



Collaborative Programmes Validation and Revalidation Procedure

Document Control Box	
Document title (include version number if amended within same year as approved)	Collaborative Programmes Validation and Revalidation Procedure
Reference Number	016/23
Approval category (Please indicate)	
Governance/Governor	X
MPRIG Executive/Other Committee (insert name)	
Senior Staff (insert name)	
Date document approved	15/3/23
Supersedes (insert previous title/version date)	
Date document last reviewed and/or updated	
Date next due for review	December 2025
Related statutes or regulations	
Related policies/procedures/guidance/forms	
Staff member responsible for update	TBC

Amendment History

Version	Revision Summary	Date Approved	Author



Collaborative Programmes Validation and Revalidation Procedure

Introduction

1. Validation is the process through which Spurgeon's College (the College) ensures that a new programme meets defined academic standards and that it will offer students the best opportunity to learn. It is about assuring quality and high academic standards.
2. This procedure documents the process for validating a programme which is delivered by a collaborative partner.

Principles

3. This validation procedure allows for a proposed new undergraduate or taught postgraduate programme being delivered by a collaborative partner to be examined by a group of experienced peers and academics, employer representatives and a student representative. The procedure is aligned with the expectations, practices, advice and guidance within the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#).
4. The approval and ongoing review of units and programmes is one of the principal mechanisms through which the College secures academic standards of its validated programmes and ensures the quality of learning opportunities within programmes of study that lead to a Spurgeon's College qualification.
5. This procedure applies to all undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision being delivered through an approved collaborative partner and leading to a recognised award of Spurgeon's College.
6. The College's Academic Partnership Section (APS) has practical oversight of the validation of collaborative partner programmes. The College's Programme Approval Revalidation and Review Committee (PARRC) is responsible for ensuring that partner programmes are academically viable, have defined academic standards and conform to relevant regulations, prior to being scrutinized by a Validation Panel. The College's Academic Board gives academic approval to proposed programmes, on the advice and recommendation of a Validation Panel. The College's Board of Governors gives final approval for the College to validate a collaborative partner programme.
7. The College's approach to validation involves a validation event, during which a panel scrutinises the proposed programme.
8. The process ensures:
 - a. Equivalence in academic standards with comparable programmes across the UK higher education sector.
 - b. Alignment with all relevant external reference points, including the UK Quality Code and relevant Subject Benchmark Statements.
 - c. Recognition by an associated Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) if relevant. The College remains solely responsible for all

academic awards offered in its name and the validation of these programmes.

9. During the validation process consideration is given to the following themes:

- The rationale for the new programme.
- The programme curriculum, its design, content, delivery and assessment.
- The appropriateness of the standards set for the level of the award.
- The suitability of human, physical and other learning resources to support the programme.
- The student experience offered by the new programme including opportunities for employment and further study for its graduates.
- The way in which the programme facilitates the widest possible access to ensure that all students can maximise their potential.

10. Programmes will normally be validated for six years. Shorter validation periods may be approved.

11. If a validated programme is modified, it may require revalidation depending on the nature and extent of the changes, and in accordance with the Collaborative Programmes Curriculum Modification Policy.

12. All proposals must have gone through a process of programme approval as detailed in the 'Collaborative Partner Handbook (Validation)' prior to being considered for validation.

13. This process requires the collaborative partner to provide evidence to the College that:

- a) Each proposed programme has a sound academic rationale.
- b) An appropriate statement of financial viability is in place for each proposed programme, which demonstrates that appropriate staffing and other resources are in place for the effective delivery of the programme.
- c) Each proposed programme has been designed in such a way as to meet the College's expectations for academic quality and standards, to meet or exceed the expectations of the UK QAA Quality Code where relevant, and to meet any appropriate requirements of Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB).
- d) The collaborative partner has sought written advice on each proposed programme from an external advisor who will be an impartial and appropriately qualified academic expert in a relevant field¹.
- e) The collaborative partner has engaged with current or prospective students to obtain their input on the proposed programme and keep records of the process and outcomes².

¹ Usually only applicable to proposals for programmes that have not been previously validated.

² Stet

14. This document has been informed by the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, in particular the following Advice and Guidance themes:

Course Design and Development (<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/course-design-and-development>)

External Expertise (<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/external-expertise>)

Monitoring and Evaluation (<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/monitoring-and-evaluation>)

Responsibilities

Validation Panel

15. A Validation Panel's responsibilities are:

- a. To consider proposals from the collaborative partner for the validation or revalidation of new higher education programmes or pathways.
- b. To consider proposals from the collaborative partner for major changes to existing programmes or pathways that are validated by the College.³
- c. To ensure the effective scrutiny of any proposals by a process which facilitates peer review and uses methods deemed appropriate to the validation status and subject matter of the programmes concerned.
- d. To assess any proposals to ensure that they satisfy quality criteria and threshold academic standards appropriate to the type and level of award.
- e. To assess any proposals to ensure that they meet the external regulatory demands of the UK education sector and professional bodies.
- f. To provide summary reports to the Academic Board of all activity undertaken and to make recommendations based on the outcome of any assessment of proposals received from the collaborative partner.
- g. To report to the collaborative partner, through the APS, any issues identified with existing programmes which require action.

16. The Validation Panel will:

- a. Critically examine the validation documentation and undertake discussion with the collaborative partner and other relevant stakeholders in order to make a collective judgement as to the quality and academic standard of the proposed programme.
- b. Recommend to the Academic Board whether or not the proposed programme should be validated.

³ If the College's Collaborations Committee or PARRC (as relevant) feels that the scope of the proposed modifications to a programme are such that academic quality and standards, opportunities available to students, or the continuing validity and relevance of the programme might be affected, then this should be regarded as a new programme and the appropriate parts of the approval process for Collaborative Programmes should apply. See Part C of the Collaborative Partner (Validation) Handbook.

Collaborative Partner

17. A collaborative partner's responsibilities are:

- a. To gather and present evidence for the validation process. This will include evidence of external academic advice, consultation with students and other stakeholders, programme specifications and unit/module descriptors, student handbooks, staff CVs, and any changes to the curriculum or external standards since the last validation event.
- b. To ensure that all relevant staff attend the validation event.
- c. To provide the College with all requested documentation in a timely manner.
- d. To ensure that all necessary action is taken to update programmes/courses following the validation process.
- e. To address any recommendations or required technical corrections arising from the validation process and to report progress to the College as requested.

Academic Partnership Section

18. The responsibilities of the APS are:

- a. To facilitate the validation process. To collate paperwork, produce the Validation Report on behalf of the panel⁴, and send this to the Academic Board for academic approval.
- b. To liaise with the Academic Director to appoint suitable external members to the panel.
- c. To ensure that all necessary action is taken to update programmes following the revalidation or re-approval process.
- d. To co-ordinate with the collaborative partner to ensure the implementation of any conditions, required technical corrections, or recommendations made by the panel.
- e. To report progress to the Academic Board.
- f. To keep copies of the Definitive Programme Documentation of each partner programme.

Validation Panel Membership

19. The membership of each Validation Panel will be independent of the collaborative partner. This will avoid conflicts of interest and enable fully independent scrutiny of any proposals to take place.

20. Each instance of a Validation Panel is convened by the Academic Director, through the APS.

21. Membership of the Panel will be made up as follows:

⁴ The Secretary to the Validation Panel referenced in this procedure will be from the APS.

- The Academic Director who will act as Chair.
- At least one, and up to two members of the College's academic staff
- At least one appropriately qualified member, external to College staff, with academic expertise in the relevant programme area, and who is not associated with the collaborative partner.
- Suitably experienced members from employer or professional bodies, as relevant.
- At least one student representative from the collaborative partner.

22. The Chair may consult others as appropriate e.g., sector experts, other members of College staff. These individuals will not form part of the Validation Panel.

23. The role of the external academic expert is to help the College ensure that the scrutiny of the programme is academically robust.

24. Staff from the collaborative partner will be invited to panel meetings, in order to answer the questions panel members may have. These may include, but are not limited to:

- Senior staff members
- Academic Director or equivalent
- Programme proposer or members of the programme development team
- Programme Director or other relevant academic staff

25. A member of the APS will act as Secretary to the Validation Panel.

A detailed guide to the roles and responsibilities of panel members during the validation process is given in Appendix A.

Criteria for the appointment of panel members

26. Academic expert panel members are nominated and appointed through the APS, in consultation with the Academic Director. They should be able to demonstrate:

- a. Appropriate competence and experience and continuing active involvement in the relevant subject discipline(s).
- b. Relevant academic and/or professional qualifications, normally to at least the level of the qualification being presented for validation, and/or extensive practitioner experience where appropriate.
- c. Knowledge and understanding of relevant external reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality.
- d. Competence and recent experience relating to the design and delivery of programmes of study within the relevant subject discipline(s) to at least the level of the qualification being presented for validation.

27. Employer representatives on the panel are nominated and appointed through the APS, in consultation with the Academic Director, and should:

- a. Be an employer or professional representative of the sector in which graduates might be expected to work.
- b. Be of an appropriate level of seniority or have significant recent professional experience within the relevant field.
- c. Possess sufficient experience within the sector to be able to comment on the relevance of the programme for those wishing to gain employment in the sector.

28. Where relevant, external panel members may also need to satisfy additional criteria set by PSRBs.

29. Terms of appointment for all external panel members should be confirmed in writing.

Circumstances where appointment to a Validation Panel is not permissible

30. The appointment as an external panel member of anyone in the following categories or circumstances is not permissible:

- a. Anyone who has been involved in the design and development of the proposed new programme or is intended to be involved in subsequent programme delivery.
- b. A member of the governing body of the collaborative partner.
- c. A current employee of the collaborative partner.
- d. A current or former external examiner appointed to a programme at the collaborative partner unless a period of five years has elapsed since the appointment ended.
- e. Anyone teaching on a programme where a current employee of the collaborative partner is appointed as the external examiner for the programme.
- f. Anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member staff or the governing body of the collaborative partner.
- g. Anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative activities (including research) with a member of staff of the collaborative partner.
- h. Former staff or students of the collaborative partner institution, unless a period of five years has elapsed since their employment ended or they completed their studies.

Validation Process

31. The validation process involves a Validation Panel meeting of internal and external experts to discuss and recommend approval of the proposed new programme, based on:
- Their prior consideration of a standard set of programme documentation compiled by the APS; and
 - Discussion with key staff and, where relevant, students from the collaborative partner during the Validation Panel meeting.

Submission and circulation of documentation

32. Validation documentation provides the formal record of the programme(s) to be offered to students, and should include:
- a. Collaborative Programmes - Programme Approval Form
 - b. Programme Specification providing a summary of the proposed new programme and associated learning, teaching and assessment strategies.
 - c. Programme or Technical handbook (where relevant)
 - d. Student programme handbook (including unit/module descriptors).
 - e. Definitive programme record.
 - f. Where relevant, any additional student handbooks covering particular aspects of the programme (for example work-based learning or professional practice).
 - g. Mapping of programme and unit/module intended learning outcomes for each award presented for validation (including exit awards).
 - h. Staff CVs.
 - i. Feedback from external academics and/or other stakeholders consulted on curriculum development (if relevant).
 - j. Evidence of, and feedback from, student consultation and input into the programme development.
33. In addition, other relevant policies, procedures, and background documentation should be provided. These may include:
- Degree regulations
 - Fitness to study policy
 - Academic Malpractice Policy
 - Mitigating Circumstances Policy
 - Academic Appeals Procedure
 - External Examiners Policy
 - Disability Policy
 - Admissions Policy
 - Programme Approval Procedure
 - Student Complaints Procedure

- Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy

34. As a minimum a Validation Panel must receive:

- Validation documentation as outlined above
- Validation Panel meeting programme (including details of those attending)
- List of panel members and roles
- This procedure
- Terms of Reference of a Collaborative Programmes Validation Panel
- Validation Threshold Criteria

35. In addition, panel members should be provided with directions to the location of the validation event and should be informed of how to claim expenses.

Before the meeting

36. To do their job effectively, panel members need time to read the documentation thoroughly and to seek clarification in advance on points identified. The Secretary will circulate the documentation to the panel members three weeks prior to the panel meeting. The Secretary will ask for initial written feedback, requesting that the panel members raise any queries for clarification and highlight any areas they wish to particularly explore during the Validation Panel meeting.

37. The Secretary will summarise these comments and circulate them to the panel members and to the collaborative partner as relevant. If time allows, the collaborative partner may respond to straightforward queries prior to a Validation Panel meeting, leaving more time to explore substantive issues on the day.

38. Should any significant shortfalls be identified upon receipt of the documentation, it is the responsibility of a Validation Panel chair to draw these to the attention of the collaborative partner. A significant shortfall will normally fall within one or more of the following categories:

- Deficiencies in information which will leave a Validation Panel unable to draw a reliable conclusion.
- Non-compliance with expected requirements/protocols, such as procedures set out in this procedure or non-adherence with relevant sections of the QAA Quality code.
- Presentation of information which is significantly unclear or contradictory.

Validation Panel Meeting

39. Consideration of the programme proposal will be undertaken through the analysis and discussion of the documentation provided.

40. During the validation process consideration is given to six main themes:

1. The rationale for the new programme.
2. The programme curriculum, its design, content, delivery, and assessment.
3. The appropriateness of the standards set for the level of the award.

4. The suitability of human, physical and other learning resources to support the programme.
5. The student experience offered by the new programme including opportunities for employment and further study for its graduates.
6. The way in which the programme facilitates the widest possible access to ensure that all students can maximise their potential.

41. The considerations below detail the issues on which the panel will focus, in order to assess the proposal and the resource base and learning environment in place for the delivery of the proposed provision.

How judgements are made

42. Collaborative partners should be clear about how these issues are being addressed in their proposal. Validation Panels should use these as discussion prompts when evaluating new programmes but avoid a mechanistic 'tick-box' approach. If any of the following considerations have not been taken into account during the design process this would indicate a significant gap in the development of the programme.

- a. Are the characteristics of the programme clearly defined?
- b. Is the proposal in line with the College's learning and teaching strategy?
- c. Will the programme provide a good learning experience for the likely student intake?
- d. Will the curriculum prepare students for the opportunities potentially available on completion of a programme?
- e. Is the programme designed to ensure that the overall experience of a student has logic and an intellectual integrity that are related to clearly defined purposes?
- f. Is the intellectual challenge and value of the programme defined at the correct level, and with reference to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)?
- g. Has the partner taken account, as appropriate, of external reference points, including any relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statement(s), Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ), the Higher Education Credit Framework for England and the requirements of Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies and employers?
- h. Does the curriculum impose an increasing level of demand on the learner during the course of the programme?
- i. Is the programme balanced, for example in relation to academic and practical elements, personal development and academic outcomes, breadth and depth in the curriculum?
- j. Does the award title reflect the intended learning outcomes of the programme?
- k. Is it clear how the intended learning outcomes of the programme will be promoted, demonstrated, and assessed?
- l. What has the team done to design and implement e-learning into the programme?
- m. Are the identified resources necessary to support the programme and are they in place or committed?

- n. Is the programme designed so that students are treated equally, in accordance with The Equality Act 2010?
- o. Do programme learning outcomes feature employability and career management skills development?
- p. Do placement learning outcomes contribute to the overall coherence and integrity of the programmes, where applicable?

43. The Panel should also ensure that each of the Validation Threshold Criteria has been met and note this in the Validation Report Template.

44. The headings in the Validation Report Template or the Validation Threshold Criteria for the programme may provide a useful structure for discussion.

Outcome of the validation

45. At the end of a Validation Panel meeting, the Panel must decide whether it wishes to recommend approval of the proposal. Observers will be asked to leave the meeting whilst this final discussion and decision making takes place.

46. The Panel's recommendation will fall into one of the following categories:

- **Approval for six years**, without or without conditions and/or required technical corrections, and/or recommendations.
- **Approval for a shorter fixed period**, with or without conditions and/or required technical corrections, and/or recommendations.
- **Not approved** – an invitation given to resubmit.
- **Not approved** – recommendation that the proposal be withdrawn.

47. Approval for six years, which is the standard length of approval, is granted subject to agreed processes of ongoing review and curriculum modification.

48. The recommended outcome and any key conditions or required technical corrections may be fed back to the collaborative partner verbally by the Chair prior to the conclusion of the meeting.

49. A written summary should be given in writing as soon as possible after the meeting. This will be produced by the Secretary and approved by the Panel Chair. It should be made clear that the content of the summary is subject to change, prior to the final report being agreed.

Conditions

50. These are serious issues that must be addressed to the satisfaction of the panel, normally before delivery of the programme can commence or, in the case of a revalidation, to allow the programme to continue after a specified date. When setting conditions, the panel must specify clearly what is to be done, by whom and by when, and what the arrangements will be for ensuring that the given conditions have been satisfied. In certain instances, it may be appropriate to set deadlines for some conditions that fall after the planned start of delivery.

51. Issues not discussed during the day will not be included as conditions unless the panel discusses them with the collaborative partner before issuing the formal report.

Required technical corrections (RTCs)

52. Items that are not serious enough to inhibit the commencement of the programme, but that do need to be addressed as soon as possible, such as changes required to programme handbooks and technical corrections to templates. If the panel chooses to identify the RTCs in a separate list, provided by the Secretary, this list should be appended to the validation report.

53. The collaborative partner is responsible for addressing any RTCs and reporting progress to the APS of the College. They will in turn update the Validation Panel and Academic Board.

Recommendations

54. These should be addressed by the collaborative partner as part of subsequent review and development activities, usually in the form of an Academic Action Plan which will be agreed by the College. The collaborative partner is required to submit a formal response to the recommendations to the panel as a follow-up to the validation.

55. In addition to citing conditions and recommendations of approval, the panel may also wish to identify key observations arising from the validation process, to include exemplary features and examples of good practice.

Preparation of the report and validation follow-up

56. The outcome of a Validation Panel will be fully documented in a report, drafted by the Secretary, which should be finalised and circulated within five weeks of a Validation Panel meeting. The report should be drafted using the Collaborative Partner Validation Panel Meeting Report Template in Appendix B.

57. Panel members will be invited to provide comments on a draft before a final version is agreed. The report, once finalised, will be circulated to key staff within the collaborative partner for factual accuracy. Once checked the Academic Director will send it to the College's Academic Board, usually within 8 weeks. Once Academic Approval has been granted by the Academic Board, it will be sent to the next appropriate meeting of the Governors for final approval. The APS will notify the collaborative partner of the decision and send them a copy of the report.

Responding to conditions and required technical corrections

58. The APS is responsible for coordinating the follow-up activity. This includes ensuring that the collaborative partner provides evidence to the panel that changes have been made and action taken in response to the conditions and required technical corrections set, as well ensuring they produce a formal

response to any recommendations. The documentation produced must be sent to the Secretary for onward transmission to the panel. Where they have received responses, panel members must confirm to the APS that they are satisfied with the action taken in response to the conditions, required technical corrections and recommendations set.

59. Following validation, the APS is responsible for the storage and maintenance of the Programme Specifications, Programme Handbooks and Unit Descriptors (which form the Definitive Programme Documentation) during the life of the programme.
60. The APS is responsible for the appropriate storage of relevant documentation and reports relating to the validation process, so that an accurate record is kept of the process.

Revalidation

61. Collaborative partner programmes are normally validated for a period of six years. Towards the end of this period, the continuing appropriateness of provision is reviewed and confirmed via the revalidation process.
62. Collaborative partner programmes going through revalidation will normally follow the process as Programme Validation with a Pre-Validation Scrutiny by the Colleges PARRC, and subsequent validation event.
63. It is anticipated that some elements of the revalidation process may be less onerous than for a validation, especially if no significant changes have been made to the programme and standards have remained the same.
64. Revalidation may approve a programme for up to a further six years.
65. For revalidations, it is expected that the panel will have the opportunity to meet with a representative group of students (or recent graduates) from the existing programme. The APS will liaise with the collaborative partner to secure appropriate representation.
66. If the outcome of the process is that re-validation is not approved, then the Senior Management Team is responsible for ensuring that the Partner's Student Protection Plan is implemented in a timely and appropriate manner.

Revalidation in relation to Periodic Review

67. Where the re-validation of a programme is scheduled in the same year as a periodic review, the periodic review should be undertaken at least three months prior to the start of the validation process. This will allow enough time for the outcomes of the periodic review to inform the validation. Relevant elements of the periodic review may also be used within the validation process to avoid unnecessary duplication (e.g., student consultation).

Further information

The UK Quality Code for Higher Education

68. All approved programmes must conform to the Quality Assurance Agency's UK Quality Code for Higher Education, found at <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code>

69. Within this website, please note the following especially:

- The Frameworks for HE Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies
- Higher Education Credit Framework for England
- Benchmark statements

Appendix A - Roles and responsibilities of panel members

1. By accepting membership of a Validation Panel, members are expected to allocate reading time as early as possible following receipt of the documentation and to raise points for clarification and discussion in advance. In the spirit of openness and transparency, the likely topics for discussion should be shared with the collaborative partner in advance of a Validation Panel meeting. As a rough guide, panel members should be asked to submit their initial observations on the documentation to the Secretary within two weeks of receipt. There will follow a dialogue between the panel and the Secretary, who will liaise with the collaborative partner, with a view to clarifying as many issues as possible in advance of a Validation Panel meeting. This process should ensure that the focus of a Validation Panel is on the major issues.
2. Depending on the validation type, a combination of all or some of the following members will form a panel:

Validation Panel Chair

3. The Chair's main role is to ensure that a fair judgement about the proposed programme can be made by the end of a Validation Panel meeting and that issues are explored and debated in a way that adds value to the quality of the proposal. Their key responsibilities are as follows:

Before the meeting

- Read through validation documentation as soon as it is available – if there are problems or points that need clarifying beforehand, it is essential to clear these up with the collaborative partner, via the Secretary, as soon as possible and at least one week before a Validation Panel meeting. This is particularly important where there are technical and procedural issues which ought to be clarified prior to a Validation Panel meeting.
- Review preliminary comments from panel members before the panel meeting.
- Decide whether any staff members from the collaborative partner should be invited to attend all or part of the panel meeting, and issue invitations as appropriate via the Secretary.

During the meeting

- Open discussion by establishing the purpose of the meeting and setting a constructive tone at the outset to promote a good dialogue with the programme team.
- Be transparent by making sure all the issues are on the table – share any concerns with the collaborative partner.
- Manage the debate by agreeing who will lead questioning and balance the time available to the topics in proportion with importance – this is done during the first private panel meeting.
- Discourage aggressive questioning styles towards internal staff present.

- Encourage everyone to participate but don't let individual members dominate – they may need to cut short contributions that are unproductive or repeating earlier business.
- Have regard to the core guidelines against which new proposals are validated and ensure that, either through the documentation presented or meeting with the team, these are satisfied.
- Guide the panel through the validation options available if there is a shortfall in meeting the core criteria, which range from not validating to combinations of validating with conditions, with required technical corrections (RTCs), with recommendations for improvement and making observations and commendations.
- Highlight resource deficiencies where these present a serious threat to students having a reasonable chance of achieving programme outcomes. A condition should be set which requires the deficiency to be addressed to the satisfaction of the panel. Chairs should refrain from directing the collaborative partner in how to solve their resource problems. It is useful, however, in the spirit of sharing the expertise of the panel, to give feedback where, in the panel's judgement, enhancements in approaches to delivery could be considered.
- Close the Validation Panel meeting by giving provisional feedback on the outcomes and ensuring dates and follow-up actions are specified, including who is responsible for ensuring conditions have been met.

After the meeting:

- Approve a draft of the conditions and recommendations for circulation by the Secretary to the programme team.
 - Approve the full report (drafted by the Secretary) for circulation to the panel.
 - Confirm in writing to the collaborative partner (via the Secretary) when all the conditions are satisfied. Note: it is the responsibility of the Secretary to co-ordinate submission of the evidence to the Chair and other panel members where appropriate.
4. A new programme proposal should be referred back for further consideration and development if the panel does not have confidence because:
- Resource deficiencies are such that students will not have a reasonable chance of achieving programme outcomes, and there is no strategic commitment to address the shortfall.
 - The academic challenge of the programme is not set at the correct level and is defined without engagement with national reference points.
- 5. If the panel is not confident that deficiencies can, or will, be remedied through setting validation conditions the outcome must be not to recommend validation.**

External panel members

Academic expert

6. Their main role is to give an independent and objective view of the academic quality of the proposal and to draw on their wider experience of provision from other higher education institutions.
7. Their contribution to the validation process is to provide expertise on:
 - Equivalence in academic standards with comparable programmes across the UK higher education sector.
 - Alignment with relevant external reference points, including the UK Quality Code and relevant subject Benchmark Statements.

Employer representatives

8. Employer representatives will contribute their knowledge of the features of the programmes that lead to a valuable professional, creative or vocational profession.
9. Their contribution to the validation process is to:
 - Take an independent expert view and be frank where they judge there are shortfalls in quality or standards to be addressed.
 - Recognise and commend good practice.
 - Be corrective to possible tendencies in programme design or learning and teaching which are stale or no longer effective.
 - Challenge assumptions held by the collaborative partner, or the College, and offer a fresh critical, but constructive, perspective.

Student representative

10. Their main role is to comment on whether the proposal is likely to appeal to students, and on issues relating to student accessibility and support, for example:
 - Whether they feel the methods of learning and assessment described would be accessible to part time as well as full time students, to students with disabilities, and to those of differing ability, culture and gender.
 - Whether the levels of support provided would meet student needs and expectations.
11. They will also be asked to comment on the information provided to students about the new programme, specifically whether the faculty/programme handbook is appropriate and accessible.
12. Further guidance on the role of the student representative will be provided by the College as required.

Validation Secretary

13. Their main role is to prepare the validation report and act as the key point of liaison between the panel and the collaborative partner. They are responsible for coordinating the domestic arrangements for the validation, working closely with the College's Academic Director and Validation Panel Chair. In particular, they are responsible for:

- Booking the venue, refreshments, transport and/or accommodation for panel members.
- Ensuring the documentation is collated and subsequently circulated to the panel.
- Acting as the key point of contact between the panel and the collaborative partner, in respect of collating and sharing the panel's initial observations and circulation of the partners responses to these in advance of the validation.
- At a Validation Panel meeting, keeping minutes on all discussions, including a list of issues that are likely to be identified as conditions, required technical corrections (RTCs) or recommendations.
- Draft the summary of outcomes and circulate an agreed version to the collaborative partner.
- Draft the full validation report and circulate an agreed version to the panel, and then to the collaborative partner.
- Liaise between the panel and collaborative partner, as they respond to any conditions, RTCs and/or recommendations.
- Maintain a full e-record of the validation documentation and audit trail (with hard copies as appropriate).

Appendix B



Collaborative Programmes Validation Panel Meeting Report

Collaborative Partner:

Programme title:

Award (including exit awards):

Mode(s) of study:

Programme Director:

Location of Delivery:

Date of any Previous Validation:

Validating Body:

Anticipated Date of First Intake:

Validation Panel

Chair

External Academic Expert Panel Member

External Employer Representative Panel Member

College Academic Representative/s

Student Representative

Secretary

In attendance:

Section A: Outcome

Approval for six years

Approval for a shorter fixed period

Not approved – invitation to resubmit

Not approved – recommendation that the proposal be withdrawn.

- 1 Recommended Conditions of validation
- 2 Required technical corrections (RTCs)
- 3 Recommendations

The following sections provide a summary of the comments of the panel regarding the programme, including commendations. The section headings are based on the Threshold Criteria for Validation.

Section B: General

Section C: Programme Aims and Outcomes

Section D: Graduate Attributes

Section E : Curriculum

Section F: Learning, Teaching and Assessment

Section G: Entry Requirements, Student Progression and Achievement

Section H: Student Support and Guidance

Section I: Learning Resources

Section J: Quality Management and Enhancement

Section K: Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Issues

(Good practice; areas for development; support for students with disabilities and learning differences). Note that EDI issues are covered in sections 5,9 &10 of the Threshold Criteria.

Section L: Any other observations

(Please include in this section that the panel have confirmed that the programme meets all the Validation Threshold Criteria)

Section M: Authorisation of Report

Chair <date>

Copy sent to Academic Board for Academic Approval <date>

The minutes of the Validation Panel may be attached to this report for additional information and context.