

**Code of practice for the assurance of academic
quality and standards in higher education**

**Section 7: Programme design, approval,
monitoring and review - September 2006**

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2006

First published 2000
Second edition 2006

ISBN 1 84482 556 6

All QAA's publications are available on our website www.qaa.ac.uk

Printed copies of current publications are available from:

Linney Direct

Adamsway

Mansfield

NG18 4FN

Tel 01623 450788

Fax 01623 450629

Email qaa@linneydirect.com

Registered charity number 1062746

Contents

Foreword	1
Introduction	4
Precepts and explanations	6
General precepts	6
Programme design	9
Programme approval	12
Programme monitoring and review	13
Programme withdrawal	16
Evaluation of processes	16
Appendix 1: The precepts	18
Appendix 2	21
Appendix 3	24
Appendix 4: Sources of further information	28
Appendix 5: Membership of the advisory group	29

Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education: Programme design, approval, monitoring and review

Foreword

1 This document is the second edition of a code of practice for programme design, approval, monitoring and review in UK higher education institutions. It is one of a suite of interrelated documents which forms an overall *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education (Code of practice)* for the guidance of organisations subscribing to the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) and other bodies offering UK higher education.

2 The overall *Code of practice* and its 10 constituent sections were originally prepared by QAA between 1998 and 2001 in response to the Reports of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and its Scottish Committee (the *Dearing* and *Garrick Reports*). The *Code of practice* supports the national arrangements within the UK for quality assurance in higher education. It identifies a comprehensive series of system-wide principles (precepts) covering matters relating to the management of academic quality and standards in higher education. It provides an authoritative reference point for institutions as they consciously, actively and systematically assure the academic quality and standards of their programmes, awards and qualifications.

3 The *Code of practice* assumes that, taking into account principles and practices agreed UK-wide, each institution has its own systems for independent verification both of its quality and standards and of the effectiveness of its quality assurance systems. In developing the *Code of practice*, extensive advice has been sought from a range of knowledgeable practitioners.

4 The *Code of practice* does not incorporate statutory requirements relating to relevant legislation, for example the *Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001*. It assumes that institutions

have an overriding obligation in all such cases to ensure that they meet the requirements of legislation. However, where a section of the *Code of practice* is related to legislative or similar obligations, efforts have been made to ensure compatibility between them.

5 Since 2001 a number of developments in UK higher education have encouraged QAA to begin a revision of individual sections of the *Code of practice*. In undertaking this task QAA has also decided to review the structure of the sections and, in particular, to replace the original 'precepts and guidance' format with a 'precepts and explanation' approach, using the explanations to make clear why the precepts are considered important and reducing opportunities for a 'checklist' approach to the *Code of practice*. In doing so QAA has sought to meet Recommendation 4 (part 4) of the Better Regulation Task Force in its report *Higher Education: Easing the Burden*, July 2002. This revised section has also taken account of the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*.

6 Revised sections of the *Code of practice* are therefore now structured into a series of precepts and accompanying explanations. The precepts express key matters of principle that the higher education community has identified as important for the assurance of quality and academic standards. Individual institutions should be able to demonstrate they are addressing the matters tackled by the precepts effectively, through their own management and organisational processes, taking account of institutional needs, traditions, culture and decision-making. The accompanying explanations show why the precepts are important.

7 The *Code of practice* is a statement of good practice that has been endorsed by the higher education community. As such it is useful in QAA's audit and review processes that consider the extent to which an institution, in developing and implementing its own policies, has taken account of the *Code of practice* and its precepts.

8 Institutions may find the explanations useful for developing their own policy and for allowing some flexibility of practice at subject

level, depending on local needs. It is important to emphasise that the explanations do not form part of QAA's expectations of institutional practice when QAA teams are conducting audits and reviews.

9 Academic staff in departments and schools do not necessarily need to be familiar with the detail of all of the various sections of the *Code of practice*, although they might well be expected to be familiar with the institutional policies it informs and any parts which are particularly relevant to their own responsibilities.

10 To assist users, the precepts are listed, without the accompanying explanations, in Appendix 1 to this section of the *Code of practice*.

11 The first version of this section of the *Code of practice* was published in April 2000. The publication of this second version follows consultation with staff in institutions, who have helped to update the *Code of practice* to take account of institutions' practical experience of using the guidance contained in its predecessor.

Introduction

12 The second version of this section of the *Code of practice* takes as its starting point the principle that formal and effective procedures should exist in all institutions for the design, approval, monitoring and review of programmes of study. It takes into account various changes in context since 2000, including changes in QAA's external review and audit processes, and the subsequent emphasis on institutions' own responsibilities to assure the standards of their awards and quality of the students' learning experiences. It is also mindful of the continuing work in the UK on the development of a credit framework, including consideration of the European Credit and Transfer System, the existing Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework and the Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales. The progress of the Bologna process and the development of the framework of qualifications for the European Higher Education Area have also been considered.

13 This section of the *Code of practice* provides a set of precepts, with accompanying explanation, on the arrangements for programme design, approval, monitoring and review that institutions should consider when developing and reviewing their procedures. For the purpose of this section of the *Code of practice* a programme is defined as an approved curriculum followed by a registered student. This will normally be a named award route that leads to the intended learning outcomes set out in the relevant programme specification. Programmes may be offered at different levels within a single subject. A programme may be multidisciplinary, for example, a joint honours degree or a combined honours degree. The term programme may also refer to the main pathways through a modular scheme, which may itself include several subjects. In many institutions programmes are constructed from individual units or modules which have their own outcomes. The principles of design, approval, monitoring and review that are set out in this section of the *Code of practice* may, where appropriate, be equally applied to such units.

14 Programme design is a creative, and often, innovative activity. The processes used by institutions to approve, monitor and review academic programmes should foster creativity, and encourage a culture of continuous enhancement of provision.

15 At the end of this section of the *Code of practice* are five appendices. Appendices two and three are intended to provide institutions with a framework of the kinds of questions that might be considered by, on the one hand, programme designers and, on the other, approval and review panels. Institutions will also want to cross-refer to other, relevant sections of the *Code of practice*.

Precepts and explanations

General precepts

1

Institutions ensure that their responsibilities for standards and quality are discharged effectively through their procedures for:

- the design of programmes
- the approval of programmes
- the monitoring and review of programmes.

The monitoring and review of programmes are central to an institution's assurance of the quality and standards of its provision. When evaluating policies and practices for programme design, approval and review against this precept, it is important to consider whether due account is taken of:

- external reference points, including any relevant subject benchmark statements, national frameworks for higher education qualifications and, where appropriate, the requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs), employers and any relevant national legislation/national commitments to European and international processes
- the compatibility of programme proposals and developments with institutional goals and mission
- strategic academic and resource planning
- existing provision within the institution, including any awards that may be offered jointly with other UK or overseas institutions
- the level of risk involved in each approval/review process and the optimal level of resource necessary to ensure that the required outcomes of the process are achieved.

2

Institutions ensure that the overriding responsibility of the academic authority (eg senate or academic board) to set, maintain and assure standards is respected and that any delegation of power by the academic authority to approve or review programmes is properly defined and exercised.

It is important that the respective roles, responsibilities and authority of different bodies involved in programme design, approval, monitoring and review are clearly defined in order that staff and students involved in such processes are clear about the hierarchy of procedures and about which body will take final responsibility. The evaluation of any delegated power is important in allowing the institution to ensure that it is continuing to operate its processes in an effective manner.

3

Institutions make use of external participation at key stages for the approval and review of programmes, as independence and objectivity are essential to provide confidence that the standards and quality of the programmes are appropriate.

External participation is important for ensuring that programmes are designed, developed, approved and reviewed in the light of independent advice and for ensuring both transparency of process and confirmation of standards. Such external participation provides assurance at various levels: to the team delivering the programme and to the institution itself in monitoring the independence and objectivity of decisions taken under its procedures; to its students; and to any reviewers who may carry out reviews/audits that are external to the institution's own processes.

It is important that institutions ensure they make use of external contributions of an appropriate kind when developing, approving and reviewing programmes. External examiners may provide useful contributions at various stages of approval and review processes but, for the purpose of demonstrating impartiality, they are unlikely to be appropriate members of formal approval and review panels. It is also

important that this external participation is proportionate to the level, importance and complexity of the process being followed. Useful contributions could be made in different ways by, for example:

- external advisers who provide relevant information and guidance on current developments in the discipline(s). In considering the guidance provided by academic peers from other institutions, the Higher Education Academy may be a useful resource, particularly through its Subject Centres, in providing access to staff working in specific subject areas
- academic peers from other disciplines within the institution
- any programme partners, for example, institutions with which there are collaborative arrangements
- students, either studying on the programme or with an appropriate representative role
- graduates from the programme
- appropriate PSRBs
- external sources and advisers who provide relevant information and guidance on current developments including, for example, in the workplace. (see Appendix 4 for illustrative examples of such sources).

The use of appropriate externality in processes for programme design, approval and review may also allow an institution to avail itself of opportunities for enhancement, as well as for assurance.

4

Approval, monitoring and review processes are clearly described and communicated to those who are involved in them.

It is important that processes for approval and review of programmes are understood by all those who are involved or who have an interest in them. The following may help institutions as they consider the clarity and accessibility of their processes:

- the publication of clear principles and procedures for the approval and review of programmes, that are available to all staff and students in the institution and to external participants in the processes, including the institution's own processes for deciding whether to group programmes together for review purposes or to scrutinise them in a more detailed, individual way
- the clear statement of the different stages of approval and review and the clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of participants (see precept 2)
- the clear definition of the responsibility for initiating the process of primary consideration, monitoring and review of programmes
- how staff development strategies and activities may include the dissemination of good practice in relation to programme design, approval, monitoring and review.

Programme design

The rationale underlying this section of the *Code of practice* is that programme design, approval, monitoring and review are linked, and that the processes involved need to be seen in a holistic and integrated manner. Good programme design creates programmes that facilitate the delivery of the intended learning outcomes and required standards, and is fundamental when institutions approve new programmes or review the effectiveness of existing provision. Where practices for the initial design and approval of programmes are rigorous and effective, subsequent evaluation is likely to be relatively straightforward. Duplication of effort and documentation can be reduced if the requirements of external bodies, such as PSRBs and QAA, are taken into account when programmes are designed, approved and reviewed.

5

Institutions publish, or make available, the principles to be considered when programmes are designed and developed, the fulfilment of which will be tested at the approval stage.

Proper design and development of a programme is crucial for ensuring that it is relevant and sustainable. It is also important for its successful delivery. If the design processes are well thought through and operate effectively, they can assist in the successful operation of later approval, monitoring and review procedures. There are many principles and reference points that may be considered when designing and developing a new programme. These include:

- the institution's goals and mission
- the intended aims of the programme
- the level of the programme - its intellectual challenge and value - and its place in a national and/or European qualifications framework
- external reference points, including any relevant subject benchmark statements, any European reference points, national qualifications frameworks for higher education and, where appropriate, the requirements of PSRBs and employers
- the role of students in the design and development of programmes
- the concept of progression, so that the curriculum imposes an increasing level of demand on the learner during the course of the programme (see Appendix 2 for an explanation of 'level')
- opportunities which might be available to students on completion of a programme
- the balance of the programme, for example, in relation to academic and practical elements, personal development and academic outcomes, breadth and depth in the curriculum
- the coherence of the programme, to ensure that the overall experience of a student has a logic and an intellectual integrity that are related to clearly defined purposes (see Appendix 2)

- the award title, to ensure it reflects the intended learning outcomes of the programme
- how the intended learning outcomes of the programme will be promoted, demonstrated and assessed
- that the necessary resources are available to support the programme.

In those cases where a module programme may be negotiated by an individual student, with guidance and agreement from the institution, the design principles should, in particular, inform the policies and procedures within which such negotiation takes place.

A set of criteria for programme design, which institutions might find helpful to consider when determining their own guidance, is described briefly in Appendix 2. It is presented as a series of questions that those designing and developing programmes may wish to ask themselves as they go through the process. It is relevant to all programmes but may be of particular help to demonstrate that standards are appropriately established for interdisciplinary and innovative programmes for which there are no directly relevant subject-specific external reference points. It may also be useful for those staff working in collaborative partnerships with other institutions.

Programme approval

6

Institutions ensure that programme approval decisions are informed by full consideration of academic standards and of the appropriateness of the learning opportunities which will be offered to students, and that:

- **the final decision to approve a programme is taken by the academic authority, or a body acting on its behalf that is independent of the academic department, or other unit that offers the programme, and has access to any necessary specialist advice**
- **there is a confirmation process, which demonstrates that a programme has fulfilled any conditions set out during the approval process and that due consideration has been given to any recommendations.**

With regard to the responsibility of an individual institution for the assurance of the quality and standards of its awards, and in the interests of transparency, it is important that there is a clear designation of the body responsible for approving a programme and for ensuring that all conditions have been met before the programme begins.

It is important for institutions to be clear about the type of process that is appropriate to different kinds of approval; for example, for a new programme, a new module/unit, or a change in the balance of assessment within a module/unit. It may be helpful for this decision to be based on proportionality and risk analysis, with institutions making informed decisions about the kind of process and level of externality that will be appropriate.

During the period of design, approval and commencement of a new programme, the following may be considered (some institutions have a two-stage approval process and will want to consider which of the following are appropriate to which stage):

- the design principles underpinning the programme
- the definition and appropriateness of standards in accordance with the level and title of the award
- the necessary resources to support the programme
- anticipated demand for the programme
- monitoring and review arrangements for the programme
- the length of time for which approval is granted
- the contents of the programme specification
- the nature of the learning opportunities offered by the programme
- the development of the programme between its approval and start
- the relationship between the programme's curriculum and current research in the same area.

Programme monitoring and review

Institutions should consider the appropriate balance between routine monitoring and periodic review of programmes so that there is a continuous cycle. Routine monitoring is an activity likely to be undertaken within the providing unit. Periodic review is normally an institutional process, involving external participants of high calibre and with academic/professional credibility. In developing and evaluating such processes, institutions will want to be assured that they are monitoring the cumulative impact of small/incremental changes.

7

Institutions routinely monitor (in an agreed cycle) the effectiveness of their programmes:

- **to ensure that programmes remain current and valid in light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and practice in its application**
- **to evaluate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes are being attained by students**
- **to evaluate the continuing effectiveness of the curriculum and of assessment in relation to the intended learning outcomes**
- **to ensure that recommendations for appropriate actions are followed up to remedy any identified shortcomings.**

Routine monitoring of programmes is important; it allows providers to consider the effectiveness of the programme in achieving its stated aims, and the success of students in attaining the intended learning outcomes. It is a process to which an element of proportionality and risk analysis may be applied, with institutions making informed decisions about the kind of process that will be appropriate. Routine monitoring activity, which will often be the responsibility of people who appraise their own performance at the end of each academic year, may consider, for example:

- external examiners' reports
- any reports from accrediting or other external bodies
- staff and student feedback
- feedback from former students and their employers
- student progress and other relevant data
- material available to students such as programme specifications, student handbooks and websites.

Effective and prompt follow-up of any recommendations made will protect the interests of current students and should also allow any staff and resource development needs to be addressed.

8

Institutions periodically undertake a broader review of the continuing validity and relevance of programmes offered.

The timing and nature of reviews will depend on a number of factors, including the rate of development of knowledge and practice in the discipline, the extent to which wider questions of overall aims are dealt with in routine monitoring, and overall institutional policy on such reviews. It is important to remember the concept of continuous evaluation; evaluation processes are not carried out in isolation from one another or from other institutional priorities.

Periodic review assesses the continuing validity and relevance of the programme in the light of, for example, the following:

- the effect of changes, including those which are cumulative and those made over time, to the design and operation of the programme
- the continuing availability of staff and physical resources
- current research and practice in the application of knowledge in the relevant discipline(s), technological advances, and developments in teaching and learning
- changes to external points of reference, such as subject benchmark statements, relevant PSRB requirements
- changes in student demand, employer expectations and employment opportunities
- data relating to student progression and achievement, including that available on the Teaching Quality Information website
- student feedback, including the National Student Survey.

Programme withdrawal

9

In the event of a decision to discontinue a programme, measures are taken to notify and protect the interests of students registered for, or accepted for admission to, the programme.

Institutions are responsible for managing their portfolio of provision, including any awards that are offered jointly with another UK or overseas institution, and other collaborative partners. This may involve the withdrawal of existing programmes as well as the design and development of new ones.

It is important that the process for the orderly withdrawal of programmes is as well embedded, articulated and understood as those for design, approval and review.

In the event of significant changes to the character of the programme, an institution needs to have a process in place to manage this change effectively. It also needs to be clear about what, in its own institutional context, constitutes a significant alteration to the character of the programme, and how any collaborating partners are kept informed.

Evaluation of processes

10

Institutions have a means of assessing the effectiveness of their programme design, approval, monitoring and review practices.

Evaluation of processes can provide a focus for enhancement and will allow institutions to consider:

- the benefits gained by the institution, staff, students and other stakeholders from the approval, monitoring and review activities undertaken
- how the outcomes of processes promote enhancement of students' learning experiences
- the identification and dissemination of effective practice, both internally and externally

- opportunities to make approval and review practices more effective and efficient
- whether the institution, through its processes, is managing risk appropriately and proportionately for its portfolio of programmes.

Appendix 1

The precepts

General precepts

1

Institutions ensure that their responsibilities for standards and quality are discharged effectively through their procedures for:

- **the design of programmes**
- **the approval of programmes**
- **the monitoring and review of programmes.**

2

Institutions ensure that the overriding responsibility of the academic authority (eg senate or academic board) to set, maintain and assure standards is respected and that any delegation of power by the academic authority to approve or review programmes is properly defined and exercised.

3

Institutions make use of external participation at key stages for the approval and review of programmes, as independence and objectivity are essential to provide confidence that the standards and quality of the programmes are appropriate.

4

Approval, monitoring and review processes are clearly described and communicated to those who are involved with them.

Programme design

5

Institutions publish, or make available, the principles to be considered when programmes are designed and developed, the fulfilment of which will be tested at the approval stage.

Programme approval

6

Institutions ensure that programme approval decisions are informed by full consideration of academic standards and of the appropriateness of the learning opportunities which will be offered to students, and that:

- the final decision to approve a programme is taken by the academic authority, or a body acting on its behalf that is independent of the academic department, or other unit that offers the programme, and has access to any necessary specialist advice
- there is a confirmation process, which demonstrates that a programme has fulfilled any conditions set out during the approval process and that due consideration has been given to any recommendations.

Programme monitoring and review

7

Institutions routinely monitor (in an agreed cycle) the effectiveness of their programmes:

- to ensure that programmes remain current and valid in light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and practice in its application
- to evaluate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes are being attained by students
- to evaluate the continuing effectiveness of the curriculum and of assessment in relation to the intended learning outcomes
- to ensure that recommendations for appropriate actions are followed up to remedy any identified shortcomings.

8

Institutions periodically undertake a broader review of the continuing validity and relevance of programmes offered.

Programme withdrawal

9

In the event of a decision to discontinue a programme, measures are taken to notify and protect the interests of students registered for, or accepted for admission to, the programme.

Evaluation of processes

10

Institutions have a means of assessing the effectiveness of their programme design, approval, monitoring and review practices.

Appendix 2

This Appendix does not form part of the *Code of practice, Section 7: Programme design, approval, monitoring and review*. It is included to provide a series of prompts for institutions to consider when determining their own guidance on programme design and for providers to use when working with institutional processes in this area. It may prove useful for staff development purposes and as guidance for any participants in the design and approval process(es) who are external to the institution.

In many institutions programmes are constructed from individual units, or modules, which have their own outcomes. The principles of design, approval, monitoring and review that are set out in this section of the *Code of practice* may, where appropriate, be applied equally to such units or modules. In those cases where a modular programme may be negotiated by an individual student, with guidance and agreement from the institution, the design principles in particular should inform the policies and procedures within which such negotiation takes place.

Academic programmes fulfil a range of purposes including the provision of personal academic development, preparation for knowledge creation and research, preparation for specific (often professional) employment or for general employment, or as preparation for lifelong learning. Understanding and defining the balance of purposes is important in order to design a curriculum and to provide the related learning opportunities that will enable the stated intended learning outcomes to be achieved. Institutions should aim to design and deliver programmes that reflect current knowledge and best practice and meet the requirements of the student target group and the goals and strategic plans of the institution.

Design criteria

- Do the institutional guidelines for the design of programmes allow for the promotion of good practice in programme design?

- Do they provide the assurance that standards are set appropriately and intended learning outcomes specified accordingly?

Level

- At what level is the programme being designed/evaluated?
- What is the level of the intended learning outcomes for the programme for any named stages in the programme? (A level is an indicator of the relative demand, complexity, depth of study and learner autonomy involved in a programme. Various systems are currently in use to identify levels, including descriptors indicating the intellectual and skill attainment expected of students).
- What is the location of the programme on *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*? Are there any European or other reference points that should be considered with regard to level?

Progression

- Does the curriculum promote progression so that the demands on the learner in intellectual challenge, skills, knowledge, conceptualisation and learning autonomy increase?

Flexibility

- Has the range of requirements of learners likely to enter the programme been considered?

Coherence

- Has the overall coherence and intellectual integrity of the programme been considered?
- Has the programme been designed in a way that will ensure the student's experiences has a logic and integrity that are clearly linked to the purpose of the programme?

- Have the academic and practical elements and opportunities for personal development and the academic outcomes been considered?
- Have the breadth and depth of the subject material to be included in the programme been determined?

Integrity

- Are the expectations given to students and others about the intended learning outcomes of the programme realistic and deliverable?
- Has the feasibility of attainment of the outcomes been considered?

Reference points

- Have internal and external points of reference been used to inform the design of the programme? (External reference points might be provided by a subject benchmark statement, information about similar or parallel programmes elsewhere or expectations of PSRBs, or employer expectations (for example, as set out in occupational standards). In a student negotiated programme, an inherent part of the negotiation process will involve the student and tutor, in designing the programme, taking into consideration the intended level of the award and jointly agreeing the relevant sources of reference).

Appendix 3

This Appendix is not part of the *Code of practice*. It is included to assist institutional review panels. While the *Code of practice* does not require that institutions use these questions, they may be useful as a framework for routine monitoring and periodic review panels. Institutions will wish to determine their own approaches but might find it helpful to consider the questions as they reflect on their practices. They may prove useful for staff development purposes and as guidelines for any participants in the routine monitoring and periodic review process(es).

How do the intended learning outcomes relate to external reference points and to the broad aims of the provision?

- 1 What are the intended learning outcomes for a programme?
- 2 How do they relate to external reference points including relevant subject benchmark statements, the qualifications framework, the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* and any professional body requirements?
- 3 How do they relate to the overall aims of the provision as stated by the subject provider?
- 4 Are they appropriate to the aims?

How are the curricula design principles used to permit achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

- 5 How does the provider ensure that curriculum content enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes?
- 6 How does the provider ensure that the design and organisation of the curriculum is effective in promoting student learning and achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

How are the intended learning outcomes communicated to students, staff and external examiners?

- 7 How are the intended outcomes of a programme and its constituent parts communicated to staff, students and external examiners?
- 8 Do the students know what is expected of them?

How does the subject provider create the conditions for achievement of the intended learning outcomes?

- 9 Do the design and content of the curricula encourage achievement of the intended learning outcomes in terms of knowledge and understanding, cognitive skills, subject-specific skills (including practical/professional skills), transferable skills, progression to employment and/or further study, and personal development?
- 10 Is there evidence that curricular content and design is informed by recent developments in techniques of teaching and learning, by current research and scholarship, and by any changes in relevant occupational or professional requirements?

How does the assessment process work?

- 11 Does the assessment process enable learners to demonstrate achievement of all the intended learning outcomes?
- 12 Are there criteria that enable internal and external examiners to distinguish between different categories of achievement?
- 13 Can there be full confidence in the security and integrity of assessment procedures?
- 14 Does the assessment strategy have an adequate formative function in developing student abilities?

- 15 What evidence is there that the standards achieved by learners meet the minimum expectations for the award, as measured against relevant subject benchmark statements and the qualifications framework?

How does the institution review and improve the quality of the student learning experience?

- 16 How does the institution review and seek to enhance the quality of the student learning experience? Does it have strategies for building upon its quality assurance processes to enhance the quality of its provision?
- 17 How effective is teaching in relation to curriculum content and programme aims?
- 18 How effectively do staff draw upon their research, scholarship or professional activity to inform their teaching?
- 19 How good are the materials provided to support learning?
- 20 Is there effective engagement with and participation by students?
- 21 Is the quality of teaching maintained and enhanced through effective staff development, peer review of teaching, integration of part-time and visiting staff, effective team teaching and induction and mentoring of new staff?
- 22 How effectively is learning facilitated in terms of student workloads?

How is students' learning supported?

- 23 Is there an appropriate overall strategy for academic support, including written guidance, which is consistent with the student profile and the overall aims of the provision?
- 24 Are there effective arrangements for admission and induction which are generally understood by staff and applicants?

- 25 How effectively is learning facilitated by academic guidance, feedback and supervisory arrangements?
- 26 Are the arrangements for support clear and generally understood by staff and students?
- 27 Are students offered careers guidance?

How satisfactory are learning resources and how are they deployed?

- 28 Is the collective expertise of the staff suitable and available for effective delivery of the curricula, for the overall teaching, learning and assessment strategy and for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes?
- 29 Are appropriate staff development opportunities available?
- 30 Is appropriate technical and administrative support available?
- 31 Is there an overall strategy for the deployment of learning resources?
- 32 How effectively is learning facilitated in terms of the provision of resources?
- 33 Is suitable teaching and learning accommodation available?
- 34 Are the subject book and periodical stocks appropriate and accessible?
- 35 Are suitable equipment and appropriate information technology facilities available to learners?

Appendix 4

Sources of further information

The following websites may provide further sources of information.

- The Higher Education Academy (www.heacademy.ac.uk)
- Foundation Degree Forward (www.fdf.ac.uk)
- Information on external review processes operated by QAA (www.qaa.ac.uk)
- Teaching Quality Information (www.tqi.ac.uk)
- The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (www.enqa.eu)
- *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*. March 2005 (www.enqa.eu/pubs.lasso)

Appendix 5

Membership of the advisory group

Janet Alleyne	Head of Quality Management and Audit Unit, University of Ulster
Keith Bartlett	Deputy Principal, Norwich School of Art and Design
Helen Bowles	Policy Adviser, Standing Conference of Principals
Dr Richard Brown	Development Officer, The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education
Fiona Crozier	Assistant Director, The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education
Damian Day	Head of Accreditation, Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain
Richard Hughes	Head of Academic Policy Support, University of Oxford
David McParlin	Academic Secretary, University of Wales, Aberystwyth
Professor Robert Mears	Head of School of Social Sciences, Bath Spa University
Paul Mitchell	Higher Education Consultant
Dr Larry Roberts	Director of Academic Development, Kingston University
Clive Robertson	Director, Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism
Jenny Saint	Associate Dean, School of Animal, Rural and Environmental Sciences, Nottingham Trent University

Dr Frank Quinault Director of Learning and Teaching Quality,
University of St Andrews

Greg Wade Policy Adviser, Universities UK

The design criteria set out in Appendix 2 were drafted by a sector-wide Advisory Group on Multidisciplinary and Modular Provision which reported to QAA in November 1999.



The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

Southgate House
Southgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000
Fax 01452 557070
Email comms@qaa.ac.uk
Web www.qaa.ac.uk

QAA 121 07/2006