address these, where appropriate.
• To what extent does the course attract students from under-represented groups e.g BAME, Polar 1

3. **Course Rationale and Evidence for Demand**
   Provide an evaluation of the ongoing demand for the course with reference to application data provided (applications, offers, acceptances and enrolments) for the past 3 years and developments in (a) the discipline and (b) the creative industries.

4. **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:

   4.1 The continuing relevance of the *Aims and Outcomes of Undergraduate Study* to your course;

   4.2 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.*

5. **Course Delivery**

   5.1 Staff profiles - include a short summary for each course member summarising research interests, practice and responsibilities.

   5.2 Include a short summary of how curriculum currency has been maintained and enhanced: for example, through industry links; staff research, scholarly activity and professional practice; other mechanisms.

   5.3 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 the impact of enhancements identified through annual monitoring and include an evaluation of student feedback including NSS data, survey data and feedback from student representatives.

   5.4 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?

6. **Learning, Teaching and Assessment**
   The emphasis of this section is to evaluate (not describe) the effectiveness of learning, teaching and assessment e.g the appropriateness of learning, teaching and assessment
methods, opportunities for assessment feedback and assessment loading. The following prompts are provided to assist your evaluation:

- How effectively do the course team draw upon their research, scholarship or professional activity to inform their teaching?
- How is the quality of teaching and learning enhanced through delivery by part-time and visiting lecturers?
- Is the percentage of passes at first attempt above NUA mean and how does the course team respond to the ability profile of the student intake through its learning, teaching and assessment?
- How does the team incorporate approaches to students with protected characteristics in its learning, teaching and assessment? for example: Are there any examples of experimentation with new approaches to teaching and learning in order to address diverse student needs?
- How does the course team use feedback from students on the quality of teaching to improve the quality of learning opportunities offered?
- How is students’ learning supported?

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.
6. 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 periodic 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 a student-focused document that acts as an introduction to the course. It is also a useful guide to support Marketing and Recruitment in articulating the provision to applicants. As such it should be written in plain English and student friendly (avoid acronyms and use of specialist language). It is appropriate to address the reader directly as ‘you’ rather than as ‘the student’.

You are required to articulate the distinctive approach to learning and teaching 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:

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

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

- 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)

- What is the proposed balance between teaching and independent study time for creative practice, careers and employability, and research and communication (including scientific practice for BSc course)? (n.b. A breakdown of hours is not sought in this section, but the role and relationships of taught study and independent learning should be provided as part of the reason for the pattern of study and curriculum content).
• How the specialist skills, knowledge, experience, research and scholarly activity of the course team will enable delivery of the award and contribute to the quality of teaching on the Course?

• How will students’ knowledge, skills and career readiness be enhanced by the course?

• 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?
7. 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 by QME in advance of the 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.

An example of a completed Responses to Conditions and Recommendations template is provided on pages 19-24 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:** BA (Hons) Film and Moving Image Production and BA (Hons) Photography External Periodic Review

**Meeting Date:** 1st and 2nd February 2018

**Panel Chair:** Professor Hilary Carlisle

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BA (Hons) Film and Moving Image Production</th>
<th>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</th>
<th>Approved by LTQC (date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONDITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 To review reading lists in all Unit</td>
<td>Reading lists have been reviewed for all projects and the</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook to ensure a clear sense of</td>
<td>following actions taken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progression through each year of the</td>
<td>• Generic materials have been removed from recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course in terms of the complexity and</td>
<td>reading lists in all Unit Handbooks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriateness of the texts to the level</td>
<td>• There is comprehensive and detailed reading material in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of study.</td>
<td>the project briefs for each unit, where evidence of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>progression of skills and knowledge are clear. Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handbook reference material has been updated to refer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students to this material in Project Briefs for Units BA1a,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA1b, BA2a and BA2b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research materials for BA3a and Unit 3b are specified to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individual students through tutorials dependent upon their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specialism/ research and practice areas and therefore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Film and Moving Image Production</td>
<td><strong>CONDITION</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 To include an indication of potential graduate destinations and career options in the Course Philosophy.</td>
<td>Handbooks have been updated with new text indicating this individual approach to supervision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

| 2.1 To consider embedding phrases such as ‘risk taking’ and ‘experimentation’ into Unit Handbooks as appropriate to reflect the creative requirements of the course. | Text added to Creative Practice Section of Unit BA1b, Unit BA2a, Unit BA2b, Unit BA3a | 16 May 2018 |
| 2.2 To review the sound and edit software packages taught on the course in terms of industry standards, appropriateness as education tools and cost-effectiveness. | Course Team have discussed Pro Tools and Avid as potential software tools for the course in team meetings. Pending a further discussion with Dean of Arts and Media and Resources Manager to explore possible capital bids. The course team is seeking to bring in VLs with Mobile Avid and Pro Tools software to run familiarisation workshops for Year 3 students in 2018/19. | 16 May 2018 |
| 2.3 To review the language used throughout the Course Philosophy in terms of impact and clarity. | Tracked Changes added to Course Philosophy | 16 May 2018 |
| 2.4 To remove the repetition of discussion of student profile data in the Critical Evaluation. | Removed | 16 May 2018 |
| 2.5 To highlight the work placement scheme within the Course Philosophy to emphasise its significance. | Paragraph Added to Course Philosophy to reflect potential work placement examples | 16 May 2018 |
### BA (Hons) Film and Moving Image Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</th>
<th>Approved by LTQC (date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Paragraph added to Unit briefs to clarify individual assessment practices in relation to group projects in Units BA1a, BA1b, BA2a and BA2b. Text will be reviewed in the Production Team Guidelines document which is published to students each academic year to ensure that information reflects assessment practice. <em>Note this document was not presented as part of the approval process.</em></td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BA (Hons) Photography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</th>
<th>Approved by LTQC (date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>To aid comparison across the four years of the course the reading lists have been pasted in to one document. Books have been reviewed to ensure a progression of texts throughout the course. Where texts are used across different units and years, specific sections have been identified appropriate to the level of study. The AoP book Beyond the Lens is in every reading list which is a condition of affiliation. Year 3 reading lists break this down to information specifically related to the unit of study.</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDITION</td>
<td>Response <em>(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</em></td>
<td>Approved by LTQC (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journals have been reviewed and strengthened throughout the course. The reading lists will go through further scrutiny at the end of the academic year as the course team will review the course form year 0 through to MA.</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>To include an indication of potential graduate destinations and career options in the Course Philosophy. Additional text added at the end of the Course Philosophy identifying a range of graduate opportunities - tracked changes.</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>Response <em>(giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</em></th>
<th>Approved by LTQC (date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>To consider how space usage can be enhanced to allow laptop users a working area without blocking access to iMacs for other students. The Course Team have consulted with the Resource Manager and reviewed plans for possible working areas in the Digital Darkroom, which are complex due to layout of the room, however for the next academic year, the University have identified additional space in the form of a base room in St Andrews house. There will be facilities for using laptop computers in this space</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>To strengthen the approach to team work to ensure it is embedded within the course and highlighted within the course documentation. The course already utilises teamwork throughout the three years of study within workshops and technical sessions. In year 1 students work in groups in initial projects; in year 2 students are engaged in the collaboration project and in year 3 students often work in groups as part of a professional practice within the studios. These activities will be reviewed in detail at the end of the academic year and opportunities for team working will be signposted further and the potential for more collaborative projects early on in Year 1.</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Response (giving details of action taken or planned for the future)</th>
<th>Approved by LTQC (date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 To review the language used throughout the Course Philosophy in terms of impact and clarity.</td>
<td>We have reviewed the course philosophy, which we believe does provide a clarity to the focus of the course along with the enthusiasm for an aspirational course.</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 0 Photography Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Approvals</th>
<th>Approved by LTQC (date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 To revise the Project Briefs as follows:                              | • Year 0 glossary has been provided  
• Project briefs have been re-formatted  
• Reading lists have been re-formatted                                                                 | 16 May 2018             |
| • simplify the language and/or provide a suitable glossary to enable non-traditional students and those with Learning Differences to readily understand requirements.  
• ensure that briefs are well formatted, dyslexia friendly and headings avoid unnecessary and potentially confusing repetition  
• ensure Reading Lists are appropriately formatted and comply with NUA Harvard referencing format. |                                                                                                                             |                        |
| 1.2 To ensure the Unit Handbooks are titled with the correct unit numbering. | Completed                                                                                                                   | 16 May 2018             |
| 1.3 **Condition to the University:**  
To ensure that adequate resources are in place to accommodate extra student numbers and the particular needs of Photography students. | As part of the operationalizing of new course provision, detailed 3-year resource and budget plans are put in place by the University with due regard to projected student numbers, staffing, space and equipment resources. These are overseen by the PVC(A), Dean, Resources Manager and Head of Finance reporting to SMT. | 16 May 2018             |
Staffing: The cost of additional staffing is already built in to the course resource model and the Resource Allocation Model (RAM) which is based on projected student numbers.

Space: Two additional spaces have been allocated to Year 0 by the University for 2018-19 academic year which gives an additional allocation of 167sq metres to Year 0 space, including photo editing and studio space.

Equipment: Additional cameras, lighting, IT hardware and software, and related specialist equipment are in the process of approval by SMG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Approved by LTQC (date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 To review the Year 1 curriculum content in relation to the Year 0 content over the next academic year and report on within the following ACR.</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The course team will review the curriculum content at the end of this academic year. The year 0 content will be reflected on within the 2018/19 ACR and reviewed and developed as required.

Approved by Panel Chair

Name: Professor Hilary Carlisle

Position: Dean of Design and Architecture

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 2 May 2018
NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

ANNEX J: ANNUAL MONITORING 2018-19

Aim
The aim of annual monitoring at NUA is to ensure course quality and enhance the student experience in the context of internal and external indicators of quality.

Annual monitoring 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

Wider Purpose:
- To review and evaluate courses 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

OfS Conditions of Registration and UK Quality Code expectations
Annual monitoring is one of the mechanisms used to assure ourselves that we meet the OfS on-going conditions in B: Quality, reliable standards and positive outcomes for all students and the expectations for standards and quality of the UK Quality Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OfS Conditions of Registration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>The provider must deliver well-designed courses that provide a high quality academic experience for all students and enable a student’s achievement to be reliably assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>The provider must deliver successful outcomes for all of its students, which are recognised and valued by employers, and/or enable further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>The provider must ensure that qualifications awarded to students hold their value at the point of qualification and over time, in line with sector recognised standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>The provider must deliver courses that meet the academic standards as they are described in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications at Level 4 or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UK Quality Code for Higher Education covers annual monitoring in its Advice and Guidance: Monitoring and Evaluation. This guidance states that:
“Monitoring and evaluation of higher education is an essential process within providers, forming a fundamental part of the academic cycle. It can, and should, look at all aspects of the higher education experience.” Course monitoring and review processes enable providers to consider how learning opportunities for students may be improved.
Expected for Standards
The academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.

The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards.

Core Practices
- The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications frameworks.
- The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.
- Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the standards of its awards are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them.

Common Practice
- The provider reviews its core practices for standards regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement.

Expectations for Quality
Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student’s achievement to be reliably assessed.

From admission through to completion, all students are provided with the support that they need to succeed in and benefit from higher education.

Core Practices
- The provider designs and/or delivers high-quality courses.
- The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.
- The provider actively engages students, individually and collectively, in the quality of their educational experience.

Common Practice
- The provider reviews its core practices for quality regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement.
- The provider’s approach to managing quality takes account of external expertise.
- The provider engages students individually and collectively in the development, assurance and enhancement of the quality of their educational experience.

Process for Course Annual Review
- In 2019 we will pilot using Course Enhancement Plans in place of more detailed Annual Course Reviews for all course except BA (Hons) Architecture which will
require a tailored submission to meet ARB Annual Monitoring requirements. The template for BA (Hons) Architecture is provided in Appendix 2.

- Academic Registry will produce UG and PGT dashboards on a number of benchmarked data together with RAG rating.
- An Annual Review meeting will be convened for each course week commencing 9 September 2019.
- Membership will include
  - QME - Quality Manager or Senior Quality Officer
  - Academic Registry - Academic Registrar or Deputy Registrar
  - Deans of Faculty
  - Course Leader and course team members as agreed by Course Leader

The purpose of the annual review meeting is:
- To discuss the data
- To evaluate student outcomes, and discuss enhancements to course delivery and the student experience
- To finalise the Course Enhancement Plan for the year under review (2018-19)
- To draft the Course Enhancement Plan for the forthcoming year (2019-20)

The annual review meeting will consider the following evidence and use this to appraise course performance:
- External examiner reports
- Outcomes of the Internal Verification Process
- Any reports from periodic review, accrediting or other external bodies
- Student feedback - NSS/ISS/PTES/Dean’s Forums
- 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)
- Industry liaison and feedback from graduates and their employers

Annual Review Meeting Agenda Items
The following items will be discussed with reference to the data dashboard

Agenda Item One: Course Enhancement Plan: Review of the previous year
The meeting will use the previous enhancement plan as a starting point. Following discussion of the evidence the previous year’s enhancement plan (2018-19) will be updated.
- The enhancement plan will be updated to 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. This will be evidenced using data and consideration of the impact that the action taken has had.
- If an action has not been completed or the target set has not been achieved consideration will be given as to whether 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 consideration will be given as to whether any parts of the action should be carried forward to the following years Course Enhancement Plan.
• If the action is still required, the column will state that the action is being carried forward to the enhancement plan for the year ahead and will be cross-referenced in the following years Course Enhancement Plan.

**Agenda Item Two: Strengths/Issues and Risks arising**

The meeting will consider areas of strengths and highlight any aspects of data which give cause for concern. All items recommended for action in Section 5.3 of the External Examiners Report will be considered.

The meeting will agree the issues which require enhancement and these will be reflected in the draft Course Enhancement Plan.

**Agenda Item Three: Draft Course Enhancement Plan for the year ahead (2019-20)**

• This should summarise actions the course team need to take over the coming year to address any issues identified as being in need of enhancement.
• Items recommended for action in Section 5.3 of the External Examiners Report should be included as agreed.
• This section should also include any actions which could not be fully completed and need to be carried forward from the previous year.
• 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/Graduate Outcomes data/Recruitment/Retention.

**Agenda Item Four: Good practice**

The meeting will identify 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 the course evaluation up to three areas of good practice should be identified which will be presented to the Faculty Board of Studies/LTQC/Senate for approval and shared with the wider University community through the intranet and University Development Days.

Following the meeting a short paragraph should be compiled for each area of 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*
All actions need to be SMART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurable</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievable</td>
<td>All actions should be realistic, practical and attainable within operational constraints dependent upon availability of resources, knowledge and timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timebound</td>
<td>All actions should have clear deadlines expressed and regular review periods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How outcomes from annual monitoring are considered by the University

Appendix 1 provides the Annual Monitoring 2019 Key Dates and Processes.

Course Enhancement Plans

Course Enhancement Plans (CEPs) will be considered at the Faculty Board of Studies Annual Monitoring Meeting in October. The meeting will confirm changes required. Final versions of CEPs will be presented to the Dean for checking prior to approval by LTQC and Senate.

LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting

The LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting in November will receive the final Undergraduate and Postgraduate Course Enhancement Plans, minutes of the Faculty Board of Studies/ Board of Studies for Postgraduate Taught Annual Monitoring meeting, BA (Hons) Architecture Annual Course Review and submission to Architects Registration Board, Institutional Overview of External Examiners’ Reports and the Areas of Good Practice.

The LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting in November will capture key issues and good practice as well as key themes arising from annual monitoring. The revised Institutional Quality Enhancement Strategy is agreed following the Annual Monitoring Meeting of LTQC.

Senate Annual Monitoring Meeting

The Senate Annual Monitoring Meeting in December will consider the Report from LTQC Annual Monitoring Meeting, Institutional Overview of External Examiners’ Reports, Undergraduate and Postgraduate Course Enhancement Plans, BA (Hons) Architecture

**Follow-up Activity**

- The Course Enhancement Plans are sent to External Examiners following approval.
- The annual monitoring submission is made to Architects Registration Board.
- Boards of Study are responsible for monitoring progress with Course Enhancement Plans and reporting to LTQC.
- Actions taken should be reported on and evaluated in the following year’s annual review meeting and Course Enhancement Plan.
- The University Quality 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Monitoring Data Flags</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention Flag</td>
<td>NUA average + / - 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Flag</td>
<td>Passes at first attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Classification Profiles Flag</td>
<td>Changes in profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Process Outcomes</td>
<td>Any areas indicated by IV Group as an issue will be notified to Course Leaders via QME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Profile Data Supplied for Comment Flag</td>
<td>Anything unusual and request comment. Age, gender, BME, disability, qualifications on entry vs. degree outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>Any data requiring comment will be notified to Course Leaders via QME.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS Flags</td>
<td>For sudden increase or decrease in score and satisfaction levels below 90%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Examiner Reports</td>
<td>Any negative responses to the questions relating to Assessment and Standards will be notified to Course Leaders via QME.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This document describes the key dates and processes for NUA’s Annual Monitoring.

### ANNUAL REVIEW TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafting CEPs</td>
<td>Course Enhancement Plans pre-populated by QME</td>
<td>Previous Year Enhancement Plan pre-populated with progress to date by QME</td>
<td>By July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG and PG Data Dashboard published by Academic Registry</td>
<td>Including;</td>
<td>By the beginning of September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• External Examiner Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• National Student Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Student Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HEA Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• DLHE Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unit Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Award Profile Retention and Award Profiles (including resubmission results)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student Profile data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review Meetings for Course Teams</td>
<td>Meeting with Course Teams to review the data dashboard, finalise Previous Year Enhancement Plan, identify risks/issues, draft the Enhancement Plan for the year ahead and agree good practice.</td>
<td>w/c 9 September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Drafts of Enhancement Plans for the previous year (2018-19) and the year ahead (2019-20)</td>
<td>Final draft UG Course Enhancement Plans are completed for consideration by Faculty Board of Studies Annual Monitoring Meeting.</td>
<td>By 7 October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final draft PG Course Enhancement Plans are completed for consideration by Board of Studies for Taught Postgraduate.</td>
<td>By 16 October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNUAL REVIEW TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Sept</td>
<td>UG and PG data dashboard available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/C 9 Sept</td>
<td>Annual review meetings with Course Leader/course team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Oct</td>
<td>Complete final drafts of Course Enhancement Plans - previous year (2018-19) and year ahead (2019-20) NB BA (Hons) Architecture to complete full Annual Course Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Oct</td>
<td>Complete final drafts of External Examiner responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Oct</td>
<td>Faculty Board of Studies annual monitoring meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Oct</td>
<td>Postgraduate Board of Studies annual monitoring meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov</td>
<td>Complete amends to UG/PG Course Enhancement Plans (2019-20) for presentation to LTQC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov</td>
<td>Complete amends to External Examiner Responses for presentation to LTQC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Nov</td>
<td>Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee Annual Monitoring Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nov</td>
<td>Complete final amends to UG/PG Course Enhancement Plans (2019-20) for presentation to Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dec</td>
<td>Senate Annual Monitoring Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Jan</td>
<td>Publish all outcomes from Annual Monitoring (External Examiner responses, Course Enhancement Plans, Good Practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of UG Examiners’ reports by NUA</td>
<td>2 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of PG Examiners’ reports by NUA</td>
<td>26 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging of reports and drawing up of Response templates</td>
<td>As reports received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response templates sent to relevant Dean and Course Leader, copied to PVCA and Deans Support</td>
<td>As soon as available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans to identify staff who need to respond to recommendations and whether specific action is required in the Course Enhancement Plan</td>
<td>As soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed responses templates returned to <a href="mailto:qme@nua.ac.uk">qme@nua.ac.uk</a></td>
<td>7 October 2019, or as soon as possible after Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to University wide recommendations completed</td>
<td>7 October 2019, or as soon as possible after Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Responses UG Examiners’ reports to be considered at Faculty Board of Studies Annual Monitoring meeting</td>
<td>16 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Responses PG Examiners’ reports to be considered at Faculty Board of Studies Annual Monitoring meeting</td>
<td>25 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final amendments to responses and response to overarching report and preparation of overview report for LTQC Annual Monitoring meeting</td>
<td>1 November 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norwich University of the Arts Annual Course Review Course Enhancement Plan (2018-19)

Course title:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Issue identified for action/enhancement</th>
<th>Target (identify an appropriate target for the action e.g. NSS/DLHE)</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Action required by whom</th>
<th>Action required by when</th>
<th>Action taken to include actual impact</th>
<th>Target achieved (State whether Yes Partially achieved Not achieved)</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Course Enhancement Plan

Were there any other enhancements that you implemented that were not part of your enhancement plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Issue identified for action/enhancement</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norwich University of the Arts Annual Course Review – Course Enhancement Plan 2019-20

Course title:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Issue identified for action/enhancement</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Action required including by whom and when</th>
<th>Expected impact</th>
<th>Action taken to include actual impact</th>
<th>Target achieved</th>
<th>Is this action being carried forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Please identify where the evidence for action arises External Examiner reports/recommendations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please identify an appropriate target for the action e.g. NSS/Graduate Outcomes)

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please identify where the evidence for action arises External Examiner reports/recommendations) (identify an appropriate target for the action e.g. NSS/Graduate Outcomes) Yes Partially achieved Not achieved
Norwich University of the Arts
Quality Management and Enhancement
Annual Course Review for the Academic Year 2018-19
BA (Hons) Architecture

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 2018-19. 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.
### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
# Section one: How we have strengthened the course this year – review of this year’s Enhancement Plan (2018-19)

This section should include a review and evaluation of the Course Enhancement Plan for 2018-19 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, Dean’s Forum or other fora, assessment results, Graduate Outcomes data etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Issue identified for action/ enhancement</th>
<th>Target (identify an appropriate target for the action e.g. NSS/ Graduate Outcomes)</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Action required by whom</th>
<th>Action required by when</th>
<th>Action taken to include actual impact</th>
<th>Target achieved (State whether Yes Partially achieved Not achieved)</th>
<th>Is this action being carried forward Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Were there any other enhancements that you implemented that were not part of your enhancement plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Issue identified for action/enhancement</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include where possible, evidence of impact. Examples can be from increases in NSS scores, feedback from students through ISS, Dean’s Forum or other fora, assessment results, Graduate Outcomes data etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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 raised as a potential item for University enhancement at the Faculty Board of Studies. Please indicate in brackets e.g. (Item no 1.) where comments link to the enhancement plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Following discussion within your department please comment on the following</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use as evidence all of the data/information available including relevant NUA benchmarks, NSS, ISS, Dean’s Forum meetings, DLHE, admissions, progression, retention and achievement data, External Examiner reports, Successes of staff, students, alumni and any other Faculty or University monitoring systems in place such as Internal Verification (IV).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Please consider Internal and external influences (e.g. PRSB, employers, other NUA departments) Dean’s Forums or other meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Please ensure you consider issues relating to Equality and Diversity and Health and Safety when completing this section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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, *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.

### 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 2019-20
Course title: BA (Hons) Architecture

Please complete this plan which should include a summary on how the course proposes to build on existing good practice for the purposes of enhancement. The Plan should also reflect issues from preceding sections which may need to be given further consideration, such as student data, NSS, ISS, or Graduate Outcomes, external examiner comments, feedback from Internal Verification team or student or employer’s feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Issue identified for action/enhancement (Please identify where the evidence for action arises External Examiner reports/recommendations)</th>
<th>Target (Identify an appropriate target for the action e.g. NSS/Graduate Outcomes)</th>
<th>Action required including by whom and when</th>
<th>Expected impact</th>
<th>Action taken to include actual impact</th>
<th>Target achieved</th>
<th>Is this action being carried forward</th>
<th>Yes*/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please complete this plan which should include a summary on how the course proposes to build on existing good practice for the purposes of enhancement. The Plan should also reflect issues from preceding sections which may need to be given further consideration, such as student data, NSS, ISS, or Graduate Outcomes, external examiner comments, feedback from Internal Verification team or student or employer’s feedback.
NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS

QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

COURSE DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND REVIEW

APPROVAL OF PROPOSALS FOR UPDATING PROJECT BRIEFS

Overview

This Annex details the procedure to follow to propose and gain approval to introduce new Project Briefs or to make changes to existing Project Briefs.

Approval Process

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.

The introduction of new Project Briefs or amendments to existing Project Briefs are subject to written approval from the relevant Dean of Faculty before they are implemented within the course of study. Deans are responsible for checking that the new or amended project brief meets the relevant unit aims and learning outcomes. Project Briefs should normally be approved four weeks prior to the delivery of the Unit but exceptionally requests for approval to introduce new Project Briefs or approve changes to Project Briefs in year can be made to the relevant Dean.

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. Please refer to page 3 for guidance.

Project Briefs will normally be published on course VLE pages and made available to students through taught sessions.
Diagram of Process for New Project Briefs / Updating Project Briefs 2019-20

Feb
• Deans' Support to archive Project Briefs from previous year and set-up folder structure for the forthcoming year.

April
• Deans Support set deadlines for approval of Project Briefs, book admin time into Deans' diaries and add dates to Project Brief Tracking spreadsheet.

May
• Deans Support/QME to upload Word Versions of all previous academic year's Project Briefs to OneDrive. Course Leaders emailed hyperlink and notification of deadlines for receipt of completed documentation (cc QME)

23 Aug
• All Units: Deadline for Course Leaders to email Project Briefs to deans@nua.ac.uk. Deans Support to rename to standard naming convention and save in "For checking by Dean"

9 Sep
• Deadline for Deans to approve Project Briefs and place within folder "02 Approved by Dean" (NB: Deans notify Deans Support by email when this is done).  
• Deans Support to save PDF version in "03 PDF copies - CL to upload to VLE" and send link to Course Leader (cc relevant Course Admin and QME)

16 Sep
• Deadline for Course Leaders to publish final PDF versions on VLE

13 Dec
• All Units: Deadline for Course Leaders to email replacement, additional and/or revisions to Project Briefs to deans@nua.ac.uk. Deans Support to rename to standard naming convention and save in "01 For Checking by Dean"

6 Jan
• Deadline for Deans to approve additional changes to Project Briefs and place within folder "02 Approved by Dean" (NB: Deans notify Deans Support when this is done).  
• Deans Support to save PDF version in "03 PDF copies - CL to upload to VLE" and send link to Course Leader (cc relevant Course Admin and QME)

13 Jan
• Deadline for Course Leaders to publish final PDF versions on VLE
Guidelines for Academic Staff to write 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 key curriculum areas (e.g. Creative Practice, Research, Professional Practice) are not required;
- Boxes mapping which Learning Outcomes the Project Brief covers are required for Year 3 but are not required for Year 1 and 2 (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.

**Heading**

Norwich University of the Arts  
BA/BSc (Hons) [course name]: Year [0,1,2,3] – 2019/20  
Unit: [code] – [title]

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

**Key Information required:**

- Start and end date
- Unit submission date if different
- Indication of expected time spent on the brief (i.e. 2 weeks, every Friday etc.)
- Briefing date
- Final critique or review date
- 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:*

Where Project Briefs require additional reference material the Course Team should liaise with the library and ensure that the reference is available. Additional reference material should be disseminated to students via the VLE. Additional reading recommended to students throughout the year should be considered annually by the Course Leader for inclusion in the Unit Handbook. Amendments to the Unit Handbook should be made in accordance with QME guidance and timeline. 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](#))