



AUM ACADEMIC QUALITY HANDBOOK

CONTENTS

Introduction

PART I: PROGRAMME, COURSE DEVELOPMENTS.....PAGE 8

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

- 1.1. Introduction
- 1.2. Review Procedure
- 1.3 Amendments to Existing Provision
- 1.4 Programme Approval
- 1.5 Exit Award Approval
- 1.6 Professional and Regulatory Body Visits

2. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

2.1 Educational Programme Review Procedure

2.2. Guidance - Educational Programme Review Procedure

2.2.1 Approval of Programme Titles

2.2.2 Planning and Scheduling of the Review Event

2.2.3 Review Panels

2.2.4 Documentation and QA Approval

2.2.5 Online and Blended Delivery

2.2.6 Outcomes of Review Event

2.2.7 College Response to Outcomes of Review Event

2.2.8 Review Report

2.2.9 Evaluation of Process

2.2.10 Documentation Requirements – Educational Programme Review

2.3 Structure of Review Documentation

2.3.1 Production of Review Documentation

2.3.2 Content of Part 1: Overview

2.3.3 Part 2: Detailed Course Descriptor

2.3.4 Part 3: Programme Descriptors

2.3.5 Preparation of Summary Curriculum Vitae (Academic Staff)

3. AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING STUDY PROGRAMMES

3.1 Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) Discussion Procedure

3.2 College Level Approval Procedure

4. PROGRAMME APPROVAL PROCEDURE

5. EXIT AWARD COURSE APPROVAL PROCEDURE

5.1 Exit Award Course Approval Procedure

5.2 Third Party Collaboration

5.3 Quality Assurance of Programmes Delivered as Exit Awards

6. AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING PROGRAMMES AND EXIT COURSES

6.1 College Level Discussion Procedure

7. PROFESSIONAL AND/OR REGULATORY BODY (PRB) VISITS

8. PROCEDURE FOR CESSATION OF A STUDY PROGRAMM

9. MARKETING AND RESEARCH FOR NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES

PART II. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS.....PAGE 22

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

2. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURE2

3. GUIDANCE - QUESTIONNAIRES

3.1 Student Programme/Course Evaluation and Student Experience Questionnaires

3.2 Feedback to Students arising from Questionnaires

4. ANNUAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS

4.1 Annual Programme Reviews

4.2 Educational Programme Review

4.2.1 Standard Courses/Programs

4.2.2 Credit-Rated Short Courses/Exit Awards

4.3 Guidance for Completion of Annual Programme Review Reports

4.4 THE REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

PART III. INTERNAL REVIEW: GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES Page 31

1.OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

2. INTERNAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

3. GUIDANCE

3.1.Planning and Scheduling of the Internal Review Event

3.2 Review Panels

3.3 Programme/Course Documentation and Approval

3.4 Outcomes of Internal Review

3.5 College Response to Outcomes of Internal Review

3.6 Review Report

4. GUIDELINES TO INTERNAL REVIEW REPORT

PART IV. EXTERNAL REVIEWER

ARRANGEMENTS..... PAGE 39

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

1.2 Administrative Responsibilities

1.3 GUIDANCE NOTE ON THE EXTERNAL REVIEWER ROLE AND EXPECTATIONS

1.3.1 Authority and Responsibilities of External Reviewers

Part V. WORK-BASED LEARNING: INTERNSHIP PROVISION.....PAGE 41

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

2. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

2.1 Internship Arrangements

2.2 Internship Provision

2.2.1 Academic and Support Issues

2.2.2 Health and Safety

2.2.3 Internship Providers

3. STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4. STUDENT SUPPORT AND INFORMATION

5. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

5.1 College Responsibilities

5.2 University Responsibilities

6. DEALING WITH COMPLAINTS

7. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF INTERNSHIP LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

7.1 During Internships

7.2 After Conclusion of Internships

8. EXEMPLAR DOCUMENT FOR INTERNSHIP ARRANGEMENTS

9. SUGGESTED LIST - STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND RIGHTS

10. SUGGESTED LIST - STUDENT SUPPORT AND INFORMATION

Before the start of the Internship

During the Internship

After the Internship

Part VI. ACADEMIC COLLABORATION.....PAGE 50

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Types of Academic Collaboration

1.3 Overview of the Approval of Academic Collaboration

1.4 Guidance: Preparing an Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma

1.5 Guidance: Contract of Collaboration

1.6 Guidance: Quality Assurance

1.7 Guidance: The Role of the Moderator

1.8 Guidance: The Role of the External Reviewer

2. APPROVAL PROCEDURE: FRANCHISED COURSES

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Preparation and Submission of Paperwork to Curriculum Development Committee/CDC

2.3 Planning the Approval Event

2.4 Approval Event

2.5 Purpose of the Approval Event

2.6 Documentation Requirements for the Approval Event

2.7 Format and Layout of the Supporting Information and Resources Document

2.8 External Reviewer Arrangements

3. APPROVAL PROCEDURE: VALIDATED COURSES

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Preparation and Submission of Paperwork to AC

3.3 Planning the Review Event

3.4 Review Event

3.5 Documentation Requirements for the Review Event

3.6 External Reviewer Arrangements

4. APPROVAL PROCEDURE: CREDIT-RATING OF EXTERNAL PROVISION

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Preparation and Submission of Paperwork to CDC

4.3 Planning the Approval Event

4.4 Approval Process

4.5 External Reviewer Arrangements

5. APPROVAL PROCEDURE: STUDENT EXCHANGE STUDY PERIODS

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Approval Process

5.3 Responsibilities of the Dean in Approval Process

5.4 External Reviewer Arrangements - Student Exchange Study Periods

5.5 Ongoing Management and Monitoring

5.6 Review of a Student Exchange Study Period Agreement

INTRODUCTION

The *Academic Quality Handbook* serves as a key constituent of the University's quality assurance framework, defining and providing detailed operational guidance on the University's quality assurance procedures. The three main components include:

- **Program/Course Review** – a process whereby all new courses/programs are subject to formal consideration and approval prior to implementation.
- **Annual Review** – a process whereby the delivery of all courses/programs and output standards achieved are monitored.
- **Internal Review** – a process conducted on an annual and 5 yearly basis which consists of two major elements i.e., review of educational programs and their developments.

Other sections of the *Academic Quality Handbook* refer to:

- **Academic Collaboration**
- **External Reviewers**
- **Internships**

The *Academic Quality Handbook* is subject to regular annual review, the impetus for which includes:

- Ongoing process to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of QA procedures.
- Feedback from externals engaged with the University's internal procedures
- Changes within the external quality assurance environment, in particular, further revisions to sections of the *Malta Further and Higher Education (Licensing, Accreditation and Quality Assurance) Regulations* <https://legislation.mt/eli/sl/607.3/eng> and the devolved responsibility for undertaking a review of all subject provision within a five-year cycle.

Fundamental to the effective operation of all the quality assurance procedures are the University's committees. The most senior of these are the *Board of Trustees, Academic Council and University Council*, the latter assuming responsibility on behalf of the Board of Trustees for the overall planning, development, and supervision of the academic work of the University. The Committees have also key roles in overseeing the development and implementation of the University's quality assurance framework and in monitoring quality and standards.

The executive authority is for approving/implementing transactional activity associated with the University's quality assurance procedures. The key postholders in this respect are:

- The President in his role as the Chair of University Council (*Institutional development and Quality*)
- The Provost in his role as Chair of Academic Council (*Academic Development and Quality*)
- Deans of Colleges in their roles as Heads of Colleges and members of the University and Academic Councils

Further details of executive roles and responsibilities are available from the University's *AUM Organizational Chart*.

Operational support to the Colleges of the University is provided by the academic and non-academic units, including the *Registrar, QA Office, Student Affairs Department, Admissions Department, Student Affairs, HR and others*. The University's focus for quality improvement is the holistic student experience, and effective engagement with students is integral to the University's approach to the assurance and improvement of the quality of teaching and learning. This student engagement includes, *inter alia*:

- Engagement and collaboration with the Student Union
- Student Survey (Programme Evaluation Questionnaire and Student Expérience Questionnaires)
- Staff/student liaison arrangements at educational programme level
- Student representation on Internal Review Panels
- Student representation on all the University's committees
- Annual meetings of the Provost and Deans with Students/or Representatives

The University's *Quality Assurance system* is the key mechanism for monitoring progress towards the University's improvement priorities. The system described in this Handbook is reviewed each year through a combined top-down and bottom-up approach.

PART I: PROGRAMME, COURSE DEVELOPMENTS

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

1.1 Introduction

All the University's course/programme provision is designed using the *Malta Qualifications Framework (MQF)*, which means its awards are described in terms of MQF Levels and ECTS credits. A full description of the MQF may be found at its website [https:// www.mfhea.mt](https://www.mfhea.mt) and at AUM website and its application to the University's awards is prescribed in policies.

The University defines a *programme* as the approved curriculum followed by an individual student that leads to named award and/or the achievement of academic credit.

This Section of the *Academic Quality Handbook* provides details of the Review Procedure, whether this is for the purpose of approving new provision or substantial amendments to existing provision and offers guidance on each of the stages of the Procedure and other issues to consider during the process.

In addition, it also provides the procedures to be followed to approve and amend Programmes/courses and credit-rated exit courses.

As part of the review and administration of programs, the University requires several elements of core documentation.

1.2 Review Procedure

The approval of new study programs, or of substantial amendments (more than 25%) to existing courses or programs, involves two stages. Before the Review Procedure is initiated for a new study program, the proposal requires to be discussed by the *Curriculum Development Committee (CDC)*. Thereafter, review is the process through which the University assures itself of the quality and standards of its educational programme provision prior to implementation and delivery or discusses substantial changes to existing educational programme provision.

Key aspects of the Review Procedure include:

- Preparation of a plan for the review event
- Preparation of documentation for the event, drafted in accordance with the University's requirements, e.g., *Detailed Course Descriptors, Programme Descriptors, ECTS, Learning outcomes*, etc.
- Authorization, by the *Dean*, for the release of the documentation for discussion at *Curriculum Development Committee* and *Academic Council* respectively with documentation of approval and decision to be eligible to

submit for evaluation and accreditation of Professional and Regulatory Body (PRB)

– The *Quality Assurance Panel* reviews prior to commencement of delivery of the educational programme to Professional and Regulatory Body (PRB)

1.3 Amendments to Existing Provision

Approval for changes to existing study programs is undertaken at two levels:

a) The *Curriculum Development Committee (CDC)* is required to discuss amendments to existing study programs if these amendments involve any or all the following:

- changes to an existing Educational Programme title
- additions/changes to mode(s) of delivery
- changes to named exit awards
- proposals for re-developments to the educational programme curriculum affecting more than 25% of an award's MQF credit value (e.g., *learning outcomes, Programme content*).
- educational programme cessations

b) For reaccreditation:

- Justification for proposed changes
- Impact on objective/ rationale, learning outcomes, entry requirements, mode of assessment, distribution of hours, mode of delivery, etc.

c) Deans of Colleges have devolved authority to approve amendments affecting less than or equal to 25% of an award's MQF credit value. Executive action by *the Dean* is taken to approve changes and these changes are reported to the *Quality Assurance Panel*. Changes proposed might include:

- changes affecting assessment (i.e., *Programme assessment plan, assessment weightings*)
- changes affecting progression
- inclusion of new and/or revised courses (i.e., *course titles, MQF level/credit*)
- Internship, etc.

1.4 Programme Approval

Courses may be used in the following ways:

- as constituent units of credit-rated award-bearing courses and programs.
- as credit-rated exit awards typically offered as Professional Development (PD) provision or fulfilling the University's commitment to the lifelong learning agenda.

– as credit-rated non-award-bearing short courses offered in collaboration with a third party.

Programmes/Courses delivered as part of a credit-rated award-bearing course or program can only be credit-rated with MQF 30\60 ECTS at the appropriately defined level, or multiples thereof, unless otherwise required by a professional or regulatory body. Programmes offered as credit-rated award-bearing courses can be credit-rated with MQF 30 or 60 ECTS at the appropriately defined level.

Unless Programmes are approved during a review event, new and amended Programmes/courses require approval by the College. The key aspects of this process include:

- the preparation of proposed changes by the Dean and consideration of these changes by an external subject expert, professional expert from industry and Curriculum Development Committee.
- review by *QA Panel* and approval by the Academic Council.
- consultation with the External Reviewers and students if assessments or progression requirements are affected.

1.5 Exit Award Approval

The procedure for approving courses to be delivered as Exit Award Course is the same as for the approval of new courses. Approval allows credit-rating for future delivery only.

Short courses derived from existing courses that have not been amended are not subject to any further formal approval.

1.6 Professional and Regulatory Body Visits

A significant number of the University's study programmes are affiliated to Professional and Regulatory Body and are therefore subject to accreditation/re-accreditation by the relevant bodies. The organization and management of these visits is included within the University's quality assurance procedures to ensure appropriate oversight and monitoring. The format of Professional and regulatory Body visits is dictated by the individual body.

Key aspects of such visits include:

- preparation of documentation for the event, drafted in accordance with the University requirements

- authorization, by the Dean, for the release of the documentation to the Panel, after appropriate internal scrutiny and approval of the documentation by a Curriculum Development Committee.
- preparation by the College of a response, as appropriate, to the event outcomes that is subject to the subsequent approval by the Dean prior to issue to the Regulatory Body.

2. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

2.1 Educational Programme Review Procedure

1. Dean prepares to the *Curriculum Development Committee* a *Course Development Proposal (with reference to Marketing and Research for new programmes)* which is signed and documented. If the proposal is for multi-disciplinary course, signatures of all appropriate Deans are required.
2. Dean, prepares *Rationale and Composition of Proposal* and forwards to the Curriculum Development Committee.
3. *Course Development Proposal* considered by the Curriculum Development Committee. Once approved and signed by the Provost, the Academic Council advised approving accordingly.
4. Dean co-ordinates preparation of appropriate documentation in liaison with QA office.
5. Dean approves documentation as being of satisfactory standard and passes approved documentation by CDC to the Academic Council.
6. QA Panel reviews event outcomes and informs the Academic Council accordingly.

2.2. Guidance - Educational Programme Review Procedure

2.2.1 Approval of Programme Titles

The title of a course must be simple in form, clearly reflect the course content, and accord with the form generally accepted by higher education institutions and by the relevant professional and regulatory body. The title may not be changed between periodic Internal Reviews without prior discussion at the Curriculum Development Committee and approval of the Academic Council, respectively.

2.2.2 Planning and Scheduling of the Review Event

The event must normally be at least 12 weeks prior to the anticipated date for commencement of the Educational Programme to enable responses and actions arising from a Review event to be addressed prior to delivery. The *Review Planning* serves as a framework for the establishment of timescales and deadlines and is used to monitor progress against these targets.

2.2.3 Review Panels

Panels for Review events comprise a combination of external and internal members appropriate to the nature of the event, including a student, and the membership is derived with the aim of making available as wide a spectrum of external advice and comment as possible. The relevant professional or regulatory body should also be consulted, where appropriate, in respect of program requirements.

Review Panels have a minimum composition as follows:

Chair: QA Office representative appointed by the decision of the University Council or an internal member of staff appointed by the Provost, from a central list of nominees submitted by Deans

One external member: Who must be an academic with relevant subject experience and who is not from the University.

Second internal member: Who must represent the appropriate industry, profession, or commerce.

Third student member: a student representative must be included as the voice from students' body.

For each external member of the Panel there must be a statement indicating previous involvement with the University/Department(s). Where there has been no involvement this should also be stated.

2.2.4 Documentation and QA Approval

The Dean is responsible that the documentation has been produced according to University Regulations, guidelines and Policies.

The Dean ensures the documentation is passed to the Provost Office for approval, together with the *QA Approval*. QA is required to approve the following elements of the documentation in accordance with formal benchmarks requirements:

- Course Objectives (*Detailed Course Descriptor*)
- Course Learning Outcomes
- Mapping of Course Learning Outcomes to educational programme
- Teaching and Learning Methods and Strategies/Pedagogy
- Course Assessment

The Dean authorizes the Review documentation prior to it being issued to the Panel.

2.2.5 Online and Blended Delivery

The Provost Office is required to submit the style and format of educational programme materials for any provision being developed in online learning mode or for delivery on the blended mode of delivery. The College always remains responsible for ensuring the integrity of the academic content of the online /blended learning materials.

2.2.6 Outcomes of Review Event

The Review Panel is asked to:

- formulate a recommendation for approval of the course subject to regular Internal Review events (*normally every 5 years*).
- impose conditions where these are necessary for the approval of the study programme.
- make other recommendations where appropriate; or recommend that the course not be reviewed.

It is also University practice that when any conditions are attached to the approval of a study programme, the Panel should set a deadline for meeting these conditions. The Panel will also highlight issues for recommendation.

2.2.7 College Response to Outcomes of Review Event

Following the review event, the College is required to produce a response to any conditions and recommendations, which must be discussed with the Dean and QA before issue to Panel members. Once the Panel confirms acceptance of the response the Educational Programme can commence delivery.

The College Response should be set out in the following way:

- Each condition and recommendation should be re-stated, via track changes. Under each, the College should indicate how it will meet the condition or action the recommendation in as detailed a manner as possible/appropriate.
- If the conditions and recommendations require a re-write of some of the Educational Programme documentation presented at review, then the relevant revised sections should be attached as appendices to the response.

2.2.8 Review Report

A formal report of each review event is prepared by QA officers, who attended the event. After it has been approved by all members of the Panel, the confirmed report is made available from the QA Department.

2.2.9 Evaluation of Process

As part of its commitment to continuous improvement of its quality assurance procedures, the University reviews, on an annual basis, the efficiency and effectiveness of the review process.

2.2.10 Documentation Requirements – Educational Programme Review

2.3 STRUCTURE OF REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

The documentation for a Educational Programme Review comprises:

Part 1: Overview

Part 2: Detailed Course Descriptor

Part 3: Programme Descriptors

The Review is a combined event with a Regulatory Body for accreditation purposes, it is essential the College studies the Regulatory Body requirements to establish its documentation properly.

Detailed Programme Descriptors are required for every course. The QA Department is responsible for ensuring the accuracy and currency of these documents and

The QA Department will supply the Review Panel with the following:

- Briefing Note for Members of Review Panels
- *Curriculum Development Committee Course* approval, and/or other appropriate educational programme development proposal documentation
- *Undergraduate and Graduate Syllabi/Handbooks* (external members only)
- *Academic policies* (external members only)
- *MFHEA course benchmarks* (as appropriate)
- electronic link to the relevant *Program Specification*

2.3.1 Production of Review Documentation

The documentation is produced by the College concerned. The Graphics Department uses these originals for photocopying the required number of documents, producing them in a comb-bound format and in the University's corporate style.

2.3.2 Content of Part 1: Overview

Part 1: Overview and Resource Document should include:

- the rationale for the development of the Educational Programme (or for revisions, in the case of a re-Review), referring to the University’s Mission.
- the context of the Educational Programme both within the College and the wider University.
- Who did the Educational Programme Development Team liaise with when developing the Educational Programme and associated documentation?
- external references and guidance, such as the MFHEA Educational Programme *Benchmark Statements*, Regulatory Body requirements and so on
- details of additional staff resources required to deliver the Study Programme.
- details of any external input, e.g., in the case of subcontracted elements within the Study Programme.
- a list of Programme Coordinators and their summary CVs
- details of staff development required to support Educational Programme implementation
- an overview of the research and scholarly activities that underpin the Study Programme
- details of any specialist support required from the University to support the development or delivery of the Study Programme

2.3.3 Part 2: Detailed Course Descriptor

The *Detailed Course Descriptor* is the MQF-compliant *Program Specification*.

2.4 Part 3: Programme Descriptors

The *Programme Descriptors* are the MQF compliant programme specifications.

2.5 Preparation of Summary Curriculum Vitae (Academic Staff)

CVs need to be customized for the specific review event and should focus on the staff member’s expertise in relation to the subject nature of the Study Programme. Each summary CV must be no longer than two sides of A4.

The CV should include the following information:

- (i) Name, abbreviated qualifications.
- (ii) Job Title/Post held within the University.

(iii) Qualifications (Academic, Professional and Current Professional Affiliations). Qualifications should be listed with the most recent last, indicating the year the award was received and the awarding institution. College qualifications should not be listed.

(iv) Employment Experience. This should be listed in chronological order with the most recent last, indicating the job title/position held. Only experience directly related to the staff member's current area of expertise should be listed.

(v) Main Subject/Interest Areas and Related Public Output (preceding 5 years only). State the total number of items of public output a staff member has produced in the last five-year period and provide up to six examples of relevant items of public output.

(vi) Research/Consultancy/Professional Practice (preceding 5 years only). Only list experience directly related to the development under consideration.

4. AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING STUDY PROGRAMMES

3.1 Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) Discussion Procedure

For changes to an existing course title; additions/changes to mode(s) of delivery; changes to named exit awards; proposals for re-developments to the course curriculum affecting more than 25% of an award's MQF credit value (e.g., *learning outcomes, Programme content*); and educational programme cessations.

1. If changes affect progression and/or assessment, external reviewers must be consulted, and written consent received. All students affected by change must be consulted and their views taken into consideration. Consultation with Regulatory Body if appropriate, and QA if online learning or change involves conversion to online learning. Dean prepares a report including justification, needs analysis, confirming extent of all consultation, and signs.

2. If the Educational Programme is online learning or a change involves conversion to online learning, explanation and justification is attached.

3. *Programme change is considered by Curriculum Committee.*

4. If a change or new mode of delivery involves online learning material, Dean scrutinizes online learning to ensure it includes appropriate details of revised management arrangements.

5. In liaison with Provost Office, educational programme documentation updated.

6. QA ensures appropriate amendments to documentation in programme database.

3.2 College Level Approval Procedure

For changes affecting less than or equal to 25% of an award's MQF credit value such as: changes affecting assessment (i.e., *Programme assessment plan, assessment weightings*); changes affecting progression; inclusion of new and/or revised Programmes (i.e., *Programme titles, MQF level/credit*); reInternship of Programmes with other existing Programmes; and alteration to the timing of delivery of existing Programmes.

1. Preparation of amended *Programme Descriptor(s)* for approval.
2. Appropriate consultation with External Reviewers and students.
3. Dean completes programme change request in consultation with College Teaching staff.
4. Amended Programme Descriptor(s) passed to QA. QA scrutinizes amended Programme Descriptor(s) and verifies in accordance with internal and external regulations.
5. Forms and all associated paperwork maintain information on course changes to monitor cumulative course changes.

5. PROGRAMME APPROVAL PROCEDURE

1. Preparation of Programme Descriptor(s) for approval. If the new programme is replacing existing programme, Dean must discuss proposed amendments with all Educational Programme staff responsible for courses/programs in which Programme is delivered.

2. New Programme Descriptor(s) passed to QA together with *QA verification and approval*. QA approval required for:

- Programme objectives
- Programme Learning Outcomes
- Programme Assessment
- MQF level and credit

5. New Programme Descriptor(s) passed to External Subject Expert, who may be External Reviewer, completes Programme Approval - *External Subject Expert Report*.

6. Dean considers *Programme Change Request* with new Programme Descriptor(s) and with Programme Approval - External Subject Expert Report

7. Form and all associated paperwork considered by Dean to confirm paperwork is in order. Dean maintains information on course changes to monitor cumulative course changes
8. QA ensures appropriate amendments to documentation in programme database.

5. EXIT AWARD COURSE APPROVAL PROCEDURE

5.1 Exit Award Course Approval Procedure

The procedure for approving Programmes to be delivered as credit-rated award/non-award-bearing exit courses is the same as for the approval of new Programmes.

5.2 Third Party Collaboration

The University may wish to evaluate and credit-rate provision that will be developed and delivered by an external organization (e.g., *an employer, a professional body, or a non-degree awarding institution*). Please refer to *Section 6* of this Handbook for further guidance on the approval process.

5.3 Quality Assurance of Programmes Delivered as Exit Awards

The following applies to Programmes delivered as short courses, and not part of an award-bearing course.

Annual Course Review Credit-rated short courses are included in the Annual Review Process. A *Programme Review* is completed by the College offering Short Educational Programme. For details of the Annual Review Process, please refer to **Section 2** of this Handbook.

Internal Review

Credit-rated short courses are subject to re-approval during the Internal Review process if they are delivered at least on an annual basis. A report should be prepared by the host College reviewing all credit-rated short courses developed in the College. For details of the Internal Review procedures, please refer to **Section 3** of this Handbook.

Evaluation

All participants on short courses are required to complete the *Programme Evaluation Questionnaire* (refer **Section 2** of this Handbook). Short Educational Programme staff is responsible for the distribution, collection, and analysis of the *Programme Evaluation Questionnaire*. An analysis of the evaluation outcomes should inform the Annual Review Process and Internal Reviews.

6. AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING PROGRAMMES AND EXIT COURSES

6.1 College Level Discussion Procedure

If an existing Programme or short\exit course requires amendment, such amendments require discussion at the College only if they affect:

- Programme Assessment (QA approval also required)
- Programme Learning Outcomes (QA approval also required)
- MQF level or credit (QA approval also required)
- Mapping of Programme Learning Outcomes to the Level Learning Outcomes (only relevant for Programmes that are delivered as part of award-bearing programs) (QA approval also required)
- Programme Title

7. PROFESSIONAL AND/OR REGULATORY BODY (PRB) VISITS

1. Visit date confirmed by QA in consultation with the representative of the regulatory body
2. QA co-ordinates preparation for visits in consultation with relevant Dean of College(s) and university units.
3. PRB advises University of Panel composition
4. Agenda confirmed in discussions with University and PRB
5. QA issues confirmed Agenda and Panel Membership to all units
6. Dean co-ordinates preparation of appropriate documentation in liaison with the Provost office and QA
7. Before documentation is forwarded, Dean should review if it is of a satisfactory standard and confirms documentation as being of satisfactory standard and passes the documentation to QA
8. Dean and QA check documents comply with University Regulations and guidelines (not academic content), receive signed QA confirmation.
9. Dean authorizes issue of event documentation, and documentation sent to Graphics and event documentation issued by College.
10. Panel undertakes visit. Preparation of report is coordinated by PRB.
11. Dean (through discussion with CDC) and QA produce response, as appropriate, to outcomes of visit and submit this to PRB.
12. QA advised of event outcomes and informed Academic Council accordingly. Curriculum Development Committee also considers event outcomes.
13. QA ensures appropriate amendments to documentation in programme database.

8. PROCEDURE FOR CESSATION OF A STUDY PROGRAMM

Proposals for the cessation of an educational programme require the confirmation of the Curriculum Development Committee.

1. College agrees to cease delivery of an educational programme, Dean prepares *Educational Programme Cessation Report* and signs.
2. Curriculum Development Committee considers proposal for cessation of the programme. The Academic Council advised accordingly.
3. QA ensures appropriate amendments to documentation in *programme database*.

9. MARKETING AND RESEARCH FOR NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES

Effective marketing surveys and research is vital for understanding the market and identifying market potential. It is a foundation for effective decision-making.

Good marketing surveys and research can inform targeting and evaluation of marketing activities and help course developers to understand stakeholder decision-making processes.

Doing robust market survey which informs the development of new programmes is vital if these programmes are to succeed in the market, and to provide data which will allow for new courses to be marketed effectively.

Market research may be developed and carried out internally in collaboration with the University Marketing Department, or it may be outsourced (*if needed*) to a Marketing Consultancy recommended by the University Marketing Department. There will be a cost attached to all market research and this should be factored into all programme development budgets.

When developing new courses, it is recommended that the following research is undertaken to establish both the demand for the programme and the packaging of the programme:

All the areas below should be addressed and robust evidence from a representative sample provided which will then be assessed by the Curriculum Development Committee:

1. evidence of current demand for the programme within the current marketplace.
2. proof of a demonstrable need for the programme – evidence could include the following:
 - exemplar job advertisements proving employer demand for the qualification.
 - requests for the programme gathered from external sources which could include employers and potential students.
 - identification of future employment trends which prove that demand for the qualification will increase.
3. demonstrate the likely life cycle of the programme

4. at undergraduate level evidence should be provided that proves that the cohort identified for entry point of the programme will have the necessary qualification required to study the programme – this will require evidence drawn from subject choice trends at secondary College level
5. at postgraduate level evidence should be provided that proves that there are enough at undergraduate level studying degrees suitable for progression
6. evidence that provides a detailed breakdown of the target market for the programme
7. a description of how it is envisaged that the target market will be reached
8. evidence of the suitability and marketability of programme titles

The above should be gathered and presented as a substantial dossier to Curriculum Development Committee\CDC (i.e., by completing and submitting a *CDC Programme Development Proposal Form*, who will then use this evidence to assess the suitability of further development.

PART II. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

The Annual Review of teaching and learning is central to the University's quality assurance processes. It enables the University to ensure its quality of programmes, courses and programs will satisfy the criteria for any review by any external body or satisfy quality internally. The process is designed to enhance the monitoring of quality and standards and to encourage the identification and dissemination of improvement issues. Furthermore, it is designed to facilitate the provision of good quality feedback to students on an ongoing basis.

The process is informed by several key sources including feedback from students obtained through the staff/student liaison process and evaluation questionnaires, feedback received from *External Annual Reports*, as well as performance indicator data produced by the University.

Commencing with the completion, by students, of *Student Programme Evaluation Questionnaires* and relevant *Student Experience Questionnaires*, this is followed by the review, at college level, of individual Programmes, and courses/programs. Once all Educational Programme Management Teams have completed this exercise, an *Annual College Review Report* is produced by the Dean. All *Annual College Review Reports* are considered by the Dean of College, which is submitted to the Quality Assurance office and has to be reported and approved by the Academic Council accordingly.

A fundamental principle of the *Annual Review Process* is that both strengths and weaknesses are identified at all levels of the process, the necessary action taken, and confirmation that the matter has been resolved reported to the appropriate Committee/body. Feedback is given throughout the process and, where appropriate, executive action taken.

The evidence gathered during this process is used to inform, incrementally, the program of Internal Reviews and to satisfy the requirements of external bodies such as the Quality Assurance Panels, External Professional Evaluation Agencies or Regulatory Bodies.

2. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

December, May

Student Programme Evaluation Questionnaires and *Student Experience Questionnaires* completed by students.

Summer

Analysis of Questionnaires completed by QA and distributed to Colleges.

May - August

Reviewers asked to submit *Annual Report* within four weeks after examination session

July - September

Performance Indicator issued by the Provost office on Student including:

- on student achievement/progression at programme level
- Applications/Enrollments
- Target Enrollments
- Entry Grade Point Averages
- Student Achievement Rates
- Non-Progression Analysis
- Graduate Output and Award Classifications
- Destination of Leavers from Higher Education., etc

August - September

Dean reviews Programmes and *Student Programme Evaluation Questionnaire*. Completes *Annual Programme Review Report*

September - October

College:

- considers all Annual Educational Programme Review Reports for College
- provides feedback on issues raised which can be dealt with at College level
- confirms responses to External Annual Reports

September - October

QA prepares summary report to Academic Council.

October - November

Annual College Review Reports submitted to the Academic Council for consideration and approval in accordance with agreed process.

November

QA considers Annual College Review Reports. Institutional issues identified for action and referred, as appropriate, to Committees/Working Groups/management areas.

QA considers Summary Report on the evaluation of the Student Experience

December

QA reports to the Academic Council on Annual Review on programme/course level and on institutional evaluation and major issues it has considered.

3. GUIDANCE - QUESTIONNAIRES

3.1 Student Programme/Course Evaluation and Student Experience Questionnaires

The *Student Programme Questionnaire* is designed to obtain feedback from students about their learning experience. It consists of a high-level question asking the students to indicate their overall opinion of the Programme and to further indicate the Programme 's strengths and areas for improvement from a list of pre-defined categories. An evaluation of the teaching staff on the Programme is also included and there is an opportunity for students to comment on other aspects of the Programme in a free-form comments box. The questionnaire is intended to be diagnostic and provide a basis for further investigation, if required. It provides some of the information required to complete the *Annual Programme Review Report* and forms the basis of high-level statistical information on Programme performance which is available to all Colleges.

The questionnaire is accessed via the web-based online questionnaires system which allows it to be sent to students via their email accounts.

Student Experience Questionnaires are designed to obtain feedback from students about their course and learning experience as part of an ongoing quality process. Several other different types of questionnaires have been developed as follows:

First Year Experience Questionnaire

Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Graduate Experience Questionnaire

The development of different questionnaires has enabled the University to tailor the questions to different groups of students – for example the *First Year Experience Questionnaire*, which is aimed at first year students, focuses on the student's transition to university and how well they feel they have coped, whereas the *Course Evaluation Questionnaire*, aimed at 2nd, 3rd and 4th year students, is designed to allow the student to give a reflective analysis of their course study experiences.

At the end of a pre-defined period, all student responses are collected and compiled electronically into analysis reports. Programme Deans are alerted by email, those results are available for the *Student Programme Evaluation Questionnaire* and *Student Experience Questionnaires* respectively, which are accessed via the web-based online questionnaires system.

Student Programme/Course Evaluation Questionnaires

The report on the *Student Programme Evaluation Questionnaire* are accessible to the Faculty, and Curriculum Development Committee. Deans have access to all the Programme analysis reports pertaining to the Programmes in their course, and Deans have access to all Programme data available for all courses in their college, including both quantitative and

qualitative data. Deans also have access to reports across the College, though this excludes the qualitative data. A high-level summary of student opinion of all Programmes in the College is provided to Deans by the QA Office.

Student Experience Questionnaires

Reports arising from *Student Experience Questionnaires* are accessible to Deans, and Deans have access to all the data available for all courses in their college, including both quantitative and qualitative data.

As there are questions in some of the *Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires* relating to Support Departments, separate analysis reports are issued annually by the QA Department to each Support Department (Student Services, IT Services, the Library etc.) collating any relevant data from the questionnaires.

3.2 Feedback to Students arising from Questionnaires

Feedback is provided to students to maintain students' engagement in the evaluation process. This feedback includes not only the results of the survey, but also the actions which are being undertaken as a result.

Once a *Student Programme/Course Evaluation Questionnaire* or a *Student Experience Questionnaire* has been completed, the QA Office releases the results which students may access via the *Student Portal* or the *Student Involvement AUM website*. These results consist of the statistical returns for the survey, but do not include any staff evaluation information or qualitative data.

Once the *Annual Programme Review Reports* and *Educational Programme Review Reports* are approved, Deans are requested to upload their *Annual Programme Review Reports* so they are accessible to students via the *Student Portal* or the *Student Involvement AUM website*.

Likewise, Deans are requested to upload an extract of their *Educational Programme Review Reports*, so they are also accessible to students via the *Student Portal* or the *Student Involvement AUM website*, thereby ensuring students have a full complement of information at their disposal.

Following consideration by QA, information on actions taken by Support Departments is compiled from their reports on the *Review and Improvement of the Student Experience* into a summary report for consideration by QA office, and made accessible to students via the *Student Portal* or the *Student Involvement AUM website*.

The QA Department presents an overall analysis of the results from *Student Programme and Experience Questionnaires* to Academic Council in Semester One of each session.

4. ANNUAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS

4.1 Annual Programme Reviews

An *Annual Programme Review* must be completed for each Programme within the University each academic year. *The Annual Programme Review Report* should be compiled by the relevant Dean.

4.2 Educational Programme Review

4.2.1 Standard Courses/Programs

Every course and programme within the University, and every collaborative course, must be reviewed for further updates and developments.

Each College should complete an *Annual Programme Review Report including:*

Separate performance indicator information (e.g., *Applications/Enrollments, Target Enrolments, Entry Grade Point Averages, Applications, Student Achievement Rates, Non-Progression Analysis, Graduate Output and Award Classifications, Destination of Leavers from Higher Education Statistics*) is provided for each named award.

4.2.2 Credit-Rated Short Courses/Exit Awards

A review must be completed in respect of all credit-rated short courses/exit awards. For this purpose, Deans should use the *Annual Programme Review Report*.

Participants on credit-rated short courses/exit awards are required to complete the *Student Programme Evaluation Questionnaire*, the analysis of which should be used to inform the review of a short course(s).

4.3 Guidance for Completion of Annual Programme Review Reports

The following guidance does not prevent the Dean from including any other information which is relevant.

Section 1 Progress against Proposed Actions and Improvements

Comment briefly on the outcomes of actions and improvements proposed the previous session

Section 2 Student Achievement/Progression

This section requires an analysis of the following data

- *Number of students enrolled on Programme*
- *Number of students assessed*
- *Number of students passed*
- *% Pass rate*
- *Students' progression analysis*

Section 3 Student Learning Experience

This section requires an analysis of the responses to the *Student Programme or Course Evaluation Questionnaire* (excluding the staff evaluation section of the Questionnaire, which remains confidential to the College).

Section 4 Other Issues Relating to the Programme

This section provides the opportunity to highlight any other issues relating to the Programme not previously covered, for example, issues raised through staff/student liaison activity, feedback from Student Representatives, issues raised by External Reviewers etc.

4.4 Guidance for Completion of Annual Educational Programme Review Reports

The following guidance does not preclude the Educational Programme Management Team from including any other information which it feels is relevant.

Annual Program Review Report – Undergraduate

Annual Program Review Report – Graduate

The design of the Review report is intended to encourage systematic analysis of courses/programs, reporting by 'exception', the highlighting of any significant trends, and the extraction of key issues for the attention of the Provost Office and, ultimately, QA Office.

Section 1 Progress against Proposed Actions and Improvements

Section 2 Student Enrolment

Commentary may refer to, for example, poor conversion from application to acceptance, the effects of interviewing candidates, significant differences in intake numbers for home and overseas students, differences across awards in a program, action being taken to widen participation etc.

Section 3 Student Evaluation of the Study Programme

This section requires the analysis of responses to the *Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires, Annual Programme Review Reports* and *Student Experience Questionnaires*.

Section 4 Student Achievement

- *Student Achievement Rates and Non-Progression Analysis*
- *Destination of Graduates* published during the previous session.

Commentary may refer to, for example, factors influencing withdrawal and action being taken to retain students, significant differences in the achievement rates for different groups/types of students e.g. online learning, wider access, students with needs, significant differences in employment of graduates from different awards within a program, above average unemployment, progression to further study etc.

Section 5 Standards

This section will draw on an analysis of relevant information/comments regarding standards extracted from *External Annual Reports* and, where indicated (i.e., by answering ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to any question as indicated), commentary should be provided, including action to be taken.

Section 6 Teaching and Learning Development

Details of planned changes and improvement activity should be provided as appropriate.

Section 7 Resources

Section 8 Educational Programme Organization and Operation

Section 9 Positive Developments and Good Practice

Examples of any positive developments including examples of good practice used to deliver/assess/administer the Study Programme, especially those that might be shared with other Colleges. Possible examples could be:

- New teaching methods
- Introduction of computer-based assessments

Section 10 Summary of Proposed Actions and Improvements

This section should draw on previous sections of the report and summaries all proposed actions and improvements, indicating timescales and the level of responsibility i.e., College or University

4.4 THE REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

This note provides guidance to Support Departments on the prescribed format for reporting to the Quality Assurance Office, via the Curriculum Development Committee\College Board, on the review of, and proposed improvements to the student experience.

REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE - SESSION 200X/XX

inserting the current session and identifying your department. Thereafter, please follow the following structure.

1. PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN IN SESSION 200X/OX IN RESPONSE TO ISSUES ARISING FROM THE ANNUAL REVIEW FOR SESSION 200X/OX.

This should refer to activities undertaken during the previous session in response to issues raised in the session before that, e.g., for reporting in Session 2021/22, the activities should relate to those undertaken in Session 2021/22 for issues raised in Session 2021/22.

Please report each improvement activity with the following structure:

Issue/Activity:

Provide a brief description of the issue or activity.

Source/Origin of Issue:

Indicate why this was undertaken (e.g., Self-Evaluation, Department initiative designed to enhance the student experience, student evaluation/feedback etc.)

Progress to Date: Provide a brief description.

Evaluation:

Evaluate how successful each initiative has been and describe the evidence on which this judgement is based.

Note: Improvement is defined as “taking deliberate steps to bring about continuous improvement in the effectiveness of the learning experience of students”.

2. ANALYSIS/REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE IN SESSION 200X/OX

This should refer to activities undertaken during the previous session in response to issues raised in the session before that, e.g., for reporting in Session 20XX/XX, the activities should relate to those undertaken in Session 20XX/XX.

Describe areas of strength and areas for improvement identified from analysis of feedback from the following sources, reporting with the following structure:

**(a) Student Experience
Questionnaires**

Areas of Strength:

-
-

Areas for Improvement:

-
-

(b) Other sources of feedback (e.g., external review, audit, self-evaluation etc.)

Areas of Strength:

-
-

Areas for Improvement:

-
-
-

3. PLAN OF IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES FOR SESSION 2021/2022

This should refer to activities planned for the current session in which you are reporting, e.g., for reporting in Session 20xx/xx, the activities should relate to those planned for Session 20XX/XX.

Please report each improvement activity with the following structure:

3.1 Improvements to be Undertaken During the Current Session

3.2 Improvements for the Following Session(s)

4. FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS FOR SESSION 200X/XX

This should refer to feedback provided to students on actions undertaken in the previous session, e.g., for reporting in Session 2021/22, the activities should relate to those undertaken in Session 2021/22.

The text within this section should provide summary feedback to students on the above - bullet points/one or two paragraphs would be indicative. This information will be compiled into a 'student friendly' report and fed back to students via the Student Portal.

PART III. INTERNAL REVIEW: GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

1.OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

Internal Review is the process adopted by the University to formally review, on a five-year cycle, its major curriculum and programme offerings. Following the formal review, there is an *Annual Internal Review* to monitor progress against actions/issues raised through the review process.

The primary purpose of an *Internal Review* is to assure that there is effective and responsible management of the quality and standards of its programme provision, and there is evidence of a commitment to continuous development and improvement.

The Internal Review is organized on a college basis with programme provision as per MQF accreditation requirements, or by programme by a professional body, since there may also be some additional requirements for the University to follow as prescribed by a professional body.

The Internal Review is conducted by a *Review Panel* (minimum 3 members) consisting of both internal and, if the College decides, external members (*industry or academic experts*). The internal membership also includes a representative of the University's student community.

During the Internal Review event, the Review Panel will have the opportunity to view supplementary material, inspect facilities, and meet with staff, present and former students, and employers.

Responsibility for preparing for an Internal Review rest with the appropriate Dean of each College, or the nominee, or the Programme Leader. Normally, approximately six months prior to the event, a preliminary meeting is held with the QA, Academic Affairs, Registrar, relevant Faculty Program\Course Leader, the Dean of College, and key staff involved in preparing for the event where the Convener of the event is a QA Officer. The purposes of this preliminary meeting are:

- to clarify the review process.
- to confirm the content of the review (i.e., programmes to be reviewed).
- to confirm whether Programme Review will be conducted within the event.
- to ensure that the Dean or nominee checks that the documentation meets the requirements of both the professional and regulatory body, should the Internal Review event be combined with an accreditation event for a professional, or regulatory body.

2. INTERNAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

1. QA confirms date of Internal Review in consultation with Deans and Provost, and co-ordinates preparation of *Internal Review*.
2. Two months prior to the event, QA sets up a meeting with the key staff from College level, administrative units and the Provost.
3. The Provost approves the Composition of Review Panel and forwards it to Academic Council for approval 3 months prior to the IQA event
4. The College prepares *Analytical Data*, and course documentation in accordance with University and Regulatory Body requirements, as appropriate, in liaison with QA. Consultation takes place as appropriate with students and Support Departments.
7. Dean ensures copies of *Educational Programme Portfolio* – Submission of all Program descriptors and Programme Descriptors to the Review Panel.
9. The Review Panel undertakes the event and prepares Internal Review Report in 1 weeks' time after the event
10. College prepares response to conditions and recommendations arising from the Report and submits it to Review Panel members not later than 3 days
11. Chair of Review Panel advises of event outcomes and reports to the Academic Council accordingly
12. Confirmed Report uploaded on QA's webpage (intranet only).
13. The response of the College will include a detailed improvement plan on how to deal with actions that need to be taken following the recommendations of the review
14. Dean, or the nominee, ensures completion of final documentation in *Programme Database*.
15. Students, graduates and employers who participated in event receive copy of the report.

3. GUIDANCE

3.1. Planning and Scheduling of the Internal Review Event

The Program of Internal Review is overseen by the University's Quality Assurance Department who ensures that all the proper procedures are applied in a timely manner. The *Internal Review Planning* serves as an agreed framework of timescales to be adhered to.

The Internal Review event normally spans approximately two and a half days.

The program for the Internal Review event and the composition of the Review Panel are considered and approved at the meeting of the Academic Council, where the President and the Provost decide the composition of Internal Quality Review Panel/

3.2 Review Panels

Panels for Internal Review events should consist of external and internal members appropriate to the nature of the programme under review, and the membership is selected ensuring wide a spectrum of external advice and comments as possible.

An Internal Review Panel has the following minimum composition:

Chair: Appointed by the President. The role is to manage the event, ensure it is conducted in accordance with the University's requirements.

Three to four internal members: Internal members of staff appointed by the Provost and approved by the Academic Council.

Student member: An enrolled student at the University appointed in liaison with the Student Union. The student will be a full-time learner and will normally have experience of representing students' interests at college or institutional level.

One or two external members (if applicable): External member must be an academic, or represent the appropriate industry, profession, or commerce.

Three Review Panel members is the minimum, maximum 5 or 7 members is the composition for a Panel. It may be preferable to include more external academic/professional representation depending on the discipline(s) covered by the review.

3.3 Programme/Course Documentation and Approval

Deans check and approves the documentation has been produced according to University Regulations and guidelines and passes to QA for verification.

QA is required to approve the following elements of the updated course documentation for all courses being submitted for review:

- *Course Aims (Detailed Course Descriptor (DCD))*
- *Course Learning Outcomes (DCD).*
- *Mapping of Course Learning Outcomes to Programmes (DCD).*
- *Teaching and Learning Methods and Strategies (DCD).*
- *Course Assessment (DCD).*
- *All Programme Descriptors*
- Reading List

Supplementary items of documentation are made available to Panel members, where possible, in advance. Data and supplementary documentation for each programme/course is likely to include:

- **Academic staff**
- **Programme management** and a description of their integration within the overall College management structure
- **Summary of External Annual Reports** over the last three years, prepared by the Course/Program Leader.
- **Responses to recommendations**

- **Annual Review documentation** covering the last two sessions (if applicable).
- Data relating to **Student Course and Programme Evaluation Questionnaires**
- **Annual Student Experience Survey, Student Survey, Graduate Survey:** data on achievement and employability
- **Data on student enrolment, retention, and achievement:** for example, entry qualifications, student achievement rates, course completion rates (including research)
- **Graduate First Destination Statistics** (graduate, employment statistics) etc.
- **Reports of accreditation visits by regulatory body** and an indication of how outcomes have been addressed.
- **Teaching evaluation** survey results
- **Employer's survey** (if applicable)

Documentation on collaborative arrangements:

- **Notes of University - Industry meetings (two sessions per year)** (if applicable)
- **Notes of College Board meetings**
- **Notes of Curriculum Development Committee meetings**
- **Summary staff CVs and publication lists**
- **Schedule of Visiting Lecturers** (*where appropriate*)
- **Examples of Student Handbooks, Programme and Course Handbooks and any other course materials.**
- **Samples of student work/artefacts (for the purpose of demonstrating the range, and not for the purpose of confirming standards).**
- **Programme Review Reports** (*published*)

3.4 Outcomes of Internal Review

The Review Panel will make one of the following judgments in respect of the assurance of quality and standards and of evidence of commitment to continuous development and improvement for each of the courses reviewed:

- Confidence, fulfils minimum standards
- No confidence, does not fulfil minimum standards

In reaching a judgment of “confidence” the Panel will have the opportunity to make recommendations. In reaching a judgment of ‘no’ confidence the Panel should clearly indicate the basis whereby this judgment has been reached and indicate to the University what steps could be taken to address this outcome.

In terms of the review of courses, the Panel can make the judgment either to approve a course with recommendations, or to not approve a course. In reaching the latter judgement, the Panel should clearly indicate the basis whereby this judgement has been reached.

3.5 College Response to Outcomes of Internal Review

The College is required to produce a response to the conditions and recommendations arising from the Internal Review event. This must be sent to the Review Panel members for their consideration and/or approval.

3.6 Review Report

A formal report of each Internal Review event is prepared by the Review Panel. After it has been approved by all members of the Panel the Confirmed Report is made available on the QA's webpage.

A copy of the Confirmed Report is also forwarded to students, graduates and employers who participated in the event.

4. GUIDELINES TO INTERNAL REVIEW REPORT

SECTION 1 - OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief overview of programme/course provision and relevant background information, before engaging with the more detailed content.

Typical content will include:

Part 1.1 The programmes/course(s) being reviewed and their location within the academic structure of the University, i.e., College, Curriculum Development Committee etc.

Part 1.2 Main issues arising from previous Reviews (programme/College/PRB) and subsequent actions taken.

Part 1.3 A brief description of significant developments/issues since the last review relating to the context of the subject and pertinent to the current review. This should be restricted to institutional and College developments, e.g., relocation to a new building, change in organizational structures, etc. Guidance on developments at an institutional level will be provided in the preliminary meeting.

Programme/course developments should not be included in this section as these will be addressed in Section 2.

Part 1.4 Overview of the main source of evidence and benchmarks which will be used to inform the subsequent sections of the Analytical Account, e.g., Annual Educational Programme Review, External Reviewer Annual Reports, MQF requirements, etc.

SECTION 2 - CRITICAL REVIEW OF PROGRAMME/COURSE PROVISION

In addition to including reference to the portfolio of evidence, cross reference should be made within the following subsections to supplementary documentation which will be available to the Panel. Where more than one programme/course is being addressed within the Analytical

Account, content common to all courses should be presented first, followed by course specific details.

Subsections 2.2 – 2.9 inclusive should conclude with a brief evaluation of the current situation and an indication of planned further developments and improvements.

Part 2.1 Aims of programme/course area

This should provide:

- A brief statement of the aims of the programme/course area.
- Demonstration of the relevance of programme/course aims to the University’s Mission and Vision.
- A brief description of how the subject engages with industry/professions to ensure the relevance and achievement of its aims.

Part 2.2 Programme/course developments

Highlight the key developments (and associated rationale) in the programme/course provision since the last review. Address changes/developments in respect of the following:

- capability, i.e., areas of expertise.
- capacity, i.e., faculty/staff complement.
- course provision, i.e., new course developments, course cessations and major subject content changes in continuing courses.
- research

The influence of relevant national/international developments/best practice underpinning these developments and/or proposed improvements should be highlighted where appropriate.

Each programme/course for which review is sought should be considered the following information provided:

- (a) A summary of the main issues arising at the last approval and actions taken in the light of these.
- (b) A critical review of other developments to the Educational Programme over the period since the previous review, *e.g., new awards, course structures etc.* This should include a rationale for the developments, *e.g., student feedback, compliance with the Malta Qualifications Frameworks (MQF) etc.,* and an evaluation of the success of these developments.
- (c) A summary evaluation of the performance of the programme/course drawing on the data and content.
- (d) Discussion of, and rationale for, any changes incorporated within the programme/course now being submitted for review. Where appropriate, there should be reference to any resourcing/development requirements.

Part 2.3 Teaching, Learning and Assessment

This subsection should provide a critical review of current teaching, learning and assessment practices, highlighting key developments, evidence of effectiveness and proposed future improvements. Reference should be made, where relevant, to the influence on practice at course/subject level of university-wide strategies/initiatives for the improvement of teaching, learning and assessment. Topics for inclusion include:

- pedagogy and assessment practices/policies.
- modes of delivery, e.g., online, face-to-face, blended, online learning
- work-based learning, where relevant.
- equity and diversity, and wider access.

Part 2.4 Programme/Course Standards

This subsection should contain a critical review of key practices and developments designed to secure appropriate intended and output standards.

Intended standards for taught courses relate to *curriculum design and content* and so emphasis should be placed on highlighting the mechanisms for ensuring their appropriateness, along with supporting evidence to confirm the achievement of this. This would, therefore, relate to adherence to MFHEA requirements, Malta Qualifications Framework (MQF), PRB requirements, where relevant, influence of employers and features of and relevant outcomes from course Review.

For research degree provision, a brief explanation should be provided of how research programmes are developed and approved.

Output standards relate to student achievement. Reference should be made to any developments designed to enhance consistency/security of standards. This could involve some cross-referencing to relevant aspects of Section 2.3.

Part 2.5 Student Enrolment, Retention and Achievement

This subsection should provide a critical review of key performance data relating to the taught course portfolio over the period since the last review. This should include appropriate cross reference to changes in the course portfolio, i.e., where analysis has led to course cessations, new course developments or significant course changes. Associated tabulated data for the programme/course provision should include reference to entry profiles, Student Achievement Rates, application to enrolment ratios, award profiles, first destination statistics, and comparability against national benchmarks (e.g., award of honors). Relevant data relating to wider access and equity and diversity should also be included.

Part 2.6 Learning Infrastructure

This subsection should provide a critical review and evaluation of the effectiveness of key developments and improvements in respect of the

learning infrastructure. The content of this section could be considered under two categories:

- resources and facilities at college and institutional level. This in turn would include reference to accommodation, equipment, library services and provision, IT facilities and e-learning platforms.
- student support at college and institutional level. This would include reference to developments in the personal tutorial system, College learning resources, developments to central services, e.g., academic support services, tutoring, careers services, etc.

Appropriate liaison/consultation should take place with relevant staff in Support Departments in producing this subsection.

Part 2.7 Student Evaluation of the Learning Experience

This subsection should deal with two aspects of student evaluation:

- a critical review and evaluation of the key developments in enhancing the mechanisms for obtaining and responding to student feedback, e.g., development of evaluation questionnaires, Educational Programme management, staff/student liaison mechanisms, student representative training, etc.
- the key issues arising from student evaluation, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement. An indication should be given of key changes which are taking place because of this feedback and may well involve cross-reference to previous sections of the document.

Appropriate liaison/consultation should take place with students/student representatives in producing this subsection.

Part 2.8 Research

This subsection should provide, for each programme/course within the Review, a critical review of research activity, including how the research underpins taught provision. In each case, this should conclude with the proposed research strategy for the next Review Period. Cross reference should be made to the quantitative data. Associated tabulated data should be provided including e.g., number of research staff, research students, annual publications, research income etc.

Part 2.9 Scholarly Activity and Staff Development

This subsection should provide a critical review of scholarly activity and staff development pertinent to each programme/course area. The underlying rationale for the strategies adopted should be discussed, along with proposed future strategies.

PART IV. EXTERNAL REVIEWER ARRANGEMENTS

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

The appointment of External Reviewer is one of the most important features of the University's system of quality assurance. The function of the External Reviewer is crucial to all aspects of the assessment process and his/her presence ensures the objectivity of an Assessment Board, comparability of awards and standards in the national context, the fair and equitable treatment of students, and correct application of the Academic Regulations.

The remit of the External Reviewer extends to all assessments that contribute to the award of academic credit.

1.2 Administrative Responsibilities

- Each External Reviewer shall complete a standard written Annual Report to the University on the conduct of the assessments concluded during the year and on issues relating to those assessments.
- The Educational Programme Management Team, under the direction of the Dean and Educational Programme Leader, is required to address each of the points raised in the External Reviewer's report; the Dean shall subsequently respond formally, in writing, to the External Reviewer(s) to advise him/her of the course of action adopted in respect of each of the comments raised in the report.
- Where an External Reviewer considers that any aspect of an assessment erodes or jeopardizes the standard of the University's awards, he/she shall report such concern, at the earliest opportunity, in writing to the Provost of the University.

1.3 GUIDANCE NOTE ON THE EXTERNAL REVIEWER ROLE AND EXPECTATIONS

1.3.1 Authority and Responsibilities of External Reviewers

- To ensure that students are assessed fairly and impartially, and that the standard of a particular University award is comparable with those of other awarding bodies.
- To approve, as appropriate, the form and content of draft examination papers, coursework and/or other forms of assessment that contribute to the assessment in award-bearing stages.

- To approve proposed changes to assessment regulations where these affect students currently registered for the course.
- To approve, as appropriate, proposed course/Programme changes.
- To attend meetings of the Assessment Board, as appropriate, and have right of access to the work of students where such work is subject to assessment for academic awards within the Board's jurisdiction.
- To have access to the work of those students recommended for the highest category of the award(s) and of those deemed to have failed the assessment for the award. External Reviewers shall also have authority to request representative samples of work for each category of the award to ensure that the relative placing of the students in order of merit is fair and impartial.
- To moderate the grades awarded by the internal Reviewers.
- To conduct a viva voce examination in the case of any student.
- To participate, as required, in the review of any decision relating to an individual student award.
- Every recommendation for the conferment of an award of the University by an Assessment Board shall be subject to the written consent of at least one of the External Reviewers for the award.
- Where an External Reviewer(s) declares the subject of any contention to be a matter of principle, the Assessment Board shall either accept the view of the External Reviewer(s) or refer the matter to the Academic Council for a decision. Similarly, any unresolved disagreement between the External Reviewers shall be referred to the Academic Council for resolution.
- About Programmes that are shared between colleges:
 - To ensure comparability of awards (national) and standards (University).
 - To ensure fair and equitable treatment of students who share Programmes across courses.
 - Duties of moderation of assessment, reading of scripts as appropriate.
 - Receives *Programme Results Listing*, immediately following assessment periods in Semester 1 and Semester 2, from Programme Coordinator.
 - Analysis's profile of grades (all students in host and guest Colleges).
 - Prepares *Programme Feedback Report* and submits to Programme Coordinator.
- To undertake their responsibilities in accordance with the Academic Regulations and AUM Organizational Regulations.

Part V. WORK-BASED LEARNING: INTERNSHIP PROVISION

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

This Section of the Handbook covers the University policy and procedures for the quality assurance of student internships.

Many courses/programs within the University are regulated by the requirements of professional and regulatory bodies. Where this is the case, any additional requirements should also be met for student Internships.

The following terminology is used throughout this Section of the Handbook:

Internship Coordinator – Overall Internship organizer for the College

Academic Internship Tutor – tutor based within the College

Internship Provider - university providing the Internship

Mentor – onsite tutor

The University is responsible for ensuring that, where Internship learning is an intended part of a Study Programme:

- responsibilities for Internship learning are clearly defined.
- intended Learning Outcomes contribute to the overall aims of the Study Programme.
- assessment of Internship learning is part of a coherent assessment strategy.

These aspects are also currently covered by the following Sections of this Handbook:

Section 1: Programme, Course and Program Developments

Section 2: Annual Review Process

Section 3: Internal Review.

2. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

2.1 Internship Arrangements

It is important students are aware of the basic requirements of their internship. The University requires that all students undertaking an internship period be issued, well before the start of the Internship, with a document clarifying:

- Who is responsible for securing the Internship? If the College is primarily responsible, it should be stated whether the student is permitted, or encouraged, to find his/her own Internship opportunity. If the student is primarily responsible, details of any assistance available should be given.
- The procedure for approving Internships.
- The consequences of failing to secure an internship or failing to satisfactorily complete an internship.

An exemplar document depicting the organization of Internships is given in *Appendix 5.1*, and should be modified to fit the requirements of each Study Programme.

2.2 Internship Provision

The University wishes to be assured of the ability of the Internship Provider to:

- provide learning opportunities to enable the specified Learning Outcomes to be achieved.
- support students on Internship
- fulfil responsibilities under health and safety legislation in the workplace, having regard to the level of skill and experience of Internship students.

2.2.1 Academic and Support Issues

Documentation provided to the Internship Provider should include:

- a synopsis of the learning and skills possessed by the students prior to commencing Internship.
- a statement of the Programme Learning Outcomes to be achieved.
- if a learning contract is to be developed, some guidance on the process, including examples.
- a statement of any key targets to be met, e.g., interim report dates.
- if the Internship Supervisor is to be involved in assessment, an explanation of how this is to be carried out, preferably with proformas to be completed which include detailed definitions of grades.

When approving a new Internship Provider, the Internship Coordinator should assure him/herself the above issues are well understood by the Internship Provider and adequate learning opportunities and support in terms of staff and facilities are available.

Where a learning contract is to be developed, this process should be completed at an early stage of the Internship; for a year-long Internship, it should be completed by the end of the first four weeks. In all cases, final approval of the learning contract is the responsibility of the College, and this

should include a check that all the stated Programme Learning Outcomes are adequately covered.

2.2.2 Health and Safety

Whilst the primary responsibility for the health and safety of the student rests with the Internship Provider during the Internship period, the University has responsibilities to both the Internship Provider and to the students on Internship. The University's Students Affairs has developed Student Internship Risk Management Policy and Procedure. Colleges should ensure all the procedures detailed in the current version of this are implemented. Copies of the Student Internship Risk Management Policy and Procedure are also available at the website.

For all Internships, Colleges should pay special attention if a student has specific needs. Additional checks on the suitability of the premises in which the student will work and the support to be provided by the Internship Provider must be made about the specific needs, and a report lodged with the Internship Coordinator. The University's *Adviser for Students with Disabilities* may be consulted or involved in the process, as necessary.

2.2.3 Internship Providers

Visits by Academic Internship Tutors should be used to reinforce, as necessary, the awareness of Internship Providers of their responsibilities relating to the provision of learning opportunities and support, the health and safety of students and, where appropriate, assessment.

3. STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Colleges should address issues regarding students' rights and responsibilities by conducting student briefings ahead of the Internship. It is essential students also receive guidance in written form. Whilst the items to be covered will depend on the College and the Internships involved, the list given in *Appendix 5.2* provides an indication of items which might be covered.

4. STUDENT SUPPORT AND INFORMATION

Colleges should ensure adequate support and information is provided for all Internship students by conducting student briefings ahead of the Internship, covering what the student may expect leading up to, during and after the Internship. It is essential students also receive guidance in written form. The Internship Provider should be sent a copy of any written guidance provided. Whilst the items to be covered will depend on the College and the Internships involved, the list given in *Appendix 5.3* provides an indication of items which might be covered.

5. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The University is responsible for ensuring the staff who are involved in Internship learning are competent to fulfil their role. The following procedures should be adopted and documented:

5.1 College Responsibilities

- (i) Wherever possible, Internship Coordinators should be members of groups comprising staff with similar responsibilities in other institutions.
- (ii) Internship Coordinators should brief new members of staff on what is expected of an Academic Internship Tutor, and this should be accompanied by the issue of written guidance.
- (iii) Guidelines and checklists/forms covering progress towards Learning Outcomes, any problems and remedial actions taken should be drawn up by each College for Academic Internship Tutor visits to students on Internships. The checklists/forms should be completed and returned to the Internship Coordinator to form a permanent record of each Internship.
- (iv) An annual meeting of all staff involved in Internships should be held to discuss the operation of Internships during the previous session and possible modifications for the forthcoming session. Ideally, this meeting should include staff from Internship Providers as this will raise the awareness of Internship Supervisors and involve them in developments.
- (v) Where applicable, College staff development policies should ensure the provision of arrangements to train academic staff involved in Internship activity.
- (vi) Provision should be made so an efficient immediate transfer of all Internship duties is possible in the event the Internship Coordinator is absent for a prolonged period.

5.2 University Responsibilities

- (i) The University will organize a meeting of Internship Coordinators at least once per session to review University-wide issues relating to the provision of student Internships.
- (ii) The University will provide training opportunities as required and in consultation with Internship Coordinators.

6. DEALING WITH COMPLAINTS

The University's Academic Regulation A3: Student Conduct, Appeals and Complaints applies equally to the Internship period as to any other activity in connection with study at the University.

Colleges must ensure students, University staff and Internship Providers are aware how to access *Academic Regulation A3: Student Conduct, Appeals and Complaints*.

7. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF INTERNSHIP LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

The following procedures should be followed and documented:

7.1 During Internships

Colleges should:

- (i) Encourage Internship Supervisors and students to communicate any concerns over any aspect of the Internship timeously.
- (ii) Ensure progress is monitored at regular intervals, with appropriate recording of information gathered.
- (iii) Ensure continuous communication is maintained between the Academic Internship Tutor and the Internship Supervisor

7.2 After Conclusion of Internships

Colleges should:

- (i) Collect information on the effectiveness of the learning during Internship. This may be achieved by the issue of questionnaires to, and/or by reports from, students and Internship Supervisors. External Reviewers may make an input, where appropriate, at Assessment Boards and in *External Reviewer Annual Reports*. Informal input from students and Internship Supervisors may be obtained through meetings either in groups or individually
- (ii) Process and evaluate the information, including ensuring the quality and standards of achievement of all the Internships are reviewed. The University's quality system provides several mechanisms by which this may be achieved and recorded: through Assessment Boards, with External Reviewer participation where appropriate, and the Annual Review Process
- (iii) Ensure participation of Internship Providers in the review of procedures to facilitate effective learning opportunities during Internship. The many informal opportunities for this process should be supplemented by more formal occasions. The proceedings of these formal occasions should be recorded and may include, for example, group meetings between representatives from the staff of Internship Providers and the College.

EXEMPLAR DOCUMENT FOR INTERNSHIP ARRANGEMENTS

COLLEGE OF

Students undertaking the BSc are required to undertake a week period of work experience (Internship) within an approved organization. The Internship will normally be undertaken after successful completion of semester 3 of the course.

1. Procedures for securing and allocating Internships.

Staff in the College will generate Internship opportunities, this will be coordinated by the College's Internship Coordinator. All Internship opportunities will be advertised to students.

Students may apply for any position of interest to them. Internship Providers will receive all applications and will draw up a shortlist for interview with no assistance from the Internship Coordinator. The successful candidate will be selected after progressing through the Internship Provider's own recruitment process.

2. Procedure for approving Internships

Organizations interested in employing a Internship student are required to produce a description of the tasks to be undertaken (task description) during the proposed Internship. Before advertising any Internship opportunity, this task description will be judged against the Learning Outcomes for the Internship element of the course to ascertain its suitability.

Any student identifying a potential Internship using his or her own connections is required to submit a task description to the Internship Coordinator. This will be subject to the same approval procedure as above.

3. Consequences of failure to secure a Internship or failing a Internship.

Any student failing to secure an internship by the end of September will be required to undertake a research project in the College. Any student failing the Internship, or alternative project, should be aware that only one further attempt to achieve success in this element is possible. Any student who ultimately fails the Internship, or alternative project, will not be eligible for an award.

SUGGESTED LIST - STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND RIGHTS

Student Responsibilities

Students are expected to:

1. Act as good representatives both of themselves and of the University. The work Internship will form an important part of a student's CV, particularly in the early stages of his/her career. For the student, a good impression is

important to get the most out of the Internship and possibly a useful referee for future applications; for the University, future Internship opportunities for future students are at stake.

2. Pay due attention to all health and safety issues, attend briefings before the commencement of the Internship and carefully read the contents of the *University Health and Safety Pack*.
3. Return the *Health and Safety Induction Checklist* promptly by the end of week 1 of the Internship.
4. Be professional, this includes respect for any ethical, legal, confidential, or other considerations as appropriate.
5. Manage inter-personal relationships with the employer, its clients, and employees.
6. Wear appropriate dress and present a good personal appearance.
7. Report for work punctually and work as specified by the Internship Provider.
8. Work efficiently, alone or with others as required.
9. Record progress and achievements.
10. Produce material for assessments and/or as required for other purposes by your employer to meet given deadlines.
11. Alert the employer at the start of the day in the event of illness preventing attendance. If the illness persists for 5 days or more, the Internship Coordinator at the College should also be alerted.
12. Negotiate any days off with the Internship Supervisor.
13. Be enthusiastic, set out to gain as much from the opportunity as possible.
14. Avoid openly criticizing the Internship Provider or individuals within the organization.
15. Report all accidents to the Internship Supervisor and to the Internship Coordinator.
16. Promptly inform the appropriate person in the event of any problem developing which inhibits progress towards achieving the Learning Outcomes on the Internship.

Student Rights

Students may expect:

1. The Internship Provider provides a safe Internship environment.
2. The Internship Provider provides work and support that allows the student to develop appropriate skills. The University has systems and procedures in place to check if this is the case. Students should be aware that, exceptionally, (e.g., equipment breakdown, loss of contract) projects may need to be changed or re-negotiated.
3. To be treated in accordance with applicable legislation.

SUGGESTED LIST - STUDENT SUPPORT AND INFORMATION

Before the start of the Internship

Students should be informed of:

1. Details of the Internship process including:
 - How details of Internships will be made available to students.
 - The channels for applying for specific Internships and for responding to any interest expressed by Internship Provider (whether directly or through the Internship Coordinator).
 - Guidance on preparation of a CV, if appropriate.
 - Guidance on preparation for Internship interviews, if appropriate.
 - The provision which is made for the development of additional skills if appropriate (e.g., General/specific foreign language support, cultural orientation).
 - The need for personal insurance cover, if appropriate.
 - Reinforcement of the student's obligations in respect of health and safety, particularly in the new environment, and that they should pay particular attention to the health and safety briefing that the Internship Provider will give. Also, the need for any vaccinations if relevant.
 - Reinforcement of any special obligations which may apply relating to, for example, legal, ethical or confidentiality issues.
 - The stage at which a student is obliged to accept a Internship, and the consequences of a refusal at this stage.
2. The length of the Internship.
3. Any arrangements for time off during the Internship.
4. The Programme Learning Outcomes.
5. Any specific Learning Outcomes or how and when these will be determined in the case of a learning contract or learning plan which is yet to be finalized.
6. What they are expected to produce as evidence of meeting Learning Outcomes or how and when these will be determined.
7. Assessment details and criteria or how and when these will be determined.
8. When/if they may expect a visit from the Academic Internship Tutor.
9. What to do in the case of a problem arising which has the potential to seriously affect their work on the Internship.
10. Telephone number and e-mail contact details for university staff.
11. Their position during Internship in respect of:
 - Any grant or funding they may receive, and how receipt of salary may affect this.
 - Holidays during the Internship.
 - Matriculation at the University, fees and University services that remain available to students during the Internship (e.g., Library access).

12. Students should also receive from the Internship Provider a letter:

- Confirming their internship, and dates.
- Stating the time, place, and person to whom to report on the first day.
- Stating any salary to be paid.
- Giving details of any specific clothing requirements if these are to be met by the student.

During the Internship

Internship Providers should:

1. Provide a health and safety induction and participate in the completion and return of the relevant checklist in week 1.
2. Provide the support and facilities agreed with the Internship Coordinator and Academic Internship Tutor.
3. Respond to any problems brought to their attention by the student or Academic Internship Tutor.

The College should:

1. Ensure regular contact is maintained via telephone and/or e-mail.
2. Maintain regular contact with the student.
3. Respond to any problems brought to their attention by the student or Internship Supervisor.
4. Provide any regular monitoring of progress detailed in the Programme Descriptor or in documentation provided to the student/Internship Provider.
5. Visit the student at the stage(s) in the Internship, unless this proved impracticable for staff in the College itself to undertake such a visit, in which case alternative appropriate arrangements should be agreed prior to the Internship commencing. detailed in the Programme Descriptor or in documentation provided to the student/Internship Provider.

After the Internship

The College should assist student re-orientation. Examples of how this may be achieved are:

1. The provision of an individual debriefing session for each student.
2. By conducting group seminar(s) at which learning from Internship may be discussed. It is desirable that upcoming prospective Internship students attend this seminar.

Part VI. ACADEMIC COLLABORATION

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

1.1 Introduction

Collaborative arrangements are generally agreed based on individual courses, programs or short courses and the Curriculum Development Committee of the University has responsibility for approving all forms of academic collaboration.

This Section of the Handbook has been structured in order that subsections 2 to 5, which provide details of the respective approval procedures, are self-contained and should be read in conjunction with subsections 1, 6, 7 and 8.

1.2 Types of Academic Collaboration

The University recognizes the following forms of academic collaboration:

- **Franchised Course**

A whole Study Programme, or part of a Study Programme, is designed by the staff of the University, but delivered and assessed in the partner institution or organization.

- **Validated Course**

A whole Study Programme, or part of a Study Programme, is designed, delivered, and assessed by the staff of the partner institution or organization.

- **Credit-rating of External Provision**

A credit-rated non-award-bearing course designed and delivered by the staff of the partner institution or organization (in this case an employer, a professional body, or a non-degree awarding college). Normally, assessment is undertaken by the University.

On occasion, the University may seek to enter into an agreement to design, and/or deliver and/or assess a Study Programme in conjunction with one or more partner institutions or organizations with degree-awarding powers. Such joint arrangements would be subject to mutually agreed and clearly defined quality assurance processes based on those of the University and the partner institution or organization. In such arrangements, the award(s) would be jointly conferred by the University and the partner institution or organization.

In addition, the University participates in the following:

- Student Exchange Study Periods
- 2+2 Articulation Agreements

- SOCRATES Bilateral Partnership Agreements are distinct from Student Exchange Study Periods, and advice on these may be obtained from the *European Office*. Advice on contracts for research collaboration may be obtained from the Commercialization, Research and European Development Office (CREDO).
- ERASMUS and others

1.3 Overview of the Approval of Academic Collaboration

The approval of academic collaborations involves two stages. The Academic Council has responsibility for approving proposals for all forms of academic collaboration. In the case of validated courses, the Academic Collaboration may require that a visit to the partner institution or organization be taken to inform its decision. No further work on the proposed collaboration should be undertaken until approval has been granted by Academic Collaboration\AC. The University, in all instances, must satisfy itself that any form of academic collaboration fulfils its educational principles and that the partner institution or organization(s) provides a suitable learning environment for students on courses/programs leading to awards of the University.

Applications to the AC are made using the *Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma*, and staff should familiarize themselves with the type of collaboration they are seeking to pursue to assist with completion of the *Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma* and use of the *Risk Assessment Tool* that accompanies the *Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma*.

After the approval by Academic Collaboration, a formal Review or approval event is required, following the University's procedures, and this normally takes place at the partner institution or organization. The University will charge a fee to the partner institution or organization for conducting this event. This fee is a one-off payment and is normally payable in advance of the approval/Review event. The fee is in addition to the annual fees payable by the partner institution or organization to the University for each student registered on the Study Programme. This fee is discussed prior to the approval/Review event. In addition to considering the facilities at the partner institution or organization, the Approval/Review Panel will consider if the professional and research activities of staff teaching on approved courses/programs can sustain the aims of the Study Programme and its development and ensure they will be able to deliver the Study Programme to an appropriate standard.

For Review or approval events, the partner institution or organization must be prepared to supply the documentation according to the requirements of the University. Documentation detailing the human and physical resources available to support the program are required. In addition, a copy of the equivalent regulations/quality handbook (if one exists) should also be provided. (Full details of the required documents will be supplied by the University).

Partner institutions or organizations should note that accreditation by professional, statutory and regulatory bodies will not automatically occur with the approval of the collaboration.

Normally, the University will not consider entering collaborative arrangements where delivery and assessment is in a language other than English, given the University's quality assurance mechanisms have not been designed to deal with provision in a foreign language.

1.4 Guidance: Preparing an Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma

A partnership with another institution needs to be built on knowledge, trust and soundly based agreements and procedures. It is important both partners understand and appreciate that a considerable investment of time and staff resources may be necessary, even before a decision to proceed towards the formal approval or Review event is taken.

Prior to the formal establishment of any collaborative arrangement, the University would wish to become sufficiently familiar with the partner institution or organization, its resources, facilities, staff, traditions, ethos, academic and non-academic capability, and achievements to allow it to satisfy itself the partner institution or organization is fully able to meet any requirements which may be placed upon it to assure quality and standards.

The approval of a partner institution or organization as suitable for the delivery of courses/programs leading to awards of the University implies that the partner institution or organization:

- has a compatible and complementary mission statement to that of the University.
- is financially stable with appropriate resources to support higher education courses/programs.
- has an effective management system suited to assuring the quality of courses/programs?
- offers an ethos and environment for teaching and learning appropriate to higher education; and has an appropriate regulatory framework and academic and administrative policies and practices, e.g., regulations governing cheating or plagiarism should be in place as should mechanisms and resources be available to support staff development.

1.5 Guidance: Contract of Collaboration

All forms of academic collaboration which involve the conferment of a university award or academic credit must be covered by an appropriate *Contract of Collaboration* prior to their implementation. This is produced by the University

and sets out the responsibilities and duties of each partner, specifying the financial arrangements and entry requirements to the Study Programme (where these apply).

Contract templates may be obtained from

In the case of **Student Exchange Study Period**, the following documentation is required:

(i) *Contract of Collaboration (Student Exchange Study Period)*, signed by the University Provost (or designated nominee).

(ii) *Bilateral Agreement* (annex to the *Contract of Collaboration (Student Exchange Study Period)*), signed by the University Provost (or designated nominee).

1.6 Guidance: Quality Assurance

Where courses/programs lead to the conferment of awards by a partner institution or organization or another type of collaborating body, they are subject to the quality assurance processes of the University, and the approval of courses/programs in the partner institution or organization is normally conducted through the University's procedures. Similarly, the arrangements for student assessment and the conferment of the award should satisfy the University's own normal requirements.

All collaborative agreements are subject to periodic review (see subsection 7) normally annually and every five years. This may be at Study Programme or institutional level, dependent on the number of courses/programs involved. In most cases, collaborative arrangements are considered as part of the course re-approval aspect of the Internal Review of the host College. The University also reserves the right to require a review of any collaboration following a shorter period of operation.

In addition, for overseas collaborations the University requires overseas partner institutions or organizations to:

- secure written confirmation that the implementation of the Study Programme has the approval of the Government or appropriate authority of the country concerned, to forward this to the University and, confirm annually through the Moderator, that any changes to legislation do not affect the status of the agreement.
- not place the quality and standards of their collaborative arrangements at risk for financial gain or in circumstances of financial exigency.

1.7 Guidance: The Role of the Moderator

A Moderator is normally appointed by the University to take responsibility for the overall administration, general operation, co-ordination, and monitoring of the collaboration.

The Moderator:

- oversees the overall administration, general operation, monitoring and quality of teaching and learning of the collaboration.
- provides the academic link between the University and its partner institution or organization to ensure adequate ongoing communication between the two institutions.
- normally undertakes a minimum of two visits per year to the partner institution or organization (including attendance at the Assessment Board or Committee) at the partner institution or organization's expense.
- attends the Assessment Committee (if applicable) and Assessment Board for the collaboration (though the Moderator does not make decisions concerning student awards as this is the role of the External Reviewer) to ensure arrangements for the conduct of Assessment Committees and Assessment Boards are appropriately carried out and the University's Academic Regulations are adhered to;
- produces a Moderator's Annual Report for the University on the operation of the collaboration, assessment, and examination arrangements (in the case of a franchised Study Programme this role may be undertaken by the host Course Leader, but this need not be the case), which informs the Head of College/Associate Dean when they complete the *Annual Study Programme Review*.
- makes reference to issues raised in the *Annual Study Programme Review* (see Section 2 of this Handbook) and issues relating to student care and the student experience;
- has a quality improvement role.

1.8 Guidance: The Role of the External Reviewer

For all forms of collaboration, the primary responsibility of the External Reviewer is to ensure that candidates for a particular award, or credit, of the University are assessed fairly and impartially, and that the standard of the award is comparable with those of other awarding bodies.

Wherever possible and appropriate, the duties of one (or several) of the University's own External Reviewers are extended to cover the collaborative agreement. This is seen as the most effective means of ensuring consistency of the University's standards. Appropriate remuneration is made to the External Reviewer for these additional duties.

The University briefs all External Reviewers involved in the collaboration on their duties. Where practical and appropriate, External Reviewers for collaborative courses/programs are invited to attend any induction or briefing workshops offered by the University.

Where the Study Programme is one which is also offered by the University, the University's External Reviewer is expected to undertake additional duties in respect of the collaborative Study Programme, thereby providing a valuable mechanism for assuring consistent standards. The extension of the External Reviewer's duties requires approval by the relevant College Academic Board and the Dean (see *Section 4* of this Handbook).

External Reviewers are required to submit an *External Reviewer Annual Report* to the Principal of the University. Relevant *External Reviewer Annual Reports* are copied to the partner institution or organization by the Academic Affairs Department.

The Course Management Team of the partner institution or organization is responsible for responding to comments raised by the External Reviewer(s) in their *External Reviewer Annual Report*. In the case of a franchised Study Programme the host Study Programme Management Team must sign off the response to the *External Reviewer Annual Report*. In the case of a validated Study Programme, a copy of the response should be lodged with the University. Responsibility for payment of External Reviewer fees and expenses rests with the partner institution or organization.

The duties of an External Reviewer are detailed in the Academic Regulation A5: External Reviewers. In addition, reference should be made to Section 4 of this Handbook and notably the need to ensure that External Reviewers approve draft *Instruments of Assessment*.

2. APPROVAL PROCEDURE: FRANCHISED COURSES

2.1 Introduction

Franchised Course: A whole Study Programme, or part of a Study Programme, designed by the staff of the University, but delivered and assessed in the partner institution or organization.

Such courses/programs are approved using the University's procedures, and subsequently are subject to an approval event. Thereafter, the Study Programme is subject to the quality assurance processes of the University. The award(s) is always conferred by the University.

A franchise agreement is normally considered only with a university Study Programme that has been operating successfully for some time. The University will require the partner institution or organization to deliver the franchised Study

Programme(s) in accordance with the requirements laid out in the Detailed Course Descriptor and Programme Descriptors.

2.2 Preparation and Submission of Paperwork to Curriculum Development Committee/CDC

The Dean proposing the collaboration should firstly liaise with the QA. If the Dean is satisfied of the value in pursuing the collaboration (also refer to *subsection 1.3*), the *Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma* should be completed and submitted to the Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) for consideration. No further work should be undertaken on the proposal until the CDC has reached a decision.

2.3 Planning the Approval Event

Once CDC has granted approval to proceed to an approval event, the Course/program Leader shall prepare an *Academic Collaboration Planning Sheet* in consultation with the Dean and Registrar. A copy of the approved *Academic Collaboration Planning Sheet* is distributed to relevant parties, including the College and partner institution or organization.

Thereafter, the Dean will prepare a *Contract of Collaboration*, in consultation with QA. The *Contract of Collaboration* shall be accompanied by two annexes: *Annex I - Academic Quality and Standards*, and *Annex II - Financial Annex*. The provost, or nominee, has overall responsibility for approving *Annex I*. The Financial Director, or nominee, has overall responsibility for approving *Annex II*. If a draft *Contract of Collaboration* differs significantly from the standard contract, the CDC is required to approve it.

Prior to a formal approval event, it would be expected that one or more visits to the institution seeking partnership would be made to verify the feasibility of the franchise proceeding further. Such visits would usually be made by the relevant Dean (or nominee) and discipline specialists from the College considering the franchise. The Approval Panel would consider the capacity of the partner institution or organization franchising the Study Programme to deliver it to an appropriate quality and standard.

2.4 Approval Event

The nature of the Approval Event is determined by CDC and the Provost, or nominee, taking due cognizance of the nature of the proposed collaboration, the details contained within the *Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma*

As a minimum, an Approval Panel composed of the provost, or nominee, and Dean shall undertake a quality visit to the proposed partner institution or

organization. However, depending upon the scope of the collaboration, it may be considered appropriate to have a more extensive Panel, which may comprise both internal University members and external members incorporating practitioners and subject specialists.

The University Course Leader should be present as a member of the partner institution or organization team so that issues relating to communication and operations between the University and partner institution, or organization can be fully explored by the Approval Panel.

2.5 Purpose of the Approval Event

The aim of the approval event is to ensure the educational experience of the student on a franchised Study Programme is of an equivalent standard to that for students following the Study Programme at the University. The major objectives of the Approval Panel are to:

- ensure the staff of the partner institution or organization can deliver the Study Programme to an appropriate standard.
- ensure the partner institution or organization has adequate physical resources.
- ensure other elements of the overall student experience are comparable to that provided by the University.
- ensure all parties to the franchise can deploy sufficient resources to support the collaboration.

In addition, the Panel may also consider the aims and learning outcomes of the Study Programme and how these would be met within the partner institution or organization, arrangements for admission of students, optimum student numbers, assessment arrangements, student support, appeals, complaints and misconduct etc. In terms of adequacy of physical resources, the Approval Panel must satisfy itself of the adequacy of library facilities, computing facilities, etc. The basic requirements must be in place and a franchise will never be approved based on a promise to provide the facilities in the future.

2.6 Documentation Requirements for the Approval Event

To be supplied by the University to the partner institution or organization:

- *Academic Quality Handbook*
- *Academic Regulations*
- *Organizational Regulations*
- Programme Descriptors and syllabus information
- Draft *Contract of Collaboration*
- Detailed Course Descriptor for the franchise.

To be supplied by the partner institution or organization to the University:

- *Supporting Information and Resources* document
- Prospectus
- Business Plan
- Organizational and Management Structure
- Draft *Student Handbook**
- Copy of the equivalent regulations/quality handbook.

*The Student Handbook should be produced in association with the host College at the University and should follow guidance provided by the University. The Handbook should clearly detail any local arrangements relating to the implementation of the University's Academic Regulations or Procedures by the partner institution or organization, particularly in respect of Academic Regulation A3: Student Conduct, Appeals and Complaints.

2.7 Format and Layout of the Supporting Information and Resources Document

The *Supporting Information and Resources* document, provided by the partner institution or organization, will include information under the following headings:

Background Information

A brief historical account of the partner institution or organization. In the case of an overseas collaboration, this section should also include an assurance (in writing) that necessary permission has been obtained from local government or agencies of the country concerned to offer the University's Study Programme(s).

Human Resources

To include:

- Tabular information showing academic and support staffing numbers within the partner institution or organization, with details of the academic staff age distribution.
- Staff CVs and publications and a summary of research activities (for staff involved in the teaching and delivery of the franchised Study Programme).
- Staff development plans and policies (particularly for staff involved in the teaching and delivery of the franchised Study Programme). (N.B. In the case of an agreement involving online learning and/or an overseas partner institution or organization, advice from the University should be sought as to what should be included here).
- Staff appointment, induction, and review mechanisms/procedures.

Physical Resources

To include information on the following facilities to support the franchised Study Programme(s):

- Library provision.
- Teaching rooms and laboratories.
- Computer facilities.

Teaching and Assessment

A statement of how it is intended the Study Programme will be delivered and assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Detailed Course Descriptor and *Contract of Collaboration*.

2.8 External Reviewer Arrangements

Refer also to *Section 4* of this Handbook.

MALTA

The duties of the External Reviewers appointed for the host Study Programme or subject area at the University are extended to include consideration of students under all associated franchise agreements.

The partner institution or organization would constitute an Assessment Committee to initially consider student results and make recommendations to the University Assessment Board. All student results would be formally ratified by the University's Assessment Board. Samples of student work from the partner institution or organization are sent to the University's External Reviewers for consideration in advance of the University's Assessment Board. The University Moderator attends (in person or via a video-conference link) both the partner institutions or organization's Assessment Committee and the University's Assessment Board.

The University normally schedules two Assessment Boards per annum - in June and September.

The University's External Reviewers are required to refer to the performance and standards of students on the franchise in their *External Reviewer Annual Report*.

Overseas

An External Examining Team would be constituted, comprised of the appropriate External Reviewers for the host Study Programme or subject area at the University, and one External Reviewer nominated by the partner institution or organization from the local area. The role of this Reviewer would include raising any contextual issues arising from the local cultural differences. The partner institution or organization would be responsible for payment of all fees and expenses to this External Reviewer and would also contribute to the fees and expenses of the University's External Reviewers relating to the additional work involved with the franchise.

The partner institution or organization constitutes an Assessment Committee to initially consider student results and make recommendations to the University's Assessment Board. The local External Reviewer attends the Assessment Committee. All student results are formally ratified by the University's Assessment Board. Samples of student work from the partner institution or organization are sent to the University's External Reviewers for consideration in advance of the University's Assessment Board. The University Moderator attends (in person or via a video-conference link) both the partner institution or organization's Assessment Committee and the University's Assessment Board.

The University normally schedules two Assessment Boards per annum - in June and September.

The University's External Reviewers are required to refer to the performance and standard of students on the franchise in their *External Reviewer Annual Report*.

3. APPROVAL PROCEDURE: VALIDATED COURSES

3.1 Introduction

Validated Course: A whole Study Programme, or part of a Study Programme, designed, delivered, and assessed by the staff of the partner institution or organization.

Such a Study Programme is approved using the University's procedures, and the Study Programme is subject to the quality assurance processes of the University (see Section 1 of this Handbook). The award(s) is always conferred by the University.

3.2 Preparation and Submission of Paperwork to AC

The Dean proposing the collaboration liaises first with the AUM Dean of College. If the Dean of College is satisfied of the value in pursuing the collaboration (also refer *subsection 1.3*) then an *Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma* is completed along with the accompanying *Risk Assessment Tool* and submitted to the Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) for consideration. No further work should be undertaken on the proposal until the CDC has reached a decision.

Generally, the CDC will require that a visit to the partner institution or organization take place to inform its decision. Normally, a team composed of the Provost, QA, or nominee, the Program/Course Leader or/and Dean will undertake such an approval visit.

3.3 Planning the Review Event

Once CDC has granted approval to proceed to a Review Event, the Dean prepares an *Academic Collaboration Planning Sheet* in consultation with the QA and Registrar. A copy of the approved *Academic Collaboration Planning*

Sheet is distributed to relevant parties, including the College and partner institution or organization.

Thereafter, the Dean will prepare a *Contract of Collaboration*, in consultation with the provost. The *Contract of Collaboration* shall be accompanied by two annexes: *Annex I - Academic Quality and Standards*, and *Annex II - Financial Annex*. The provost, or nominee, has overall responsibility for approving *Annex I*. The Executive Director (Administrative and Finance), or nominee, has overall responsibility for approving *Annex II*.

3.4 Review Event

The nature of the Review Event, held at the partner institution or organization, is determined by CDC and the Provost, or nominee, taking due cognizance of the nature of the proposed collaboration, the details contained within the *Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma*. Organization of the Review Event will reflect the requirements of the University's for its own courses and programs. The University's *Review Procedure* for new courses and programs is used and documents prepared accordingly. The University will appoint a *Course Development Consultant* to assist in this matter.

The Dean should be present as a member of the partner institution or organization team so that issues relating to communication and operations between the University and partner institution, or organization can be fully explored by the Review Panel.

The University-appointed Moderator for the validated course should be present as a member of the partner institution or organization team so that issues relating to communication and operations between the University and partner institution, or organization can be fully explored by the Approval Panel.

3.5 Documentation Requirements for the Review Event

To be supplied by the University to the partner institution or organization

- *Academic Quality Handbook*
- *Academic Regulations*
- *Organizational Regulations*
- Draft *Contract of Collaboration*

To be supplied by the partner institution or organization to the University

- Course documentation required for a new Study Programme Review (see **Section 1, subsection 2.3** of this Handbook)
- Draft *Student Handbook**
- Copy of the equivalent regulations/quality handbook.
- Prospectus

- Business Plan
- Background information - brief historical account of the partner institution or organization. In the case of an overseas collaboration, assurance (in writing) that necessary permission had been obtained from local government, or agencies of the country concerned, to offer the University's Study Programme(s) should be supplied.

* The Student Handbook should be produced in association with the host College at the University and should follow guidance provided by the University. The Handbook should clearly detail any local arrangements relating to the implementation of the University's Academic Regulations or Procedures by the partner institution or organization, particularly in respect of *Academic Regulation A3: Student Conduct, Appeals and Complaints*.

3.6 External Reviewer Arrangements

Malta

The partner institution or organization is responsible for nominating External Reviewers to the University for approval. Such External Reviewers will have all the authority and responsibilities stated in the University *Academic Regulation A5: External Reviewers*. The partner institution or organization is responsible for payment of all fees and expenses of these External Reviewers. An Assessment Board is held at the partner institution or organization at which the University-appointed Moderator is present (in person or via a video-conference link). The Moderator is responsible for conveying the results to the Student Administration Department of the University.

Overseas

In addition, when nominating the External Reviewers to the University, at least one of the nominations should be Malta-based and have experience of examining students under the Maltese higher education system. It is expected the Malta-based External Reviewer will attend all Assessment Boards relating to the validated Study Programme.

4. APPROVAL PROCEDURE: CREDIT-RATING OF EXTERNAL PROVISION

4.1 Introduction

Credit-rating of External Provision: A credit-rated non-award-bearing course designed and delivered by the staff of the partner institution or organization (in this case an employer, a professional body, or a non-degree awarding college). Normally, assessment will be undertaken by the University.

Such a course is validated using the University's normal procedures, and the course is subject to the quality assurance processes of the University. The credit(s) are **always** conferred by the University.

4.2 Preparation and Submission of Paperwork to CDC

The Dean proposing the collaboration liaises first with the Dean of College. If the Dean of College is satisfied of the value in pursuing the collaboration then an *Academic Collaboration Proposal Proforma* is completed and submitted to the Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) for consideration. No further work should be undertaken on the proposal until the CDC has reached a decision.

4.3 Planning the Approval Event

Once CDC has granted approval to proceed to an approval event, the Dean prepares an *Academic Collaboration Planning Sheet* in consultation with the QA and Registrar. A copy of the approved *Academic Collaboration Planning Sheet* is distributed to relevant parties, including the College and partner institution or organization.

Thereafter, the Dean will prepare a *Contract of Collaboration*, in consultation with the provost. The *Contract of Collaboration* shall be accompanied by two annexes: *Annex I - Academic Quality and Standards*, and *Annex II - Financial Annex*. The provost, or nominee, has overall responsibility for approving *Annex I*. The Executive Director (Administrative and Finance), or nominee, has overall responsibility for approving *Annex II*.

4.4 Approval Process

Following the approval of the proposal to collaborate, the credit-rated non-award-bearing course descriptor (i.e. the Programme Descriptor) is submitted to the appropriate College Academic Board and Dean of College for approval in accordance with the procedure described in *Section 1, subsection 4* of this Handbook.

4.5 External Reviewer Arrangements

The duties of the appropriate External Reviewers appointed to the subject area at the University are extended to also include consideration of students under all credit-rated external provision agreements. All student results are formally ratified by the University's Assessment Board. Samples of student work from the partner institution or organization should be sent to the University's External Reviewers for consideration in advance of the University's Assessment Board. The University Moderator attends (in person or via a video-conference link) the University's Assessment Board.

The University normally schedules two Assessment Boards per annum - in June and September.

The University's External Reviewers are required to refer to the performance and standard of students on credit-rated external provision in their *External Reviewer Annual Report*.

5. APPROVAL PROCEDURE: STUDENT EXCHANGE STUDY PERIODS

5.1 Introduction

The University offers courses/programs which include both mandatory and optional Student Exchange Study Periods and, for the purposes of assuring quality, no distinction is made between them. The following also applies to the University's involvement in ERASMUS, SOCRATES Bilateral Partnership Agreements (the European Credit Transfer Scheme [ECTS]) which should adhere to the principles and procedures defined for Student Exchange Study Periods.

By enabling opportunities for Student Exchange Study Periods, the University is demonstrating its commitment to enhancing a student's learning experience whilst ensuring the student can achieve the learning outcomes of the University's Study Programme. In doing so, and in accordance with all its collaborative arrangements, the University remains accountable for the quality and standards of any Study Programme, or part of a Study Programme, that contributes to its own award.

In specifying the principles and procedures for Student Exchange Study Periods, the University aims to provide a mechanism that is both systematic and open to scrutiny. Consideration must be given, therefore, to the academic content, the system for quality assurance, and the pastoral support offered to students whilst undertaking a Student Exchange Study Period.

It is the University's responsibility to ensure that any Student Exchange Study Period provides the necessary underpinning required for a student to progress to a subsequent stage of the University's Study Programme. This requires the University to assure itself that an appropriate and comparable learning experience could be offered by a partner institution or organization, though the University does not require this to be quantified as a proportion of equivalence. It does demand, however, that the learning outcomes of the Study Programme can be met and, if the University Study Programme is accredited by a Maltese professional, statutory or regulatory body, that its requirements will also be met through study undertaken either on a mandatory or optional Student Exchange Study Period.

When considering the appropriateness of a Study Programme for a Student Exchange Study Period, it is not necessary to require a student, for example, currently studying MQF Level 6/7 Programmes, to study elements delivered in Stage 3 of the partner institutions or organization's Study Programme. In this respect "Level", "Stage" and "Year" are not synonymous

Students should only undertake a Student Exchange Study Period with a partner institution or organization if the University has a formal agreement with that institution.

Prior to completing a formal agreement, the University is required to make several checks concerning the academic content of a Student Exchange Study Period program, the system for quality assurance in operation at the partner institution or organization, and the pastoral support offered to students by the partner institution or organization whilst undertaking a Student Exchange Study Period. This applies irrespective of whether the University or another institution initiates the establishment of a Student Exchange Study Period agreement.

5.2 Approval Process

1. The Dean indicates, in principle, willingness to consider Student Exchange Study Period arrangement with proposed partner institution or organization.
2. The College undertakes background check, using *Student Exchange Study Periods Checklist*, covering quality assurance mechanisms, and pastoral and support services provided to Exchange Students.
3. After considering the information supplied, the Dean decides whether to proceed. If deemed appropriate, the Dean may request further information from the proposed partner institution or organization.
4. Head of College/Associate Dean decides to formalize agreement and, in liaison with Course Leader and Academic Affairs/ European Office, prepares contracts and agreements as appropriate.
5. *Contract of Collaboration (Student Exchange Study Periods)* and appropriate annex (two complete copies) forwarded for signature by the University's Provost.
6. *Contract of Collaboration (Student Exchange Study Periods)* (two complete copies) forwarded by European Office to Principal (or equivalent) of partner institution or organization for signature. One signed copy returned to and retained in European Office.
7. For agreements under the auspices of SOCRATES, European Officer submits Application for Socrates-Erasmus Student and Teaching Mobility, signed by the University Principal, by annual deadline [normally May] containing all expected student and teaching mobility that will take place, this information being provided by European Study Programme Management, based on figures contained in Bilateral Agreements.

5.3 Responsibilities of the Dean in Approval Process

Acting on behalf of the College and the University, the Dean must take all reasonable efforts to:

(i) ensure the Student Exchange Study Period provides the necessary underpinning for the student to progress to the next stage of the University's Study Programme on their return, and the study offered by the partner institution or organization complies with the relevant learning outcomes for that stage of the Study Programme.

(ii) be satisfied that the information provided by the partner institution or organization in support of the arrangement is reliable.

(iii) maintain documentation in support of any decision taken in respect of the Student Exchange Study Period arrangement, which would be available for scrutiny by representatives of either the University or external agencies.

(iv) be satisfied the Student Exchange Study Period, whether optional or mandatory, would meet the requirements of an associated professional, statutory, or regulatory body.

(v) be satisfied the examination and assessment procedures, including instruments of assessment and grading/marking schemes, at the partner institution or organization, are equivalent to those of the University, particularly if the period of Exchange contributes to the classification of a degree or an award with distinction.

(vi) be satisfied with the resources to support the Study Programme and proposed delivery are appropriate.

(vii) be satisfied that, if the language of instruction or assessment is other than English, appropriate mechanisms are in place to support Exchange Students.

(viii) ensure the partner institution or organization produces, timeously, a suitable transcript for the Exchange Student, providing sufficient detail of achievements during the Student Exchange Study Period to inform the University's Assessment Board.

(ix) be satisfied with arrangements for removing a student from a Student Exchange Study Period subsequently considered unsuitable (for academic, quality, or pastoral reasons).

(x) ensure the partner institution or organization has the means and intention to undertake regular and formal communication with the University throughout the duration of the Student Exchange Study Period.

(xi) remain responsible for the overall administration, general operation and monitoring of the Student Exchange Study Period arrangement and ensure that any follow-up action required is undertaken.

5.4 External Reviewer Arrangements - Student Exchange Study Periods

In addition to those specified in *Section 4* of this Handbook and *Academic Regulation A5: External Reviewers*, External Reviewers involved in University

courses/programs incorporating mandatory or optional Student Exchange Study Periods have the following responsibilities:

(i) may insist on seeing the assessments undertaken by Exchange Students prior to agreeing to progression or award (including the classification of a degree or award with distinction as appropriate), to satisfy themselves the standards applied to those assessments were equivalent to those undertaken in the University's Study Programme.

(ii) may not alter or moderate the specific marks/grades/credits conferred by a partner institution or organization; this does not preclude the Assessment Board's right to allow a student's overall performance to compensate for partial failure.

5.5 Ongoing Management and Monitoring

The University must satisfy itself, on an ongoing basis, that the administration, general operation, and monitoring of the Student Exchange Study Period arrangement continues to meet its requirements.

The Dean must:

(i) consider, as part of the home Study Program's *Annual Review Process*.

(ii) request and consider formal written student feedback on the Student Exchange Study Period.

(iii) ensure the University's External Reviewer(s) continues to receive all information deemed appropriate concerning the Student Exchange Study Period.

(iv) take all reasonable efforts to ensure the ongoing suitability of the communication links between the University and the partner institution or organization.

(v) take all reasonable efforts to ensure the ongoing standard of performance of Exchange Students studying at the partner institution or organization.

The European Office must (SOCRATES Bilateral Agreements and other arrangements with European Union Member States only) as part of the University's ongoing commitment to offer Student Exchange Study Periods:

(i) maintain an accurate and detailed database of Student Exchange Study Period Agreements.

(ii) maintain an accurate file of *European Officer Reports* to Deans.

(iii) provide a report to the Dean highlighting areas of concern.

(iv) ensure the Colleges involved in Student Exchange Study Periods continue to meet their obligations as specified above.

(v) provide an Annual Status Report on Student Exchange Study Period agreements to the Curriculum Development Committee.

5.6 Review of a Student Exchange Study Period Agreement

The University must satisfy itself, on an ongoing basis, that the Student Exchange Study Period arrangement continues to meet its requirements. After a successful approval, the Dean must, prior to a new student or cohort of students commencing a Student Exchange Study Period (whether this be on an annual basis or more frequently):

(i) re-confirm arrangements to ensure that the Student Exchange Study Period continues to:

- provide the necessary underpinning for the student to progress to the next stage of the University's Study Programme on their return,
- comply with the relevant learning outcomes for that stage of the Study Programme,
- comply with professional or statutory body requirements, if appropriate.

(ii) be satisfied that the period of Student Exchange Study Period offered by the partner institution or organization continues to meet all other requirements investigated during the Approval Procedure.

(iii) ensure visits to the partner institution or organization are undertaken by a relevant member of staff, and the *Student Exchange Study Periods Checklist* is completed satisfactorily, at least every three years. In the event that a partner institution or organization has not been visited during this time, students cannot be sent to that partner institution or organization until such time as the *Student Exchange Study Periods Checklist* has been completed. The European Office/RGU Questionnaire should also be completed annually via electronic contact with partner institutions or organizations.