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1. QMUL’s Education Manual

1.1 Introduction
The Education Manual sets out QMUL’s policies and procedures for the management of academic standards and the delivery of a high-quality student experience. QMUL aims to “to provide all our students, wherever based, an education that is judged internationally to be of the highest quality, and which exploits innovations in teaching, learning and assessment” (QMUL Strategy, Strategic Aim 3); in keeping with this aim, all academic and professional services staff have a collective responsibility for the continuous improvement of the student academic experience and maintaining the standards of QMUL’s awards.

1.2 Quality assurance at QMUL
QMUL’s quality framework for the management of academic quality and standards in teaching and learning is informed by the Strategic Plan, by the Student Experience, Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy, by the Queen Mary Statement of Graduate Attributes, and by the key external reference points encompassed in the Quality Assurance Agency’s (QAA) UK Quality Code for Higher Education and the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) Standards and Guidelines. QMUL’s approach to quality assurance is risk-based and proportionate with a clear focus on the issues that matter most to students: degree standards, student outcomes and the academic experience.

QMUL invests in the policies and processes that underpin the management of quality and standards, ensuring that these interconnect to provide a rigorous and effective framework. The framework comprises the following elements:

1. Programme development, approval and withdrawal processes
2. Programme specifications for all taught programmes
3. Guidance on collaborative provision
4. The Academic Regulations which specify programme and assessment regulations
5. The Assessment Handbook
6. The Queen Mary Academic Credit Framework
7. The use of external examiners in all examinations and examination boards, with externality as a key feature of programme development, monitoring and review
8. Student representation and feedback mechanisms including module evaluation
9. Annual Programme Review and Taught Programme Action Plans, including the analysis of student data on admission, progression and completion
10. Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes Review
11. Periodic Review of all academic schools and institutes
12. Compliance with HEFCE’s Operating Model for Quality Assessment
13. Compliance with the requirements of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies.

The Education Manual is intended to provide a helpful resource for staff, students and external visitors to QMUL, presenting all policies and procedures relating to teaching and learning in an accessible format. The Education Manual is regularly updated in light of internal discussions and in accordance with external guidance. Please see the ‘What’s New?’ page for the latest updates, details of current consultations, and information on external developments in the higher education sector.
2. Graduate attributes

2.1 Purpose
The Queen Mary Statement of Graduate Attributes expresses QMUL’s commitment to the personal development and employability of its graduates, and was developed in consultation with Queen Mary students, staff, alumni and selected employers. The graduate attributes make explicit the distinctive features of a Queen Mary graduate so that these can be shared with prospective students, parents, employers and other stakeholders, and are also intended to facilitate College-wide enhancement around curriculum development and employability. The Graduate Attributes are not simply taught but are developed through meaningful experience and the process of learning and reflection.

2.2 Scope
The Graduate Attributes apply across QMUL’s taught provision i.e. all undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes. All students will have the opportunity to try new things and broaden horizons. Tailored to different context and subject disciplines it is recognised students will have their own starting points and takes into account different educational backgrounds, cultures and experiences.

2.3 The Graduate Attributes
The Graduate Attributes are the knowledge, skills, values and behaviours that a student can expect to develop by engaging fully with their programme of study and the wider student experience. They will include the kind of qualities that employer’s value, building capacity and confidence that are relevant to the graduate role whilst allowing individuals to develop and progress in their job.

The Queen Mary Statement of Graduate Attributes has three key themes that express QMUL’s vision for its students as follows:
• Engage critically with knowledge
• Have a global perspective
• Learn continuously in a changing world

These are followed by four themes that delineate the behaviours, values, skills and knowledge with which graduates demonstrate that QMUL’s vision for its students has been achieved:
• Rounded intellectual development
• Clarity of communication
• Research capacity
• Information expertise

For more information see:
• http://www.qmldistinction.qmul.ac.uk
• http://www.qmul.ac.uk/gacep
• http://www.learninginstitute.qmul.ac.uk/graduate_attributes/

2.4 Implementation
The implementation of the Graduate Attributes programme is supported by the Centre for Academic and Professional Development (CAPD).

Work embedding the Graduate Attributes has focused on 5 key strands:
• curriculum enhancement (supporting Schools to progressively embed graduate attributes into curricula);
• extra-curricular enhancement (supporting on-campus activity managers and the Queen Mary Students’ Union to embed graduate attributes into extra-curricular activities);
• web resources (to embed information and tools to support student and staff engagement into QML Distinction and QMPlus);
• student promotional campaign (to provide information and a range of motivational and developmental messages to students through student media); and
• funded projects (to embed new activities - in schools, faculties and institution-wide - to enhance the support for graduate attributes development).

For enquiries and bespoke workshops please contact capd@qmul.ac.uk who will be happy to discuss your needs.
3. Appointment and role of external examiners and external members

Taught Programmes

3.1 Purpose
The purpose of this procedure is:

• to ensure that QMUL’s degrees are comparable in standard to those awarded by other UK universities;
• to ensure fairness and consistency in assessment procedures and student classification;
• to scrutinise the effectiveness and appropriateness of the assessment system;
• to assure the wider community of the standard of QMUL’s degrees and the fairness of its assessment procedures.

This procedure takes into account the precepts and guidance in Chapter B7 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

3.2 Scope
This procedure covers the appointment and role of external examiners and external members for all undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes of study. It does not cover research degrees or non-award-bearing continuing education.

3.3 Associated documents
Associated documents for QMUL staff can be found on the External Examiners for Staff webpage: http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/external-examiners/external-examiners-info-for-staff/index.html and include the following:

• External examiner nomination form
• External member nomination form
• External examiner extension of appointment form
• Fee payment forms

Associated documents for external examiners can be found on the External Examiners’ Resources webpage: http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/external-examiners/external-examiners-resources/index.html and include the following:

• Assessment Handbook
• Academic Regulations
• Guidance for External Examiners
• Guidance for External Members
• External examiner report pro-formas (UG, UG SMD, PG)
• External member report pro-forma

3.4 Accountability of external examiners and external members

The formal responsibility of external examiners and external members is to the Principal; their annual reports are addressed to the Principal (although sent to the Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance)), and an external has the right to make a confidential report to the Principal at any time.

External examiners and external members have a crucial role in quality assurance:

• External examiners’ primary duty is to ensure that the standard of awards is consistent with those awarded across the UK university system in that discipline.
External examiners and external members have a key responsibility to ensure that all candidates are treated fairly, and that decisions in relation to individual students are taken after due deliberation;

External examiners and external members are asked to review the examination process, and to comment on its operation. The reports of external examiners are also a key source of information in the monitoring of modules and programmes of study;

As a result of their experience of assessment procedures at other institutions, external examiners and external members are in a position to offer valuable advice and counsel to examination boards and programme/module organisers.

3.5 Procedure for the appointment of external examiners

Nominations for the appointment of new external examiners should be made on the external examiner nomination form, and sent to the Academic Secretariat by the relevant Subject Examination Board Chair along with a short CV for the nominee. This should follow consultation with the programme/module organiser and the Head of School.

Where an award is offered by QMUL also in collaboration with a partner, the same external examiner should be appointed to both Subject Examination Boards (and will need to write a report for each Board). Where the award is delivered with a UK partner, both institutions must approve the nomination before it can be considered confirmed.

The nomination is reviewed for approval against the appointment criteria provided by the QAA in the UK Quality Code, listed below, by the Faculty Dean for Taught Programmes and the Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance). Where the nominee does not strictly meet the appointment criteria (and a letter of justification has been submitted) the nomination is also forwarded to the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning) for approval by the Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance).

An external examiner should be appointed by October/November of the academic year in which s/he is to act, so that there is sufficient opportunity for briefing by the school before draft examination question papers have to be considered in February/March.

To ensure appointments are approved in good time, nominations should be passed on to ARCS by 30th June of the preceding academic year they are to start.

3.5.1 Appointment criteria (from Ch. B7 of the QAA UK Quality Code for HE)

Person Specification

Institutions appoint external examiners who can show appropriate evidence of the following:

- knowledge and understanding of UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality
- competence and experience in the fields covered by the programme of study, or parts thereof
- relevant academic and/or professional qualifications to at least the level of the qualification being externally examined, and/or extensive practitioner experience where appropriate
- competence and experience relating to designing and operating a variety of assessment tasks appropriate to the subject and operating assessment procedures
- sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the discipline to be able to command the respect of academic peers and, where appropriate, professional peers
- familiarity with the standard to be expected of students to achieve the award that is to be assessed
• fluency in English, and where programmes are delivered and assessed in languages other than English, fluency in the relevant language(s) (unless other secure arrangements are in place to ensure that external examiners are provided with the information to make their judgements)
• meeting applicable criteria set by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies
• awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula
• competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience.

Conflicts of interest

Institutions do not appoint as external examiners anyone in the following categories or circumstances:

• member of a governing body or committee of the appointing institution or one of its collaborative partners, or a current employee of the appointing institution or one of its collaborative partners
• anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the programme of study
• anyone required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the programme of study
• anyone who is, or knows they will be, in a position to influence significantly the future of students on the programme of study
• anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the programme(s) or modules in question
• former staff or students of the institution unless a period of five years has elapsed and all students taught by or with the external examiner have completed their programme(s)
• a reciprocal arrangement involving cognate programmes at another institution
• the succession of an external examiner from an institution by a colleague from the same department in the same institution
• the appointment of more than one external examiner from the same department of the same institution.

Terms of office

The duration of an external examiner's appointment will normally be for four years, with an exceptional extension of one year to ensure continuity.

Appointments run from 1st September to 31st December 4 years later. An external examiner may be reappointed in exceptional circumstances but only after a period of five years or more has elapsed since their last appointment.

External examiners normally hold no more than two external examiner appointments for taught programmes/modules at any point in time.

3.6 Procedure for the appointment of External Members

External members are only appointed to the Degree Examination Boards (DEBs). Normally, one external member is appointed to the Undergraduate DEBs and one external member is appointed the Postgraduate DEBs. The undergraduate external member is not normally required to attend the Undergraduate Dentistry, Medicine, or Law DEBs as external examiners are present at these meetings.
Nominations for the appointment of a new external member should be presented on the external member nomination form and should be forwarded to the Academic Secretariat along with a copy of the nominee’s short CV.

The nomination is reviewed for approval against the appointment criteria listed below by the Chairs of the relevant Degree Examination Boards, and by the Vice-Principal (Teaching & Learning).

3.6.1 Appointment criteria
External members should satisfy the following criteria:

- They should be people of seniority and experience, who can command authority. They should normally be employed either at the level of Senior Lecturer or Deputy Academic Registrar or above;
- They should not normally hold more than two simultaneous external examiner roles at first degree level;
- They should not normally be appointed to a Degree Examination Board from which a member of the Board is an examiner at the external's institution;
- Former members of staff should not be appointed as an external member for at least five years after they have left QMUL;
- External members should normally be serving senior academics or administrators to ensure that they are fully conversant with standard policies and practices across the sector. An external member who retires from his/her permanent post will continue as an external member until the expiry of the period of office, but a retired person should not normally be appointed as an external member. A person who is not currently the holder of a senior administrative appointment or a senior lecturer post or above will not be eligible for nomination as an eternal member;
- An external member should not normally be drawn from the same institution as his/her predecessor;
- An external member who has completed a term of office may not be re-appointed until five years have elapsed;
- An external member should not be employed in any other capacity by QMUL.

In the event that the nominee does not meet one of the criteria indicated above, a letter of justification must be included with the nomination. The term ‘normally’ should be removed from the appointment criteria to determine whether a letter of justification is required.

3.7 Period of appointment
The period of appointment shall normally be from 1 September to 31 December four years later. This will enable the external examiner/member to be involved in assessments from the start of the academic year, and to continue in office to deal with reviews, further assessment, resits etc. Continuing external examiners/members need not be re-nominated annually. In exceptional cases, an external examiner’s contract may be extended for a fifth year to ensure continuity. An extension of appointment form should be submitted to the Academic Secretariat to extend the appointment of an external examiner/member to a fifth year. The extension will be considered using the same procedures as those used for the appointment of a new external examiner/member. The extension of appointment of an external examiner/member who has regularly failed to attend examination boards and submit annual reports will not be approved. An external examiner/member who wishes to resign before the expiry of his or her normal period of office is required to write formally to the Principal (sent to the Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance)), giving sufficient notice for the appointment of a replacement.

In the event that a programme ceases to be offered by QMUL or does not recruit students in a particular year and the services of an external examiner are no longer required, prior to the completion of the period of appointment, it is the responsibility of the Chair of the Subject
Examination Board to inform the external examiner of this matter. The Academic Secretariat must also be informed to enable accurate central record keeping.

The termination of an external examiner or external member’s appointment by QMUL, before the expiry of his or her normal period of office, should be made by a formal recommendation to the Vice-Principal (Teaching & Learning) from the Chair of the Examination Board or the Academic Registrar. This recommendation must be supported by the Dean for Taught Programmes, or the Associate Dean (Education Quality) in the case of the School of Medicine and Dentistry; the Vice-Principal (Teaching & Learning) will then make the final decision. Reasons for termination of an appointment by QMUL include failure to perform his/her duties (including regular non-attendance at examination boards and non-submission of annual reports) and/or a breakdown in the relationship with QMUL.

3.8 Briefing
Upon appointment, the Academic Secretariat will send an external examiner/member a letter of appointment together with the following documentation:

- two copies of the external examiner’s/member’s agreement form;
- a personal details form (required for payment purposes);
- the last report of the previous external examiner/member and the response written from QMUL, where applicable.

The letter will include the URL (http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/external-examiners/external-examiners-resources/index.html) of the web page where External Examiners/Members can download the following:

- QMUL’s External Examiner/Member Guidelines;
- a report pro-forma for the External Examiner’s/Member’s first report;
- the Academic Regulations;
- the Assessment Handbook;
- an expenses claim form.

External examiners and members are encouraged to use the web page to access guidelines, regulations and pro-formas as this will ensure that they always use the most up-to-date version of each. The Academic Standards and Quality Officer will ensure that the web page always provides the most recent version of every document available for downloading and/or viewing. QMUL’s letter of appointment gives a general outline of the responsibilities of external examiners/members but the detailed role of each external will vary according to the discipline, the custom and practices of the examination board, and the distribution of responsibilities among the panel of external examiners. It is therefore essential that a new external examiner is carefully briefed by the chair of the Subject Examination Board as soon as possible after his/her appointment has been confirmed. The responsibility for briefing a new external member rests with the Academic Registrar.

- The briefing by the Chair of the Examination Board to the external examiner should cover the following:
  - general information on the school/subject area, including information provided to students, such as the school handbook and the regulations for the programme/s of study to be examined;
  - the names of other external examiners on the Subject Examination Board, and the programmes of study for which they will be responsible, together with the options for which each external will be solely responsible;
  - the programme’s aims and learning outcomes (and, where relevant, those of individual modules), together with their syllabi and the means by which they will be assessed;
  - the conventions used by the Subject Examination Board in assessing individual pieces of work (whether scripts, projects, coursework, etc) – for example, are
marks deducted for poor presentation; procedures for dealing with late submission of coursework; procedures for dealing with cases where students answer too many questions;

• details of assessments that are subject to double marking/moderation and the practice used by the Subject Examination Board.

• the ‘calendar’ of events over the coming year, including the deadlines for submission of work to external examiners, and for its return, the dates of meetings of the board, and dates on which external examiners are required to attend QMUL (for example, to examine projects, or to hear presentations).

The briefing by the Academic Registrar to an external member should cover the following:

• general information on practices and procedures at QM;

• the conventions used by the Degree Examination Boards;

• the ‘calendar’ of events, including the dates on which external members are required to attend QMUL for Degree Examination Boards.

On an annual basis, the Academic Secretariat will post on the external examiners’ dedicated web page the details of any major changes to QMUL’s regulations and procedures.

3.9 Duties of External Examiners

External Examiners have the following ‘core’ duties:

3.9.1 General

• to comment upon the assessments for each module for which they are responsible, the extent to which the assessments cover the syllabus, and whether they enable students to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes;

• to consider, comment upon, and approve (or otherwise) all examination question papers, and to comment upon marking schemes for individual papers, assessment criteria, and model answers;

• to confirm whether or not the standard of marking is satisfactory by scrutinising a sample of assessed work for each module (sample size to be agreed between the board and the examiner);

• to comment upon the standards of achievement of students, and the comparability of this achievement to standards elsewhere;

• to comment upon the standards of proposed awards, and their comparability to similar awards made elsewhere;

• to make known any causes for concern in relation to academic standards achieved by students, the standards of modules, and the standards of awards to be made;

• exceptionally, upon written request, to provide independent opinion where there is a significant, unresolved difference between marks awarded by first and second markers on a script or piece of work;

• to advise the Subject Examination Board on appropriate actions where the marks for a module are significantly outside the normal pattern, and to endorse (or not) recommendations by markers for actions where the marks for a module are significantly outside the normal pattern;

• to attend meetings of the Subject Examination Board, and to participate fully in decision making;

• to endorse (or otherwise) decisions on results and progression, and recommendations for award;

• to attend meetings of the Degree Examination Board, where desired;

• to submit a full written report, including an optional confidential report to the Principal;

• to perform any other duties requested by Senate or the Degree Examination Board, following appropriate consultation over the nature of those duties.
By agreement with the Subject Examination Board and in consultation with the relevant schools and institutes, external examiners may also carry out other duties including: the approval of project topics and essay titles, interviewing students on their programmes of study and experiences, commenting informally on proposed curriculum changes, commenting upon proposed changes to assessment methods.

External examiners also have a less tangible role in encouraging good practice, and advising the examination board on dealing with difficult problems.

Where the method of programme delivery is non-standard (for example, distance learning), the external examiners will wish to discuss with the internal examiners the arrangements for sampling work and moderating the internal marking, to satisfy themselves that the standards are appropriate and that individual candidates are being treated fairly. This discussion should take place at a very early stage in the session and both internal and external examiners should collaborate in monitoring the effectiveness of the arrangements throughout the session.

External examiners are particularly requested to comment on the effectiveness of the sampling and moderation procedures as they relate to non-standard programme patterns in their annual reports.

3.9.2 Moderating examination question papers

The Subject Examination Board is responsible for overseeing the production and agreement of examination papers; this is often delegated to a small sub-committee of examiners (scrutiny committees). Examination papers (including marking schemes, assessment criteria and model answers) are prepared by internal examiners in accordance with the approved minimum standards and template. These are then reviewed by a scrutiny committee before being sent to the appropriate external examiner for review and approval. Examination papers for all sittings of examinations must be set, scrutinised and approved according to the approved procedure. External examiners must review and approve all examination papers, including resit papers, even when individual questions may have been agreed separately in the past.

The external examiner must satisfy him/herself that the question paper:

- is appropriate to the level of the module;
- is an appropriate means of testing whether candidates’ have achieved the stated outcomes of the module;
- covers the full range of the syllabus;
- is fair – i.e. that some candidates will not be at an advantage other than by virtue of their academic ability and commitment.

Any comments or amendments suggested by the external examiner must be responded to or acted upon. The external examiner must be informed of action taken in response to their comments.

In the event that an external examiner refuses to agree an examination paper, for whatever reason, this shall be reported to the Chair of the Degree Examination Board and the Academic Secretary, or nominee. The Chair of the Degree Examination Board shall take a decision on whether or not the paper should be approved or if amendments are needed. This decision shall be based on consideration of the objections detailed by the external examiner and the viewpoint brought forward by the school setting the paper.

3.9.3 Moderating coursework tasks

There is not the same requirement for coursework tasks to be approved by the external examiner as there is for examination papers. It is, however, good practice for schools to seek the external examiners’ views on the nature of the proposed assessment. This is of particular relevance for those modules that are assessed solely by coursework and Subject Examination
Boards are encouraged to engage the external examiner over the design of the assessment of these modules.

Where modules are examined by coursework and examination, coursework titles should be provided with examination papers for external review, to avoid overlap between the two types of assessment.

3.9.4 Moderating examination scripts and other assessed coursework
The role of the external examiner is to moderate the marking of internal examiners, therefore, external examiners have the right to examine any script or other assessed material.

In the case of assessed coursework, External examiners would normally only request to see any items of significant assessed coursework produced by a student. The definition of ‘significant’ will vary between disciplines, but Subject Examination Boards should ensure that individual items of coursework which count for more than 25% of the overall mark are available to the external for scrutiny if required. Where coursework has been returned to students, the Subject Examination Board must have a means of having these available to external examiners if requested.

The selection of scripts/assessed work to be sent to the external examiner is a matter for determination between the external examiner and the Chair of the Subject Examination Board. The external examiner must have sufficient evidence to determine that internal marking and award recommendations are of an appropriate standard and are consistent. Sampling arrangements will therefore normally provide for an External Examiner to see the following:

• a sample of scripts / assessed work from the top, middle and bottom of the range, including some first class examples and some failures;
• scripts / assessed work of borderline candidates;
• exceptionally: scripts / assessed work where the internal examiners differ significantly on the mark to be awarded.(see below)

The scripts/assessed work must be accompanied by the comments of the internal examiners. Evidence of double marking/moderation (where required by QMUL’s Code of Practice on Double Marking and Moderation) must be clear and the marks of the two internal examiners must be easily distinguishable.

If there has been a discrepancy between the two internal markers, the final agreed internal mark must be clearly identified for the external examiner. Every effort must be made internally to finalise an internal mark prior to the despatch of the assessed work to the external examiner.

Where there is disagreement between the internal markers, the following procedure shall be employed:

1. The markers shall attempt to resolve the difference through discussion, and to agree upon a mark.

2. Where the markers fail to agree upon a mark:
   i. Where the difference is of ten per cent of the total marks available or fewer: The markers may split the difference, rounding to the nearest whole number.

   ii. Where the difference is greater than ten per cent of the total marks available, or the markers do not wish to split the difference: The assessment shall be marked for a third time, and that third mark shall stand. The third marker shall review the marking trails of the first two markers when deciding upon a mark.
The third marker shall be an independent and experienced marker with appropriate subject experience; this shall normally be a member of QMUL staff, but may be an external examiner (by specific agreement with the external, as this is not part of their core responsibilities).

Where moderation indicates the need for a significant alteration to the mark for a script/assessed work, the relevant internal and external examiners should consider whether the change relates to that piece of assessed work alone, or whether the marks for the whole cohort should be reviewed. If the latter appears necessary, the examiners have discretion on whether to remark all scripts, or to scale marks in relation to agreed benchmarks. Such rescaling should be reported to, and endorsed by, the assessing Subject Examination Board.

External Examiners must not be asked to undertake any of the following:

- first or second marking;
- revise the marks awarded for the script / assessed work of an individual student other than through giving an opinion in specific exceptional cases at the request of the internal examiners where it has not been possible to resolve the matter internally. Where such exceptional cases involve changing the mark of an individual (rather than a cohort) they must be carefully documented in the Subject Examination Board minutes.

### 3.9.5 Examination Boards

QMUL has a two tier system of Examination Boards: Subject Examination Boards (SEBs) consider marks, progression and any circumstances that may have impacted on these, and make recommendations for award. Degree Examination Boards (DEBs) are award boards and approve awards and classifications as well as ratify other results achieved and progression decisions.

All external examiners are required to attend the Subject Examination Board for the programme to which they have been appointed and may attend the Degree Examination Board should they wish to do so. Exceptionally, where an external examiner is unable to attend a Subject Examination Board, the meeting may proceed in their absence provided that they submit comments on the candidates' performance prior to the meeting. These will be reported to the meeting and the external examiner will be asked to endorse all recommendations and decisions. At least one external examiner must be present at a Subject Examination Board meeting.

It should not be necessary for external examiners to undertake more than three visits to QMUL each year. Exceptions may be made where, for example, an external has to be present at a resit board or a QMUL Board meeting.

Subject Examination Boards expect to receive marks that have already been moderated by external examiners, except in the rare occasion where the performance of a candidate, or of candidates, raises an issue of policy on which the whole board must decide. The Chair of the Subject Examination Board therefore has the responsibility of ensuring that the marks and other information put before the Board incorporates the comments of externals. Some Boards ask external examiners to send their comments in writing a week before the board meeting; others organise a ‘pre-meeting’ at which all outstanding issues are resolved.

### 3.9.6 Debtors and alleged offenders

Students who are flagged as having tuition fee debts to QMUL should be considered by the Subject Examination Board, but their official results must be withheld until confirmation has been received that the debt has been settled.

Students who are alleged to have committed any examination offence must not be considered, but the board should agree arrangements for determining their performance when the question
of the alleged offence has been resolved. The normal procedure is for the examination board to authorise its Chair, together with a named external examiner, to act on behalf of the Board when the question of alleged malpractice has been determined.

3.9.7 Classification for Honours
Degrees that are classified are based on the College Mark which is calculated using the appropriate method as outlined in the Academic Regulations. Subject Examination Boards have a certain degree of flexibility in applying certain regulations to take into account other factors when determining the class of degree. For example it can recommend a higher classification of degree where the College Mark is marginally below the required threshold (see 6.74 in the Assessment Handbook). In all cases, where discretion is applied, it must be recorded clearly in the minutes of the meeting. The decision may have to be defended on academic grounds in the event a candidate requests a review of the decision. The opinions of external examiners will be especially influential in such cases and the agreement of the external examiner must be recorded in the minutes of the Subject Examination Board.

3.9.8 Opinions of external examiners
Chairs of Examination Boards must ensure that externals are invited to express their opinions, particularly on difficult and contentious cases, and these opinions will always carry a particular weight. In routine cases where there are disagreements within the board, the final decision will normally be reached by the majority vote (the Chair having a second and casting vote in the case of a tie). Where, however, an external examiner expresses grave concern that a particular decision would be improper (for example, as being unfair to a candidate or a violation of appropriate standards), the Chair must seek the views of all of the external examiners on that issue. If the majority of external examiners are in agreement, the examination board must defer to their views, and the substance of the discussion must be recorded in the minutes or report of the meeting.

Where the external examiners, or the Examination Board, recommend a course of action which contravenes the Academic Regulations, programme regulations, or the Assessment Handbook, the Academic Registrar must be consulted without delay, and the discussions of the Examination Board on that item deferred until advice has been sought.

3.10 Duties of external members
External members have the following ‘core’ duties:

3.10.1 General
• to comment upon standards of achievement, as represented by the College Mark and degree classifications, and the comparability of these achievements to standards elsewhere;
• to make known any causes for concern in relation to academic standards;
• to provide an external perspective upon the interpretation of regulations, and upon recommendations for the suspension of regulations;
• to provide advice upon the use of discretion - within the permitted scope of any QMUL policy - in order to agree results, progression, and awards;
• to attend meetings of the Degree Examination Board, and to participate fully in decision making;
• to endorse (or otherwise) the awards, degree classifications, and progression decisions made by the Degree Examination Board;
• to submit a full report, including an optional confidential report to the Principal;
• to perform any other duties requested by Senate or the Degree Examination Board, following appropriate consultation on the nature of those duties.

External members also have a less tangible role in encouraging good practice, and advising the examination board on dealing with difficult problems.
3.10.2 Examination Boards
External members are required to attend all of the Degree Examination Boards for which they have been appointed. Exceptionally where an external member is unable to attend the Degree Examination Board, the meeting may go ahead in their absence.

It should not be necessary for an external member to undertake more than three to four visits each year to QMUL.

3.10.3 Opinions of external members
Chairs of Degree Examination Boards must ensure that external members are invited to express their opinions, particularly on difficult and contentious cases, and these opinions will always carry a particular weight.

3.11 External examiners / members reports
After the examination board has completed its deliberation on candidates, the external examiners/members will each be invited to give a brief oral report. External examiners’ oral reports should cover:

- their opinion of the assessment process, including its fairness, accuracy and efficiency;
- their opinion of the academic quality of the cohort(s) that they have just examined;
- their opinion of the quality of the teaching, as judged by their examination of the students;
- any recommendations to the examination board for improvements in the teaching or examination process;
- their opinion as to whether recommendations made in previous years have been properly followed up.

External members’ oral reports should cover:

- their comments on the examination board proceedings;
- any recommendations for improvements in regulatory and procedural arrangements;
- their opinion as to whether recommendations made in previous years have been properly followed up.

Examination boards are normally very willing to respond to external examiners'/ members' comments. If, however, the Chair of an examination board fails to respond to critical comments in a positive manner, the external should contact the Academic Secretariat as a matter of urgency.

External examiners can make representations to the Chairs of the Degree Examination Board and to Senate if they are dissatisfied with a decision.

The report from a Subject Examination Board to the Degree Examination Board must detail any case where the majority of external examiners disagreed with a decision concerning the classification of a particular candidate.

External examiners / members are also required to make a formal annual report to the Principal (though addressed and sent to the Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance)) following the principal examination board meeting each year. This is an essential part of QMUL’s quality assurance framework. External examiners’ reports form a major source of information in the annual review of the QMUL’s teaching programmes and in internal periodic reviews.
External examiner reports are also made available to student representatives via Student-Staff Liaison Committees; hence references to individual students in reports should be avoided. A confidential report may be attached as an appendix to an external examiner’s report in the event that an external examiner wishes to report a matter relating to an individual student.

The Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance) will read all external examiner/member reports and highlight comments that require a formal response. All reports are also considered by the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning). Chairs of examination boards are required to respond to the points made by external examiners, both directly (within a month after the submission of the report) and through the documentation produced for the reviews mentioned above.

The Chair of the examination board sends a written response to the external examiner, with a copy to the Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance). Where the external examiner raises an issue of principle which has not already been addressed by the School (or equivalent), it should first be discussed at a staff meeting, or the examiners’ next meeting, or at a meeting of the responsible curriculum/teaching committee, as appropriate to the circumstances.

The Academic Registrar is responsible for responding to the reports of external members. Normally the report is considered by Senate prior to the issue of a formal response to the external member.

Externals’ comments and the responses from Chairs of examination boards are considered by the Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance). An annual summary report is then written, focussing on good practice and issues that would potentially benefit from further consideration at institution level, and presented to the Senate and to the University of London.

In cases where an external examiner’s report contains particularly sensitive comments, the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning) will contact the appropriate exam board Chair or Head of School immediately when the report is received. The Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning) will normally require a written response to serious criticism.

Report pro-formas are reviewed yearly by the Academic Secretariat. External examiners and external members are asked to download the pro-formas from a dedicated web page (http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/external-examiners/external-examiners-resources/index.html) and completed reports should be returned to the Academic Secretariat, by post or to the email address on the report pro-forma. Reports should be submitted within one month of an examination board, and in any case within six months. The Academic Secretariat pursues the non-submission of an external’s report and reports the non-submission to the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning). An External’s fee is released only on the submission of a report, and QMUL reserves the right to refuse to pay for late reports.

QMUL aims to establish and maintain constructive and effective relationships with its external examiners and external members. However any problems experienced either by an external examiner, an external member or an examination board should be reported immediately to the Academic Registrar or to the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning).

3.12 Payment
3.12.1 Fees
Fees will be paid by QMUL upon submission of a fee payment form from the examination board Chair to the Academic Secretariat. The fee amount is at the discretion of the examination board; however there is a base rate calculated using a fee payment formula that takes account of (for example) the number of scripts reviewed. Fees are only paid upon receipt of an annual report (at which time the Secretariat will request the payment form from the examination board); the report should be submitted within 30 days of the examination board; QMUL reserves the right to refuse payment for reports received more than six months after the board.

QMUL is not able to make any payment unless a personal details form has been returned to the Academic Secretariat. External examiners are asked to confirm their details annually to ensure personal/bank details remain current. QMUL is also required to carry out right to work checks on all employees. Any external examiner/member who has not provided sufficient evidence of their right to work in the UK (normally an original passport, and visa if applicable) will not be paid. The normal payment date for fees is the 24th of each month, though the ‘cut-off’ for submission is the 1st of each month – claims processed after that date will be paid the following month.

3.12.2 Expenses
QMUL reimburses travel and subsistence expenses for external examiners. Subject Examination boards should make external examiners aware of the QMUL policy on travel and subsistence. To reclaim expenses, externals should submit a signed expenses claim form (at http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/external-examiners/external-examiners-resources/index.html), together with the original hard copies of the receipts, to the Academic Secretariat (addressed to the Academic Standards and Quality Officer). The Secretariat will then log the claim and pass it to the examination board to arrange payment. Please note that QMUL cannot refund claims received more than three months after the board, or claims without original receipts.
4. Programme and Module Development

4.1 Undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes
This information is aimed at Programme Proposers / Organisers in preparation for the design and revision of undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes and modules. It is intended only as a summary of the key procedures for programme and module approval, amendment and withdrawal, more detailed guidance can be found in the Programme and Module Developer Guidelines on the Academic Secretariat website.

4.2 Student Information System
The Student Information System (SIS) will continue to be used as the central repository of definitive programme and module information, which will be compiled from the forms submitted as part of the programme and module development procedures. The SIS will be used to automatically populate course information pages on the QMUL website. It is therefore imperative that schools and institutes ensure that the information provided is accurate and revisions are notified in a timely way.

4.3 Scope
QMUL’s programme and module development procedures cover proposals for:

- all new undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes of study;
- the amendment or withdrawal of existing undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes of study;
- changes to the regulations of an undergraduate or postgraduate taught programme;
- approval of all new modules;
- amendment to previously approved modules;
- withdrawal of modules;

These procedures do not cover research degrees or non-award-bearing continuing education.

4.4 Associated documents

4.4.1 Programme documents
- Part 1 Programme Proposal Form
- Stage 1 Partnership and Programme Proposal Form
- Part 2 Programme Proposal Form
- Programme Specification Template
- Guidance on Programme Specifications
- External Adviser Guidelines
- Academic Regulations
- Programme Amendment Form
- Programme Withdrawal Form
- Change of Programme JACS Form

The documents and forms for programme development can be found on the Academic Secretariat website.

4.4.2 Module documents
- Module Proposal Form
- Half Module Proposal Form (CCLS only)
- Module Amendment Form
- Module Withdrawal Form
The documents and forms for module development can be found on the on the Academic Secretariat website.

4.5 Programme Approval

The approval of a new programme of study is a two stage process. Part 1 is a planning process consisting of approval in principle of the business case and market focus of the programme proposal, taking account of the school/institute and QMUL strategic plan, likely demand and availability of resources. Part 2 involves the approval of the submission of the detailed academic content for the proposal, including the programme aims, outcomes, structure and the strategies for teaching, learning and assessment, which can be developed once approval in principle is received. A detailed Programme Specification is also required at this stage, in addition to evidence of the support of an expert in the area of the proposed programme external to QMUL.

Throughout the programme development process, consideration should also be given to other key QMUL internal reference points including the:

- Student Experience, Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy;
- QMUL Graduate Attributes Statement;
- Academic Regulations;
- QMUL Academic Credit Framework;
- Centre for Academic and Professional Development - Guidance on curriculum design
- QMUL Code of Practice on Assessment and Feedback.

Ideally, the development process should start at least 12 months before the first delivery of a programme, to enable sufficient time to establish the market; develop the programme, consult across the institution, and undertake the approval processes.

Part 1 programme proposals for undergraduate programmes due to start in September of the following year should be completed and have received Faculty approval in principle before the end of December 2016 in order to meet the UCAS deadline for students to make their applications. Postgraduate taught programmes should ensure they have been granted approval in principle to allow sufficient lead-in time for marketing the programme. Any proposal which involves collaboration with another institution or body must have Partnerships Board (PB) strategic approval of the partner organisation. For single, joint, double and dual collaborative programmes a Stage 1 Partnership and Programme Proposal form should be submitted to the Academic Secretariat for PB consideration of the partner (instead of the Part 1 form).

Approval of Part 2 is the responsibility of the Taught Programmes Board. All Part 2 programme proposals (both UG and PGT) need to be submitted to the 22nd February 2017 meeting to meet the UCAS deadline for making offers and internal deadlines for data collection and timetabling.
4.51 Summary of the Programme Approval Process

1 Non-standard fees must be approved by the Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions Group prior to submission of Part 1 Proposals. Proposals must include detailed costing information/business plan and a market research report prepared by Marketing and Communications.

2 If outside the PAR timescales, approval should be sought from the Faculty Executive. Partnerships Board (PB) approval is additionally required for new Collaborative Partners.

3 PB will consider the outline business plan, risk assessment and due diligence documentation for the proposed new partnership.

4 Following Approval in Principle and checking within the Academic Secretariat the programme can be advertised but all promotional material must carry a clear statement that the programme is ‘subject to approval’. For collaborative proposals, PB will indicate when the programme can be advertised.

5 Where minor revisions to Part 2 Proposals are required, revised proposals should be submitted within a 2 week deadline from the date of the TPB meeting where initial consideration took place.

6 Programme formally approved for its first student intake. For collaborative proposals, PB will consider Memoranda of Agreement following Part 2 Approval.
4.52 Timeline of the Programme Approval Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| September – November | • If the proposal was not submitted in the last Faculty Planning and Accountability Review (FPAR), draft Part 1/Stage 1 programme proposal for programmes due to start in September of the following year.  
                          • Lodge Part 1/Stage 1 proposal with the Faculty Executive for approval, (following school/institute Learning and Teaching Committee Approval).  
                          • Submit the Stage1 proposal to the Partnerships Board (for collaborative programmes only).  
                          • Programmes can be advertised after Part 1 approval is confirmed but no offers can be made until Part 2 approval is confirmed.  
                          • For collaborative programmes, the Partnerships Board will indicate when programmes can be advertised.                                                                 |
| December | • Undergraduate programmes should have Part 1/Stage 1 approval before the end of December to meet UCAS timescales.  
                          • Consider possible external advisers who might be willing to scrutinise the Programme Specification and Module Proposals and Specifications.                                                                 |
| January – February | • Draft the Programme Specification and the Part 2 form (including Module Proposals for any new modules).  
                          • Send Part 2 proposal information to at least one external adviser for written comments.  
                          • Part 2 programme proposals need to be submitted by 01 February 2017 for the 22 February 2017 Taught Programmes Board meeting.  
                          • For collaborative programmes, submit the Memorandum of Agreement or contract to the Partnerships Board for approval.                                                                                                                                 |
| September | • Complete nomination forms for any new External Examiners required  
                          • Start of new programme                                                                                                                    |

4.6 Programme Amendments

Amendments to existing programmes of study are initially considered and approved by school/institute Learning and Teaching Committees. A revised Programme Specification and a Programme Amendment Form should be completed by the Programme Organiser. Minor changes require consideration only at school/institute level, for example, changing the selection status (core, compulsory, elective) of modules linked to the programme, and changes to student diets. Modifications that result in a significant change to the aims, outcomes, structure, or content of the original programme may need to be processed as a new programme approval. Schools/institutes are encouraged to discuss these types of changes with the Academic Secretariat for advice on the appropriate procedure.

The deadline for the submission of a programme amendment is 10 February 2017. Those requiring Taught Programmes Board approval will need to be submitted by the 01 February 2017. Programme title changes for all programmes should be submitted earlier as they will require additional consideration by the Marketing, Recruitment, and Admissions Group (MRAG). They should therefore be submitted by 31 January 2017, to meet UCAS and admissions timescales.

4.7 Programme Withdrawals

Programme withdrawals are considered by Taught Programmes Planning Group (TPPG) and reported to Taught Programmes Board. Current students must be consulted and arrangements for the completion of their studies must be made and agreed. For collaborative programmes the partner should be consulted about all arrangements for termination, which must be consistent with the obligations on both parties specified in the Memorandum of Agreement.
4.8 Module Proposals

Proposals for new modules associated with a new programme of study will be considered as a package by Taught Programmes Board. The responsibility for approving new modules that are part of existing programmes of study is devolved to schools/institutes, subject to the published deadlines. Where new modules are introduced as core or compulsory, the programme specifications(s) should be updated and submitted with the module proposal.

The following kinds of new modules require Taught Programmes Board approval:
- modules developed as part of a new programme of study;
- modules relating to a programme delivered through a collaborative arrangement;
- modules involving work-based learning or study abroad;
- modules involving distance learning.

Where a module is delivered or developed in collaboration with another institution Partner approval should be sought from the PB via a Stage 1 Partnership proposal.

For modules not requiring consideration by Taught Programmes Board or Partnerships Board, the Academic Secretariat will log the approved module and scrutinise the module proposal for completeness of information and the appropriateness of the new module details. Any issues identified by the Academic Secretariat will be referred back to the school/institute for follow up before any module is formally created on the SIS.
4.81 **Summary of the Module Approval Process**

1. **School Proposal**
   (Discussion of proposal at staff meetings, SSLCs etc to ascertain whether proposed module fits with the school’s plan, academic framework and resources).

2. **Completion of Module Proposal Form**
   (Identification of module aims & learning outcomes)

3. **School Learning and Teaching Committee Consideration**
   (Approval denoted by HoS signature)

4. **Issues / approval conditions set?**
   - Yes: **Module Approved**
   - No: **Revise Module Proposal**

5. **Use of key internal and external reference points**
   (QA & CAPD websites, QAA Quality Code [FHEQ, subject benchmarks], PSRBs, + employers, graduates).

6. **All new modules that are not collaborative and do not involve work-based learning, study abroad and distance learning**

7. **New modules that are collaborative or involve work-based learning, study abroad and distance learning**

8. **Taught Programmes Board Consideration**

9. **Minor revisions required**
   (approval by Chair of TPB)

10. **Issues / approval conditions set?**
    - Yes: **Module Approved**
    - No: **Revise Module Proposal**

11. **Revise Module Proposal**

12. **Module Approved**

---

1. Where a new module is developed or taught by a new collaborative partner, a Stage 1 Form must be submitted to the PB for approval.

2. Where minor revisions are required for TPB, revised proposals should be submitted within a 2 week deadline.

3. Module formally approved for its first student intake
4.82 **Timeline of the Module Approval Process (modules not associated with a new programme of study)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| January - February | • Draft all Module Proposals (Semester A and B) and lodge with the School/Institute Learning and Teaching Committee for consideration.  
• All standard Module Proposals and Specifications submitted to the Academic Secretariat by 10 February 2017. Non-standard modules must be submitted to the Academic Secretariat by 01 February 2017 to be considered at the February Taught Programmes Board meeting. |
| September          | • Start of new module                                                                                                                  |

**4.9 Module Amendments**

School/institute Teaching and Learning Committees (or equivalent) consider and approve all module amendments, subject to the published deadline. The procedure for module amendments does not cover proposals to change the level or the credit value of a module; such proposals require the submission of module proposal form. For collaborative programmes, approval must also be sought from the partner institution. As with module proposals the school/institute should send the completed, signed module amendment form to the Academic Secretariat for scrutiny.

The deadline for the submission of module amendments for the following academic year is 10 February 2017.

**4.10 Module Withdrawals**

A proposal to withdraw a module should be approved by the responsible school/institute(s) Teaching and Learning Committees (or equivalent). The deadline for the withdrawal of modules is 10 February 2017. In the case of collaborative programmes, evidence that the partner institution has been appropriately consulted should be included.

**4.11 Further Guidance**

The Programme and Module Developer Guidelines provide detailed guidance on the procedures for programme and module approval, amendment and withdrawal. The guidelines and forms mentioned in this document can be found on the Academic Secretariat website, in addition to a detailed schedule of deadlines.

**4.12 Research Degree Programmes**

The Research Degree Programmes and Examinations Board has the delegated authority for approving new research programmes or for permitting changes to the structures of existing programmes (for example the introduction of a compulsory taught module).

For new doctoral programmes that involve collaboration with another Higher Education Institution, the Partnership Board must approve the partner. For further guidance, see the relevant section on Collaborative Provision in this Handbook.

In June 2014, Senate approved a framework for Professional Doctorate programmes (see the Academic Secretariat website for more information), which established a Professional Doctorates Committee (PDC) to oversee programme development. The PDC will consider proposals for new Professional Doctorate programmes and make recommendations for their

---

1 Module proposals that are collaborative, work-based learning, study abroad or distance learning need to be approved by Taught Programmes Board, and where applicable the Partnership Board.
approval to Taught Programmes Board and the Research Degree Programmes and Examinations Board.
5. Annual Programme Reviews

Taught Programmes

5.1 Purpose

Annual Programme Review (APR) is central to QMUL’s assurance of the academic standards of its provision, with the aim of enhancing the student learning experience at its core. APR is a continuous process of reflection and action planning which is owned by those responsible for programme delivery; the results of this iterative process should be added to the Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP) which is the summary of the school/institute’s work throughout the year to monitor academic standards and to improve the student experience. The TPAP is monitored at both Faculty and institutional level and reviewed annually at the Annual Programme Review meeting between the school / institute and the relevant Dean for Taught Programmes or nominated chair.

Academic staff with responsibility for the delivery of taught programmes are asked to consider the following as part of the review process:

- the progress achieved with the Taught Programmes Action Plan
- the extent to which intended learning outcomes are being attained by the students
- the academic standards set and student achievement of these
- the quality of the learning opportunities
- the Learning, Teaching and Assessment strategy of the school / institute (if required by the faculty)
- notable achievements and good practice
- programme development / curriculum review including the cumulative impact of small/incremental changes
- information for students
- student support arrangements for collaborative programmes taught at the partner venue
- future plans/new initiatives/developments to include anticipated challenges and an approach for dealing with these

In preparation for the APR meetings, schools and institutes will be expected to submit documentary evidence of the results of the review undertaken above for each programme or cognate programme group, as outlined in section 5.3.1.

Notes will be kept of each school or institute’s Annual Programme Review meeting with the Faculty Dean for Taught Programmes; from these a summary report will be produced by ARCS which will be considered by the following:

- Vice Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning)
- Academic Registry and Council Secretariat
- Students’ Union
- Education Quality Board
- Senate

5.2 Scope

This procedure covers all taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes of study. It does not cover research degrees or non-award-bearing continuing education.

5.3 Process

The Annual Programme Review process is designed to ensure that schools and institutes evaluate and reflect upon the taught provision delivered over the year and identify and resolve
any issues that may have arisen. Progress should be captured on the Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP). Alongside review of the TPAP, schools and institutes should take particular note of the general academic health of each programme, the resources and facilities available to it; student comments and action taken in response; points raised by External Examiners and evidence of good practice and should complete an internal programme review which will be considered at the APR meeting (see section 5.3.1).

5.3.1 Internal Programme Reviews
Schools and institutes are expected to have undertaken a programme review for each of the taught programmes that are offered. Programmes can be considered individually or as cognate groups if appropriate. The programme leader or convenor should review the data related to the programme (such as module evaluation results, progression information, etc.) and assess whether the delivery and performance of the programme has been as anticipated. A template has been produced to assist the reviewer in focussing on specific areas that are important for effective programme review.

A review of programme(s) would be expected to consider the following areas (as a minimum)

- Programme content
- Enrolments
- Progression
- Learning, achievement and award
- Learning resources

Reference should be made to student data relating to these areas as well as to student feedback via module evaluations, Student-Staff Liaison Committees and student surveys such as NSS.

The results of the review(s) should be submitted to the School / Institute Director of Taught Programmes (or equivalent). Review documentation (whether in the form of notes, a report, minutes or completion of the template) will be shared with the appropriate Dean for Taught Programmes (or nominee). Points arising from the programme reviews will be discussed at school and institute Annual Programme Review meetings.

Internal programme reviews for all courses should be submitted to ARCS and the relevant Faculty Dean as follows:
- undergraduate programmes - by 30 September of the following academic year
- taught postgraduate programmes - by 31 December of the following academic year.

The Programme Review Template and associated guidance is available to download from: http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/apr/94171.html

5.3.2 The Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP)
The TPAP is the means by which schools / institutes can summarise the continuous review processes undertaken for their taught provision, and can demonstrate their actions in response to feedback on the programmes. It is a living document that should be updated over the course of the year as appropriate via the website: https://webapps2.is.qmul.ac.uk/apr/index.action.

Each TPAP will be considered at the Annual Programme Review meeting. There is a TPAP for each school and institute, plus one for each of the three faculties and others for college-level strategies. The TPAP also included the facility for reflection on actions relating to smaller-scale partnership provision within the school / institute, and the achievement of students entering programmes through other collaborative arrangements such as articulation.
agreements. A discrete TPAP should be created for each collaborative programme leading to an award of QMUL and which be the responsibility of the school/institute which owns the programme. Further guidance on this area can be found at the end of this section.

The table below shows the roles that hold overall responsibility for the management of the TPAP although other staff can be given access to edit the TPAP by request from one of the roles below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Role(s) responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/institute</td>
<td>Head of School / Institute Director, Director of Taught Programmes and the School Manager /Head of Administration for each School, and the main Teaching and Learning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Dean for Taught Programmes (and Deputies if appointed), Faculty Executive, DTPAG or SMD equivalent (comprising the Directors of Taught Programmes);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>VP Student Experience, Teaching and Learning and Executive Officer, VP International and Executive Officer, Academic Lead for International Student Experience, Academic Lead for Study Abroad, CAPD, Education Quality Board and Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TPAP can be added to and amended at any point in the year, however it should be up to date and ready for discussion before the meeting between the school / institute and the Faculty Dean for Taught Programmes.

The TPAP for collaborative programmes includes most of the features of a school / institute TPAP. In addition the process may focus on the following areas:

- Organisation, management and quality assurance: actions arising from joint management or academic committees (or equivalent) and actions relating to their operation.
- Student progression: actions relating to student achievement and progression, it may also be useful to compare with other relevant QMUL provision.
- Visits to the partner institution (where relevant): actions that may arise as an outcome of partner institution visits.

In addition to the standard documents provided for the Annual Programme Review meetings, those involving a collaborative TPAP may also include the minutes of joint committees (or equivalent) with the partner institution that are concerned with quality assurance. It is also expected that the collaborative TPAP will be discussed at appropriate points in the relevant joint committee meetings with the partner.

5.3.3 Student Feedback
Student representatives should also be given the opportunity to review and provide comments on the school's/institute’s TPAP in the appropriate comment boxes. The Students’ Union will arrange an annual event to enable representatives to get together to discuss the TPAP and agree their commentary.

For more information please see the separate TPAP guidelines, or visit: [http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/apr/94171.html](http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/apr/94171.html)

5.3.4 Annual Programme Review meeting
The annual programme review meeting will normally take place in semester one. The following persons should normally be present at these meetings:
The Faculty Dean for Taught Programmes / Dean for Education or nominee (Chair)
Any other person nominated by the DTP/DE (such as the Faculty Administrative Officer)
The Head of School/Institute Director
The Director of Taught Programmes
The Director of Administration
The Director (or academic lead) of each collaborative taught programme
Any other person nominated by the Head of School/Institute
Student representative (such as nominated course representative)
ARCS Representative (secretary)

Before the meeting, schools and institutes should provide ARCS with any external accreditation reports referred to in the TPAP, together with the most recent version of their Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy (LTAS) if required by the faculty. These plus other potential sources of actions, such as External Examiner reports or NSS results, will be supplied to the Faculty Dean for Taught Programmes in advance of the meeting.

The meeting will reflect on taught programmes within the school / institute with reference to the TPAP, consider the school / institute's LTAS, and review student data relating to enrolment, progression, awards and module performance. Any good or innovative practice should be identified so that it can be more widely disseminated, and developmental issues identified and reflected appropriately in the TPAP. As well as agreeing further actions, completed, or superseded, actions may be removed from the TPAP with the agreement of the Dean. The meeting will be chaired by the Faculty Dean for Taught Programmes, and will follow a standard agenda.

Collaborative programmes leading to a QMUL award will be considered as part of the home school/institute Annual Programme Review meeting but will also be considered in a separate annual review meeting. This review will be undertaken by the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning), Vice-Principal (International) and Deputy Academic Registrar (Academic Secretariat). The outcome of this meeting will be to provide an overview report on actions and features of good practice for wider dissemination to home schools and institutes and for consideration by the Education Quality Board.

5.4 Reporting of outcomes
Minutes will be taken of each annual programme review meeting, identifying priorities for action and any areas of good practice. Notes, together with the TPAP, will be considered by the school / institute’s Teaching and Learning Committee and Student-Staff Liaison Committee. As part of this consideration schools and institutes should take account of the feedback provided at the meeting, together with any action points which should have been added to the TPAP for the following academic year.

Once the APR meetings have concluded, ARCS will provide a written overview report to Education Quality Board with a summary of meeting minutes and a review of the process. The overview report will comment on any Faculty-wide trends, examples of new initiatives and good practice and any school/institute concerns that should be brought to the attention of Senate. Senate must satisfy itself as to the conduct of the exercise (and that action has been taken to resolve or highlight any issues identified) referring issues back to the individual school/institute/faculty for comment as necessary, and referring instances of good practice to the CAPD or other central services for further development and dissemination as appropriate. Once Senate has considered the overview report it will be sent to all Chairs of Teaching and Learning Committees for discussion, with particular emphasis on considering and disseminating good practice.
For more information: http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/qa/programme_monitoring_apr/index.html.

Research degree programmes

5.5 Research degree programmes
Schools and institutes will be advised of requirements by the Doctoral College and Research Degrees Office about the process for reviewing research degree programmes.
6. Periodic Review

6.1 Introduction
Periodic Review is a key component of QMUL’s quality framework. The intention is to engage in a structured and rigorous evidence-based dialogue in which there are high levels of transparency and a free flow of information. The Review will be undertaken by a panel of peers in partnership with the school/institute.

The aims of Periodic Review are:

- to assess the continued validity of the school's/institute's programme aims and learning outcomes in light of developments in the discipline together with the school's/institute's mechanisms for the continuous improvement of the student experience. The review will also test the effectiveness of a school or institute’s processes for managing academic quality and standards, and that QMUL’s agreed policies and procedures are operating as intended to assure and enhance the standard of provision;
- to consider how a school/institute is aligned with the Student Experience, Teaching and Learning Strategy, and how QMUL's Statement of Graduate Attributes is reflected in the curriculum;
- to review all partnership, or partner supported delivery;
- to commend and disseminate good practice;
- to provide public information on the quality and standards of the school/institute.

6.2 Scope
This procedure covers the Periodic Review of a school/institute’s provision, including the schedule of reviews, the appointment and role of a panel, the responsibilities of the school/institute under review and the outcomes of a review and their consideration. The procedure covers all QMUL’s taught and research degrees, including collaborative provision.

6.3 Summary
Periodic Review is an evaluation of a school or institute’s provision, together with its systems and procedures for managing, maintaining and enhancing the academic quality and standards of teaching and learning. It involves the development of a self-evaluation document (SED) by the school/institute concerned; this document forms the basis of the review which is undertaken by a panel comprising members of QMUL and external subject specialists from other higher education institutions or from the professions.

The process of Periodic Review applies to undergraduate, postgraduate taught, and research degree provision in all schools/institutes within QMUL. Programmes offered in collaboration with an external partner (excluding articulation arrangements, year abroad provision or research degree provision) will be considered within the periodic review for a given academic school/institute at QMUL. Partner review visits will be undertaken for collaborative programmes leading to an award of QMUL in advance of a school/institute periodic review; the report of these visits will form part of the documentation for the periodic review. Partner review visits are covered in a separate document (insert link).

Following the review a full report will be produced, accompanied by a set of recommendations and commendations for the attention of the school/institute.

6.4 Associated documents
Associated documents, including a template for production of the Self Evaluation Document (SED), can be found on the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat (ARCS) web site: [http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/periodic-review/index.html](http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/periodic-review/index.html)
6.5 Schedule and format
Periodic Reviews are undertaken on a six year cycle. The schedule is approved by Senate in advance and published by the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat. The date of a review for each school/institute will be agreed by the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat following consultation with the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning), Deans for Taught Programmes and the school/institute concerned.

6.6 Self-Evaluation Document
Following the confirmation of a Periodic Review date, the school/institute will be expected to produce a self-evaluation document (SED). The Academic Registry and Council Secretariat will provide guidance and templates to support the development of this document.

The SED should provide an evaluative account of the school/institute’s provision and mechanisms for managing academic standards and assuring the quality of the student experience. It is recommended that the development of the SED is undertaken through appropriate school/institute meetings in order to ensure there is a collective ownership of the final document.

It is an important principle of the SED that it should include a candid and, where appropriate, self-critical account of the school/institute’s mechanisms for assuring, managing, and enhancing quality. The SED is an evidence-based document. The text of the document should therefore substantiate the statements made therein by cross-reference to supporting evidence contained in documents listed for submission with the SED.

The document will be circulated to the panel and should both draw on and be submitted with the following documentation:

- External Examiner reports and responses (for the past three years)
- Programme Specifications for each programme offered
- Taught Programme Action Plans and notes of Annual Programme Reviews
- Partnership visit reports (where appropriate)
- PSRB accreditation reports (where appropriate)
- A report from the placement organiser reviewing student, employer and external examiner feedback on placements (where appropriate)
- Programme handbooks
- A diagrammatic overview of the committee structure for managing teaching and learning quality
- School/Institute’s current teaching and learning strategy
- Minutes of relevant teaching committees and student-staff liaison committees
- Student Survey Results e.g. NSS, PTES, PRES (for the past three years)

Once the draft SED has been agreed, full sets of documentation should be submitted electronically. The School must submit 12 printed copies of the SED (without appendices) accompanied by 12 memory sticks containing the appendices, and any other relevant information. A copy of the SED and the memory stick will be sent to each panel member. The school/institute should provide the SED and memory sticks to the periodic review secretary at least one month in advance of the meeting date.

6.7 Student Surveys
The Academic Registry and Council Secretariat will discuss with the school/institute under review the availability of information on student opinion about their programmes (in addition to module evaluation and the Queen Mary Student Survey), and will consider with the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning) whether to conduct an on-line survey for students about the quality of their learning experiences. It may be preferable to ask
students to provide a written statement to accompany the self-evaluation document, or to summarise any issues that they wish to raise following discussion of the review process at student-staff liaison committees.

6.8 Panel composition
A Periodic Review panel will normally comprise:

- Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning) (Chair);
- Vice President (Education), Students’ Union or nominee;
- a member of academic staff from outside of the Faculty/SMD in which the school/institute under review is based;
- the Director of the Centre for Academic and Professional Development or their nominee;
- Dean for Taught Programmes/Dean for Education, SMD;
- Vice-Principal (Research) or nominee from the Doctoral College;
- two External Reviewers;
- the Deputy Academic Registrar
- a member of the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat [Secretary].

For Periodic Reviews of institutes within the SMD, the Dean for Education, SMD will act as a panel member. For all other schools, the Dean for Taught Programmes of the Faculty in which the school is based will act as a panel member. If the home school/institute of the Dean for Taught Programmes or SMD equivalent is the school/institute being reviewed then a different Dean for Taught Programmes or equivalent will be asked to serve on the panel.

Reviews are chaired by the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning) or their nominee. The school/institute will nominate two external panel members. Following approval of the nominees by the VP (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning) the external panel members will be formally invited to the panel by the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat.

The majority of reviews will take place over two days, with the panel undertaking a pre-meeting the first day to consider the questions and lines of enquiry for the meeting with the school/institute. The School/Institute will be asked to provide a person who may be contacted during this meeting if the panel has any queries or requires assistance with any factual questions. This person should be able to provide detailed advice on the overview of the School/Institute’s teaching, systems, and procedures.

6.8.1 The External Reviewers
An External Reviewer is normally a senior academic who is not a member of QMUL staff. S/he should have knowledge of the discipline concerned and, where possible, should have experience of Periodic Review in their own institution or external review by the QAA or relevant professional body. S/he should not have had any formal links with the school/institute under review within the previous 5 years.

The External Reviewers play a vital role in assisting the panel to identify key issues to be explored and play a full part in the panel’s meetings with school staff and students, and the identification of conclusions and recommendations.

In particular, External Reviewers are able to identify excellence in provision, they are able to make comparisons with similar provision at other institutions and comment on the currency of a school/institute’s programmes in the context of developments in the discipline, and can offer feedback on the appropriateness of aims and learning outcomes to future career development. External reviewers are asked to undertake a desk-based review of programme documentation in advance of the review. The provision will be allocated to each external by the review secretary and sampling will be used where there are groups of cognate programmes.
a school/institute offers any of its provision in collaboration with a partner then one of the externals will be asked to undertake the desk-based review of this programme(s) with special reference to the collaborative context; where possible, an external reviewer with experience of the delivery of provision with an external partner will be sought.

External Reviewers are invited to comment on the report of the Review and the school/institute’s response to the report. Each External Reviewer is provided with an outline of their role as a member of a Periodic Review panel and receives a fee paid from central funds.

6.9 The role of panel members
The role of all panel members is to:

- identify significant themes/issues for discussion;
- construct and manage an agenda for the Periodic Review which enables them to explore these themes/issues through dialogue with the school/institute;
- pursue lines of enquiry which allow them to test and verify whether current structures and procedures are fit for purpose;
- make evidence-based judgements about the maintenance and enhancement of quality and standards;
- make evidence based judgements about QMUL’s relation with a partner institution (where appropriate);
- Identify areas for commendation and recommendation to be conveyed to the School/Institute.

6.10 The Periodic Review
Lines of inquiry are derived from panel members’ analysis of the specific documentation produced for each Periodic Review. The expectation is that whilst Periodic Reviews will pursue a number of common and generic themes, each Periodic Review will be tailored to local circumstances.

A Periodic Review usually takes place in the Colette Bowe Room (formerly the Council Room) in the Queens’ Building on the Mile End Campus, but may also take place at a different location, or via video-conferencing facilities. The Agenda will be confirmed after discussion of the following:

- identification of broad areas for discussion;
- review of issues submitted in advance by panel members;
- clarification of any issues;
- confirmation of those members of staff who will meet with the Periodic Review panel;
- logistics for the Review.

The Panel will use the SED and supporting documentation as a basis for the discussions with the school/institute. The Panel will meet with nominated academic, administrative, technical and support staff to discuss the agreed lines of enquiry and the information provided in the SED. The meetings will usually take place over one day.

6.10.1 Meetings with Members of the School
The self-evaluation document acts as the basis for discussions between the panel and the school/institute. The panel meets with nominated academic, administrative, technical and support staff from the school/institute to discuss the self-evaluation document. This series of meetings normally takes place over one day.

It is the school’s/institute’s responsibility to arrange for staff to attend the meeting. Details of those staff who have been nominated to attend should be provided to the secretary at least
one week in advance of the review. The Panel may wish to request that additional staff are
asked to attend if necessary.

6.10.2 Meetings with Students
The panel also meets with students who should normally represent all programmes available
within the school/institute. It is the school/institute’s responsibility to arrange for student
representatives (undergraduate and postgraduate) to attend these meetings. The panel will
usually have an informal meeting with students over lunch, followed by a formal meeting.
Depending on the nature of provision, the panel may prefer to run parallel sessions with
selected panel members meeting with different groups of staff/students.

An outline agenda is available for guidance, and can be downloaded from
http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/periodic-review/index.html. Specific questions are not
prescribed for the panel to ask; instead the panel will base its questions on issues arising from
the analysis of the school’s self-evaluation document and student feedback.

6.11 Collaborative Provision
Partnership visits (7.13.7) for collaborative programmes leading to an award of QMUL will be
conducted in advance of a school/institute periodic review. These visits also inform the
partnership renewal process so the schedule of periodic reviews will be aligned to consider
these dual requirements.

The Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning), Dean for Taught
Programmes and the Academic Registrar’s nominee will undertake a partnership visit,
normally over two days. The visit will involve meetings with senior management staff, teaching
staff and students to discuss: teaching, learning and assessment; the management of
academic standards; the management of the partnership; student outcomes; staff
development; issues emerging from annual programme review; learning resources. The team
will also visit the teaching accommodation and any specialist space, together with resources
for learning support. The report of this visit will form part of the documentation for the periodic
review, in addition to consideration at other appropriate boards/groups within QMUL and the
partner.

6.12 Outcome

6.12.1 Periodic Review Report
The Secretary to the Review will confirm Panel’s commendations and recommendations in
consultation with the Panel. It is intended that the commendations and recommendations will
be provided to the school/institute within one week of the review date.
The Secretary will be responsible for writing the Periodic Review Report. The Report should
normally include:

• The composition of the Panel members;
• The details of the staff members who attended;
• Details of the school/institute’s organisation and committee structure;
• Commentary on the evaluation of programmes and curriculum;
• Commentary on the quality of learning opportunities;
• Commentary on staff support and development;
• Commentary on the maintenance and enhancement of quality and standards;
• Commentary on postgraduate research and relevant research areas;
• Details and evaluation of learning resources;
• A summary of commendations and recommendations.

The Periodic Review panel agrees the content of the report and it is then sent to the head of
school/institute for comments on factual accuracy. The final draft of the report will be
submitted to the school/institute and will be considered in detail by the Education Quality Board.

6.12.2 Follow up Actions
Following receipt of the report the school/institute should consider and draft a response. The response should take the form of a detailed and time bound action plan and provides initial responses to any issues raised and outlines how the recommendations will be addressed.

The response should be submitted to the review secretary approximately three months after receiving the final version of the Periodic Review report.

It is recommended that schools/institutes discuss the Periodic Review report and consider the implementation of the action plan within the relevant school or institute committee/s, and with partners as appropriate. School/institutes will also discuss the report and action plan with their Student-Staff Liaison Committee/s and keep students informed about action and progress in relation to issues raised by students in their discussion with the Periodic Review panel. Student concerns raised during a Periodic Review will be monitored by ARCS, in partnership with the Student Unions’ Course Representative Co-ordinator.

Any particular issues of concern that require support or monitoring will be the responsibility of the Vice-Principal and Executive Dean for the Faculty, who may convene a group of dedicated staff to support the School under review in taking forward action, while the Senate will take an overview of any institutional issues that might require attention.

After twelve months the school/institute is required to lodge a progress report with the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat. This should include evidence that students have had the opportunity to see and discuss the report, and comment on any areas of concern they may have. The progress report will be considered by Education Quality Board, which reserves the right to request further progress reports if these are appropriate. The review report can be published or made available to individuals (both internal and external to the QMUL) on request in accordance with HEFCE guidance.

6.13 Reviewing the process
The process of Periodic Review is subject to regular evaluation and review by the Education Quality Board.
7. Collaborative provision

7.1 Introduction
This chapter sets out QMUL’s quality assurance policy for the management of QMUL’s learning opportunities which are delivered in collaboration with external organisations and lead or contribute to a QMUL award or QMUL academic credit.

QMUL has committed to engage in collaborative provision in its QMUL Strategy and supporting International Strategy recognising the opportunities and benefits that collaborative arrangements can offer in order to enhance research, knowledge transfer and the student learning experience.

QMUL is responsible for the academic standards of the awards made in its name and for the quality of the programmes that lead to those awards. QMUL holds ultimate responsibility for the way in which it manages its higher education provision in collaboration with other institutions, and conforms to the QAA’s UK Quality Code for Higher Education Chapter B10 Managing higher education provision with others.²

QMUL is mindful of the risks involved in developing and managing academic partnerships and has built in appropriate due diligence and risk management processes to support these partnerships from their inception through to review.

Definition
QMUL follows the QAA definition of collaborative provision set out in Chapter B10 as “all learning opportunities leading or contributing to the award of academic credit or a qualification that are delivered, assessed or supported through an arrangement with one or more organisations other than the degree-awarding body.”

Collaborative provision refers to any educational provision leading to an award or to specific credit of QMUL which is delivered, supported or assessed through an arrangement with one or more partner organisations.

7.2 Purpose
The purpose of the document is to describe QMUL’s policy and mechanisms for developing and managing educational partnerships with external institutions with a view to ensuring that QMUL maintains an appropriate quality of student experience and effectively manages risk in relation to its collaborative provision.

This information is aimed at academic and administrative staff involved in the development of programme proposals with a UK or an overseas partner. It is intended as a summary of the key procedures leading to programme approval.

Separate Guidance Notes for collaborative proposals with details on the procedures and templates to be followed are available on the Collaborative Provision web pages.

Proposers should note that all new collaborative proposals need strategic approval from the Partnerships Board (PB) before the detailed programme approval process can begin. No new collaborative arrangements will be permitted to progress unless they have been approved via the procedures described in this document and accompanying guidance.

A summary of the Academic Programme Approval Process, including that for the collaborative programmes, can be found in chapter four of the Quality Handbook (Programme and Module Development).

7.3 Scope

7.3.1 The policy covers all partnerships that lead to an award of Queen Mary University of London, or an award made jointly with another institution, or to admission to one of QMUL’s programmes with advanced standing or involving the exchange of staff or students. It also includes partnerships that facilitate admission to programmes and/or have a role in determining entry standards.

The following types of activity fall outside of scope:

- Franchise or validation arrangements which QMUL policy does not currently allow;
- Individual research collaborations which are managed by the Joint Research Management Office (JRMO) or by the Business Development Office;
- Visiting students (i.e. those not studying for credit or on a student exchange arrangement);
- Sponsorship only agreements;
- Voluntary placements or work experience organised by the student;
- Visiting academics.

7.3.2 Types of collaborative activities covered by this policy

The main types of collaborative arrangements covered by this policy and with which QMUL may be involved include:

- General co-operation agreements (Memoranda of Understanding - MOUs);
- Articulation agreements;
- Progression agreements;
- Collaborative programmes for undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision leading to a single, joint or double award;
- Study abroad and Exchange programmes, including Erasmus+ exchanges;
- Visiting associate students studying at QMUL;
- Collaborative research degree programme arrangements. These normally lead to a single degree jointly awarded by the partner organisations. Double awards (including co-tutelles) will only be considered in exceptional circumstances, for example where required as part of an external doctoral training grant application. QMUL will only consider joint degree programmes for a cohort of students. Joint degrees cannot be set up for individual students;
- General research agreements.

A full breakdown is available in Annex A to this chapter, ‘Taxonomy of Partnerships’

7.4 Principles

The following key principles will underpin all partnership activity at QMUL:

- Academic standards and awards: QMUL retains responsibility for the academic standards of all awards granted in its name, and is responsible for ensuring that the academic standards of awards developed and delivered through partnership arrangements will be equivalent to those delivered by QMUL and will be compatible with any relevant UK benchmarking information.
- Academic reputation: QMUL will collaborate only with institutions of good academic standing. For international partners, advice on the academic standing of a prospective partner is available from the International Partnerships Office and from ARCS for partners within the UK. Any new
partnership should contribute to and enhance the reputation of QMUL as well as of the school/institute sponsoring it.

- **Quality assurance**: QMUL’s quality assurance procedures for collaborative activities follow the procedures set out in this Handbook. Specific quality assurance procedures required to support a collaborative arrangement should be set out in the agreement and should be approved at the relevant stage in the procedure. The overall quality of learning opportunities for students undertaking programmes in collaboration with others will be equivalent to that for students based solely at QMUL.

- **Assessment of risk**: QMUL ensures, through due diligence investigations, that a proposed partner is of an appropriate academic standing, with shared educational objectives, and is capable of fulfilling its role and responsibilities under the collaborative arrangement. Prior to submitting any new collaborative proposal, an assessment of possible risks should be undertaken in respect of both the partner and the proposed activity.

- **Financial sustainability**: All partnership activities should be financially sustainable, and should be fully costed to give an indication of likely direct or indirect costs to the school/institute. The financial arrangements and responsibilities will be detailed in a written agreement between QMUL and the partner.

- **Consistency with QMUL Strategy and International Strategy**: Any agreement with an overseas partner institution should be coherent with, and support the aims set out in the QMUL Strategy and the supporting International Strategy. It should also be coherent with the strategic plans of the academic units concerned.

- **Legal framework**: The responsibilities and obligations of QMUL and the partner institutions will be set out in Memoranda of Agreement and, for more substantial arrangements, in legally binding Contracts. The precise contractual requirements should be assessed on a case by case basis, but due to their greater complexity, double and joint arrangements will normally require a legally binding Contract, whilst for other types of collaboration, Memoranda of Agreement will normally be sufficient.

- **Programme management**: For any partnership leading to an award, QMUL’s management of the programme or module will operate in the same way as internal provision with formal approval and review through the programme and module approval and review processes.

- **Admissions**: The arrangements for admission to the collaborative programme are managed in accordance with QMUL’s normal recruitment and admissions policy. Any specific admissions requirements are set out in the collaborative agreement and are articulated to students as part of the admissions process.

- **Assessment**: Assessment processes and procedures of partner institutions should be consistent with QMUL’s Academic Regulations and with the Queen Mary Academic Credit Framework. QMUL’s normal External Examiner procedures apply to collaborative arrangements.

### 7.5. Associated key documents

The following documents and templates can be found on the ARCS Collaborative Provision webpage:

- Approval Flowchart
- Due Diligence Checklist and Risk Assessment Form
- Personal Declaration Form
- Stage 1 Partnership Proposal Form
- Stage 1 Partnership & Programme Proposal Form (taught single, joint/double programmes)
- Stage 2 Academic Proposal Form (Articulation Agreements)
7.6 Governance of Collaborative provision
As collaborative arrangements are formal relationships between QMUL and the partner organisations, the governance of academic partnerships is the responsibility of Senate. Senate delegates its responsibility for the strategic approval of partnership activity to the Partnerships Board (PB) and the consideration of the academic case to the Taught Programmes Board (undergraduate and postgraduate taught provision) and to the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board for research degrees arrangements (RDPEB). PB reviews the effectiveness of collaborative provision in terms of strategic objectives other than educational quality. The Education Quality Board has responsibility for the approval of policy relating to collaborative provision and the consideration of monitoring reports as appropriate. Schools and Institutes have responsibility for the day-to-day operation and management of their collaborative activity and incorporate these programmes within their structures for academic governance and the strategic enhancement of the student experience. Each collaborative arrangement should have a main academic lead responsible for the preparation and submission of the collaborative proposal and for managing the arrangement once this has been approved. ARCS staff are committed to support named academic leads in their discharge of this responsibility drawing on precedent and good practice across QMUL.

7.7 Approval of Collaborative Provision arrangements
Approval of any new collaborative provision is in one or two stages depending on the nature of the proposal.

Stage 1 partnership approval: all new collaborative proposals need the strategic approval of the Partnerships Board (PB) and should be considered at stage 1 for initial approval of the partnership. PB will consider the aims and objectives of the proposed partnership, its financial implications and will assess in detail the good standing of the proposed partner institution through due diligence and risk assessment documentation. Stage 1 Proposals need Faculty Executive approval prior to submission to PB.

Stage 1 approval MUST be obtained prior to schools/institutes committing to ANY form of agreement with an external party (including MOUs or MOAs), or entering into any financial obligation related to the collaboration. Proposals of strategic significance will be referred to Queen Mary Senior Executive (QMSE) for consideration.

Stage 2 approval: Taught Programmes Board (TPB) will consider in detail the academic case for certain types of collaboration as indicated in section 7.8. Stage 2 can only commence once stage 1 is completed. Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board (RDPEB) will consider the detailed case for a collaborative research degree arrangement.

Partnerships Board meeting dates and deadlines for paper submission can be found on the PB webpage.

7.8 Initial development of proposals
Initiation may come from the school/institute, QMUL or from the proposed partner. At the initial stage, a series of discussions will typically take place internally between school/institute staff, and between the school/institute and the potential partner in order to explore the possibility of any proposal. These discussions are an opportunity to ensure that the proposed partner is of an appropriate academic standing and to identify any potential risks as well as benefits. Before any significant work is undertaken, staff should secure strategic approval from their head of school/institute. Plans to develop new partnerships should usually be identified in the context of the Planning and Accountability Review (PAR).
Schools and institutes are encouraged to discuss collaborative proposals with ARCS before the submission of any formal proposal.

If the proposed activity involves an international party or is likely to involve overseas students studying in the UK, in addition to ARCS proposers must contact the International Partnerships Office (IPO).

The development process may take up to 18 months before the launch of a programme. Proposers should take into consideration the Table with 'Timeline of the Programme Approval Process' which can be found in Chapter 4 on Programme and Module development.

Estimated timescale for approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of collaborative provision partnership</th>
<th>Estimated timescale for approval</th>
<th>PB required at Stage 1</th>
<th>TPB/RDPEB Part 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint and Double Awards</td>
<td>12-18 months</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>TPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>TPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative modules</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>TPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative PhDs</td>
<td>12-18 months</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>RDPEB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following reference points should be used when developing the proposal:

- QMUL Academic Credit Framework
- QMUL Strategy
- QMUL International Strategy
- International Partnerships Development Plan
- School/Institute plans
- International Ethical Policy

7.9 Stage one approval of a new partnership activity

7.9.1 Stage 1 Partnership Proposal Form
This form should be used for the following types of collaborative activities:

- Co-operation agreement (MOU);
- Articulation agreement;
- Progression agreement;
- Off-campus study;
- Study Abroad and Exchanges;
- Erasmus+ Agreements;
- Collaborative research degrees arrangements;
- Funding agency agreement;
- Research agreements.

7.9.2 Stage 1 Partnership and Programme Proposal (taught joint/double programmes) Form
This form combines the requirements for Stage 1 Partnership Proposal with Part 1 Programme Proposal and should be used for seeking approval of new taught single, joint and double programmes to be delivered with a new external party.

7.9.3 Due Diligence Checklist and Risk Assessment Form
Both Stage 1 Partnership Proposal and Stage 1 Partnership and Programme Proposal forms must be accompanied by supplementary information on the proposed partner(s) using the Due Diligence Checklist which also includes a Risk Assessment.
The purpose of ‘due diligence’ is to manage any risk that might arise in relation to working in collaboration with another institution. In the case of a high risk result, schools/institutes should seek further advice from ARCS and provide any relevant supplementary documentation to strengthen the case.

The Due Diligence Checklist will be scrutinised by the Partnerships Board who will assess if the prospective partner is of good standing and has the capacity to fulfil its designated role in the arrangement.

The checklist is divided into a number of sections, not all of which are relevant to every proposal. ARCS will advise which sections need to be completed.

7.9.4 Submission of Stage 1 Proposals
The completed Stage 1 Partnership Proposal or Stage 1 Partnership and Programme Proposal forms together with the Due Diligence Check-list and Risk Assessment should be submitted to ARCS who will scrutinise the documentation and will arrange for consideration by PB. Both Stage 1 Partnership Proposal and Stage 1 Partnership and Programme Proposals need Faculty Executive approval prior to submission to PB.

Proposers are also requested to complete a Declaration of Interest for all new collaborative proposals. This will be sent to ARCS for PB consideration together with Stage 1 documentation. Further information is included in the form and in the Guidance notes for collaborative provision.

Following PB approval, a general Memorandum of Understanding between the two partners can be drafted and sent to ARCS who will arrange for signature by the Principal or his nominated deputy.

Once a programme has passed Stage 1 Partnership and Programme approval the Partnerships Board (PB) will indicate when it can be marketed. In order to publicise a new programme the school/institute administering the programme (through the programme proposer) should liaise directly with Marketing and Communications to ensure that all the necessary information required to market the programme is provided.
Where the proposal does not need to go through a second approval stage (normally non-award initiatives), the Memorandum of Agreement with detailed arrangements must still be prepared with advice from ARCS before the collaborative activity can proceed.

7.10. Stage two approval for academic programmes
7.10.1 Stage 2 academic approval
For Taught Single, Joint or Double award agreements the relevant Part 2 Programme proposal documentation should be submitted to TPB. All the details regarding academic approval arrangements can be found on the Programme development web page, summarised in Chapter 4 of the Quality Handbook.

Once a programme has been approved at this stage Part 2 approval offers to applicants cannot be made until the agreement or contract have been approved by the Deputy Academic Registrar and the Chief Strategy Officer.

7.10.2 Stage 2 Academic Proposal Form (Articulation Agreements).
This is used to seek academic approval to establish an articulation agreement with an external partner. Prior to submitting Stage 2 proposals, plans to introduce articulation/progression agreements with new partners should be identified in the context of the Planning and Accountability Review (PAR).
In the case of articulation agreements it is important to undertake rigorous academic scrutiny of the partners’ programme because students are using advanced standing to count towards the QMUL award. Evidence of mapping the Partner’s programme to the corresponding QMUL programme(s) should be submitted in a separate annex.

7.10.3 Stage 2 Research Degree Programmes Proposal Form – in development
The form should be completed by the supervisor(s) proposing the collaboration and signed by the Head of School and Director of Graduate Studies. It should then be forwarded to the Faculty Deputy Dean for Research (PGR) for consideration, together with the draft doctoral agreement. Proposals recommended by the Faculty Deputy Dean for Research (PGR) will be submitted to RDPEB for final consideration and approval on behalf of Senate.

7.10.4 Submission of stage 2 proposals
The completed forms and a draft Agreement should be submitted to Academic Secretariat who will arrange for the consideration of the proposal at Taught Programmes Board (TPB) or Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board (RDPEB).

It is recommended that the provision is approved at least 6 months in advance of the admission of students to the programme. Part 2 programme proposals need to be submitted for the TPB meeting on the 01 March 2017 to meet the UCAS deadline for making offers and internal deadlines for data collection and timetabling.

7.11. Agreement documents

7.11.1 Memorandum of Understanding
Typically, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be signed with the partner institution after Stage 1 approval for the development of the partnership has been granted. QMUL has a standard MOU template used to confirm the relationship between QMUL and the partner at the highest level, to provide an umbrella agreement under which more specific agreements may be developed. It is strongly recommended that an MOU is signed where there is a likelihood of a mutually beneficial form of cooperation. The MOU is not legally binding; it is a statement of intent which sets forth the general basis upon which the Parties wish to proceed. Not all collaborative arrangements are required to develop MOUs.

7.11.2 Agreement
An Agreement or a Contract will be signed following approval of the developed provision. This agreement will detail the respective responsibilities, roles and obligations of the parties. The expectation is that the agreement is signed before the collaborative programme commences. The Contract is a legally binding document setting out the rights and obligations of the parties and detailing the collaborative arrangements which will normally vary depending on the type of Agreement. Typically an Agreement is valid for 5 years.

The final drafts of both the agreement and/or the contract must be cleared by the Deputy Academic Registrar and the Chief Strategy Officer following PB and TPB approval. Legal advice may be sought in relation to particular contracts.

When drafting Memoranda of Understanding and Agreement documents, proposers should consult the ARCS and IPO who can advise on the agreement model to be used.

7.12 Overview of Collaborative Arrangements at QMUL
Annexes B and C set out short descriptions of the current models of collaborative provision permitted by QMUL, highlighting key points and procedures.

Annex B covers the following types of provision:
- Articulation agreements;
• Progression agreements;
• Programmes delivered by distance learning;
• Collaborative module;
• Placement learning;
• Work based learning;
• Academic study placements: Study abroad and Exchange programmes
• Visiting Associate students

• Research agreements.

Annex C covers joint double degrees which are generally more complex arrangements.

7.13 Management of collaborative programmes
All credit bearing collaborative programmes are subject to QMUL’s Quality Framework: programme development and approval; external examining; annual programme review; periodic review; student module evaluation; student representation and feedback through Student Staff Liaison Committees. Quality assurance arrangements specific to an agreement will be stipulated in the Memorandum of Agreement.

7.13.1 External Examiners
To ensure continuity, the same external examiner will be appointed to programmes that are delivered both internally and externally where this applies. External examiners will be appointed by QMUL where QMUL is the awarding institution. Where a programme leads to a joint award, partners must also appoint an external examiner, so the appointment must satisfy the criteria of both institutions. Where a programme leads to a dual award QMUL will appoint an external examiner(s) for the QMUL award. The partner may, or may not appoint an external examiner depending on the regulations for their award. However, it is strongly recommended that where this is the case, partners are encouraged to adopt a similar external approach to ensuring standards and that this is reflected in the Agreement.

7.13.2 Programme publicity
All publicity for the proposed programme should be agreed with QMUL prior to publication. In particular the use of the QMUL logo must be agreed as specified in the agreement document.

7.13.3 Student handbook
The student handbook will ensure that the requirements of the programme are clear to students including transparent information concerning the respective responsibilities of QMUL and the partner. Students will also have clear information about the nature of QMUL’s relationship with the partner institution, and which institution is responsible for the delivery of particular learning outcomes. The complaints and appeals procedure and the responsibilities of each partner in them will be clearly delineated.

7.13.4 Student Staff Liaison Committees
ARCS compiles an annual summary of issues raised at SSLCs for Senate. The annual summary report will include a separate section drawn the minutes of collaborative programmes. The format may vary to suit the culture and model of the partnership.

7.13.5 Review and renewal of existing Agreements
One year before the expiry of an existing agreement, there will be a review of the collaborative arrangement that will lead to a decision on whether to re-approve it for a further term, or to withdraw from the provision. ARCS will coordinate a meeting of key stakeholders to decide on the most appropriate process for renewal, which will include an updated due diligence report, a review of the programme(s) and a visit to the partner institution (where appropriate).
The academic co-ordinator of the collaborative arrangement will complete a Review of Activity/Renewal Form twelve months before the Memorandum of Understanding and related agreements are due to expire. For articulation agreements, a new mapping of the partner’s programme to the corresponding QMUL programme must be submitted to Taught Programmes Board.

The renewal request will be submitted to PB for approval and will have to be agreed by the Faculty VP. The report following the review process will form part of the documentation for the periodic review of the relevant school or institute.

Partnership visits will take place regularly both for renewal of Agreements and for review purposes (in advance of a Periodic Review).

7.13.6 Annual Monitoring
Regular and effective monitoring of QMUL’s collaborative provision is required in order to safeguard academic standards and ensure the quality of the student experience. The home school/institute/faculty has responsibility for continuous monitoring of educational partnerships in accordance with the procedures for all QMUL awards as set out in the Quality Handbook and an annual report on the outcomes of this continuous monitoring is required for wider consideration. QMUL’s Senate has responsibility for annual monitoring processes and has delegated responsibility for the design of these to the Education Quality Board with input from the PB in the case of collaborative provision.

All taught programmes leading to an award of QMUL should complete an Annual Programme Review (APR). Responsible schools and institutes may determine the nature of the report following the review, provided that the report/action plan covers all areas provided in the APR template (insert link). Schools and institutes will wish to discuss collaborative programmes as part of their Annual Programme Review meeting and a separate annual review meeting of all collaborative provision will be undertaken by the Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning), Vice-Principal (International), Deputy Academic Registrar (Academic Secretariat) and the Assistant Academic Registrar (Student Experience). This separate meeting will review the APR reports for collaborative programmes leading to a QMUL award and will compile a list of actions for home schools and institutes together with an overview report of QMUL-wide actions and themes for consideration by the Education Quality Board.

For collaborative research degrees, the school/institute considers reports on the programme at the appropriate Graduate Studies or other committee. Collaborative research degrees will also be discussed at the annual meeting of the Faculty Deputy Dean for Research Degrees with each school/institute.

All other types of collaborative provision (not leading to a QMUL award), including small-scale programmes, exchanges, articulations, visiting associate students, and placement learning are subject to continuous monitoring through the schools/institutes’ TPAPs and should be covered in the school/institute Annual Programme Review meeting.

Further guidance on the APR is included in the section 5 of the Quality Handbook.

PB receives annual reports from all major partnerships.

7.13.7 Periodic Review
The Periodic Review process encompasses all taught and research awards including those offered with an external partner (Chapter 6 of the Quality Handbook). Each school and institute will have a periodic review every six years.
As described in 7.13.5, a review of each partnership and collaborative programme leading to a QMUL award will take place one year in advance of the renewal of the partnership agreement. The output of this process will be considered as part of the documentation for the home school or institute’s periodic review. Each periodic review panel includes two external academic members with appropriate subject expertise; one of the external members will be asked to provide a desk-based review of the collaborative programmes offered by the school/institute and the report of this exercise will also form part of the review documentation.

7.13.8 Withdrawal from collaborative arrangements
ARCS must be notified immediately of any intention to withdraw from a collaborative arrangement, or of the receipt of a termination notice from a partner institution. Partnerships Board and Senate (or delegated authorities) will be notified at this stage.

A decision to withdraw from, or not renew, a collaborative arrangement must be communicated promptly between QMUL and the partner institution, to allow sufficient time for termination arrangements to be discussed and agreed in an exit agreement. QMUL reserves the right to terminate a collaborative arrangement if it considers that there are risks to its academic standards and quality.

All new agreements stipulate a twelve month period of notice for termination in order to enable the management of the transition where students are already enrolled on programmes. Any proposal for termination should be approved by the Head of School and referred to PB for consideration.

The exit agreement will set out the respective responsibilities of QMUL and the partner institution(s) for the period of time that will allow all eligible students to complete the collaborative programme.

Careful management of the termination process is necessary to protect the academic standards and quality of the collaborative provision during the termination period and also mitigate reputational risks to QMUL.

7.13.9 Register of Collaborative Provision
The QMUL Register of Collaborative Provision is updated following the approval and signature of the written agreement. The Register of Collaborative Provision is an up-to-date and authoritative record of QMUL’s collaborative partnerships, and a listing of the collaborative programmes operating through those partnerships that lead to a QMUL award.

The Register of Collaborative Provision will be reviewed on an annual basis by the Partnerships Board, so that it maintains an oversight of the scale and scope of QMUL’s collaborations.

7.13.10 Contacts
For information on the general collaborative approval process and partnership approval, please contact:

Raluca Vasiliu-McIver, Academic Standards and Quality Officer, ARCS;
Harriet Howse, Head of International Partnerships;
Ceri Bevan, Head of Global Opportunities, Study Abroad and Exchanges
Mary Childs, Assistant Academic Registrar, Research Degrees, for collaborative research degrees and professional doctorates.

For further information on issues related to academic approval by the Taught Programmes Board, please contact the Academic Quality and Standards Officer specifically assigned to work with your Faculty.
## Annex A
### Taxonomy of Collaborative Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of arrangement</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Process for approval/renewal</th>
<th>Student Entitlement</th>
<th>Monitoring and Review</th>
<th>Type of Agreement</th>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>Admission to an intermediate stage of a UG QMUL programme is on the basis of the recognition of completion of study at the partner institution to an agreed standard, which counts as advanced standing credit on the student’s academic record. QMUL does not currently enter into articulation agreements whereby students articulate into the final year of a degree programme at QMUL. An articulation agreement offers students from the partner university meeting the prescribed criteria advanced entry to the relevant programme at QMUL.</td>
<td>Institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership and partner through due diligence and risk assessment processes by Partnerships Board (PB); academic approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB). The procedure for academic approval will focus on curriculum mapping, and the evaluation of quality assurance processes at the partner institution.</td>
<td>Students are registered &amp; enrolled with QMUL. They will have full access to QMUL learning resources and student support services. Articulation students are given preferential places for accommodation on Mile End campus, provided they apply within the deadline. Students are also given a minimum 10% discount on tuition fees provided there is no other financial arrangement in place with the partner, eg commission.</td>
<td>Included in the School Annual Review Process. Included in the Periodic Review (every six years) Checks to ensure curricula have not changed substantially and remain sufficiently aligned to the original mapping exercise. An evaluation of student number and of students’ academic quality will be made on an annual basis and reported to PB. This information will be used to adjust entry requirements for students of that partner if necessary.</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement (articulation)</td>
<td>QMUL programmes and partners’ programmes do not fully map and gaps are identified. Students’ English level not fully satisfactory to meet the demands of the programme. Reputational risk if students’ are not appropriately supported during their studies. Student experience is important for the continued recruitment of students from that partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression</td>
<td>Progression arrangements set out the requirements for admission to the start of a</td>
<td>Institutional strategic approval of the proposed</td>
<td>Students are registered &amp; enrolled with</td>
<td>Part of the School Annual Review Process. If more than 20 students, a Memorandum of Agreement (progression)</td>
<td>Check if the proposed institution is a suitable partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative taught programmes leading to a QMUL award only</td>
<td>QMUL and one or more partner institutions collaborate to provide elements of a joint programme that leads to a single award of QMUL. QMUL is responsible for evaluating the provision and quality assurance arrangements at the partner institution (including, <em>inter alia</em>, curriculum monitoring, external examining, double marking).</td>
<td>Institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership and partner approval by PB and programme approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB). Part 2 programme approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB).</td>
<td>Students are registered &amp; enrolled with both QMUL and the partner institution. They will have full access to QMUL and partner institution learning resources and student support services.</td>
<td>Part of the School Annual Review Process. If more than 20 students, a separate Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP) is prepared linked to the relevant School’s TPAP.</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
<td>IP issues need to be clarified at the PB stage and in advance of the agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QMUL degree programme following completion of studies at a partner institution.

Students are expected to meet QMUL entrance requirement or any other requirements stipulated in the progression agreement. The School/Department retains the right to refuse admission.

QMUL. They will have full access to QMUL learning resources and student support services. Progression students on Masters programmes are given preferential places for accommodation on Mile End campus, provided they apply within the deadline.

Separate Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP) is prepared linked to the relevant School’s TPAP.

An evaluation of student number and of students’ academic quality will be made on an annual basis and reported to PB. Important to provide suitable information, do not over promise on our offering, ensure that students are supported.
<p>| <strong>Collaborative taught programmes leading to a joint award</strong> | QMUL and one or more partner institutions together provide elements of a joint programme that leads to a single award made jointly by both, or all, participants. QMUL will normally only consider entering into joint award arrangements with institutions of comparable standing to QMUL which have their own degree-awarding powers. | Institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership and partner by PB and programme approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB). Part 2 programme approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB). | Students are registered &amp; enrolled with both QMUL and the partner institution. They will have full access to QMUL and partner institution learning resources and student support services. | Part of the School Annual Review Process. If more than 20 students, a separate Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP) is prepared linked to the relevant School's TPAP. Periodic Review (every six years) External Examiner reports Student feedback | Memorandum of Agreement or Contract | Harmonisation of quality arrangements Reputational risk Safeguarding of student experience. |
| <strong>Collaborative taught programmes leading to a double award</strong> | QMUL and a partner institution collaborate to provide elements of a joint programme leading to separate awards from each institution. Arrangements involving more than two partners would lead to multiple awards in the same way. QMUL will normally only consider entering into double or multiple award arrangements with institutions of comparable standing to QMUL which have their own degree-awarding powers. | Institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership and partner by PB and programme approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB). Part 2 programme approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB). | Students are registered &amp; enrolled with both QMUL and the partner institution. They will have full access to QMUL and partner institution learning resources and student support services. | Part of the School Annual Review Process. If more than 20 students, a separate Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP) is prepared linked to the relevant School's TPAP. Periodic Review (every six years) External Examiner reports Student feedback | Memorandum of Agreement | Usual risks – management of academic standards, relationship with the partner, reputational risk, student experience etc. |
| <strong>Joint PhD agreement</strong> | QMUL and the partner degree awarding institution(s), provide a doctoral programme leading to a single PhD | Institutional strategic approval and partner approval by PB Stage 2 including detailed review of MoA | Students are registered &amp; enrolled with both QMUL and the partner institution. | Part of the School Annual Research Degrees Review Process. Examiner reports for joint degree candidates are | Memorandum of Agreement and Individual Doctoral | Harmonisation of supervision arrangements and |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>award and degree certificate</strong> issued jointly by the partner institutions.</th>
<th>programme specification by the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board (RDPEB)</th>
<th>They will have full access to QMUL and partner institution learning resources and student support services.</th>
<th>scrutinised by the school/institute and RDPEB. The consortium / partners put in place arrangements to monitor the programme, to review feedback from students, and to review student progression and examiner reports. The school/institute considers reports on the programme at the appropriate Graduate Studies or other committee.</th>
<th>Agreement (IDA) Funding agreement if appropriate examination regulations. Assuring the independence of decision making on academic progression and examination outcome. Assurance of satisfactory training, supervision and research facilities and resources provided by the partner(s).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double PhD agreement</strong></td>
<td>QMUL, together with another awarding institution, provides a doctoral programme leading to two separate PhD awards for the same work, with certificates from each institution. <strong>QMUL does not normally enter into double PhD arrangements.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint supervision / research project agreement</strong></td>
<td>A student or cohort of students will spend a significant proportion of their programme receiving supervision at both QMUL and another institution or organisation (including industrial partners). Under such arrangements students may be registered only for an award from</td>
<td>Students registered for a research degree at another university may apply to register at QMUL as associate research students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement learning:</td>
<td>QMUL or for an award from the partner institution</td>
<td>Institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership and partner approval by PB. MRAG to check balance of incoming and outgoing students. Renewal of Erasmus+ agreements to be approved by PB.</td>
<td>Students are registered with QM for the whole period of study; in addition they will be registered with the partner institution for the agreed placement period. They will have full access to QMUL and partner institution learning resources and student support services.</td>
<td>Part of the School Annual Review Process Visits to placement provider Feedback from placement provider Exchange partner feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative research arrangements</td>
<td>Research agreements with external partners which might arise from strategic alliances with other universities and research organisations, both home and overseas</td>
<td>Review and sign-off by the relevant Head of School and by the Faculty Vice Principal. Institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership by PB.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reports to Vice-Principal's Research Advisory Group (VPRAG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B

[a] Articulation agreements

Definition:
Articulation agreements are formal arrangements between QMUL and another HEI (normally overseas) whereby credit taken at the approved partner leads to advanced standing on a particular QMUL programme. Admission to an intermediate stage of a QMUL programme is on the basis of the recognition of completion of study at the partner institution to an agreed standard, which counts as advanced standing credit on the student’s academic record.

Key points:
1. QMUL is responsible for setting out the requirements for admission with advanced standing credit through an articulation agreement;
2. QMUL is responsible for ensuring that the attainment level required for articulation is at the minimum level of that to be achieved by full-programme students who are progressing at the point of entry;
3. Marks and individual partner credits achieved at the partner institution are not transferred to QMUL, and do not contribute to the QMUL award. The learning achieved at the partner institution is credited as advanced standing credit at QMUL;
4. QMUL does not currently enter into articulation agreements whereby students articulate into the final year of a degree programme at QMUL.

Overview procedure:
Approval is in two stages: institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership and partner approval through due diligence and risk assessment processes by Partnerships Board (PB) and academic approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB). The procedure for academic approval will focus on curriculum mapping, and the evaluation of quality assurance processes at the partner institution.

[b] Progression agreements

Definition:
Progression arrangements set out the requirements for admission to the start of a QMUL degree programme following completion of studies at a partner institution. Admission to the QMUL programme is dependent upon meeting all necessary academic requirements. Students will receive a QMUL award based only on credits attained at QMUL. The programme at the overseas institution may also lead to a qualification awarded by the partner. (Examples: 1+1, 4+1)

Key points:
1. Admission to the QMUL programme is dependent upon meeting all necessary academic requirements.
2. Students will receive a QMUL award based only on credits attained at QMUL.
3. The programme at the overseas institution may also lead to a qualification awarded by the partner. (Examples: 1+1, 4+1)

Overview procedure:
Approval is in one stage: Institutional strategic approval and partner approval by PB followed by Memorandum of Agreement.

[c] Collaborative programmes for undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision (single award) including Distance Learning

Definition:
QMUL and one or more partner institutions collaborate to provide elements of a joint programme that leads to a single award of QMUL.
Key points:
1. QMUL is responsible for evaluating the provision and quality assurance arrangements at the partner institution (including, inter alia, curriculum monitoring, external examining, double marking);
2. Marks and academic credit achieved at the partner institution will normally contribute to the algorithm for the QMUL award. QMUL is therefore responsible for ensuring the equivalence of marks and credit that will be taken into account;
3. The quality assurance processes to be followed will be articulated in the Memorandum of Agreement

Overview procedure
Approval is in two stages: institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership and partner approval through due diligence and risk assessment processes by Partnerships Board (PB) and academic approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB).

[d] Programmes delivered by distance learning
Definition:
Distance Learning programmes are delivered and/or supported and/or assessed through means which generally do not require the student to attend QMUL. These programmes may operate via a collaborative arrangement where the partner institution is a host for assessment activities and may provide some aspects of learner support.

Key points:
• QMUL is responsible for ensuring that the requirements of the programme are clear to students (including transparent information concerning the respective responsibilities of QMUL and the partner);
• QMUL is responsible for ensuring that the method of delivery is fit-for-purpose and reliable;
• QMUL is responsible for monitoring the suitability of the examination centres and invigilation arrangements, so that students and QMUL can be assured that all work assessed by examination is done in an appropriate controlled environment, compliant with the QMUL Academic Regulations;
• Schools and Institutes follow the QMUL procedure in the Quality Handbook where students have the dissertation element of their distance learning programme supported by a non-academic provider;
• All quality assurance processes follow the QMUL Quality Handbook.

Overview procedure:
• Approval is in two stages: institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership and partner approval by the Partnerships Board (PB).
• Part 2 programme approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB). Arrangements for assessment and the measures for monitoring the quality of the student experience will be of particular interest to the TPB.

[e] Collaborative module:
Definition
An individual module which contributes to a QMUL award which is partially or jointly delivered, taught and/or assessed by another institution/organisation.

Key Points:
• The module can be delivered on or off QMUL campuses and can be delivered by a partner entirely or collaboratively.
• In all cases, QMUL quality processes, including assessment regulations will apply.

Overview procedure:
PB will approve any new partner on the basis of a Stage 1 Partnership Proposal and Due Diligence process. In addition, proposers need to complete a new Module Proposal Form.
TPB will give academic approval of the module;
An Agreement with the partner will need to be signed.

This procedure does not apply to modules which feature guest lecturers who though possibly involved with student assessment to some degree do not take responsibility for the overall assessment of students

**Placement learning**

**Definition:**
Placement learning arrangements incorporate approved structured learning provision that typically takes place outside QMUL as an integral part of the QMUL programme. Placement activity will have clearly defined learning outcomes, appropriate for the academic level, that are essential to the programme of study.

QMUL has agreed four main types of placement learning for internal purposes:

[a] **Work-based placements:**
The student is a contracted employee and the emphasis of the placement is on gaining professional or technical employment experience. The student has the status, remuneration, and access to support structures commensurate with an employee of the organisation.

[b] **Internship placements:**
It is unusual for the student to be contracted as an employee. They complete work under supervision but the emphasis of the placement is on learning opportunities and educational experience.

[c] **Observer Placements:**
The student is not an employee and does not undertake any work; the placement is focused on the provision of learning opportunities.

**Key points for types [a] – [c]:**
- The learning completed during the placement normally contributes marks and credit to the academic record of participating students;
- In a credit-only assessment arrangement students are awarded credits but they do not directly contribute towards the calculation of the degree classification. In a placement enhanced assessment arrangement the placement is assessed by QMUL and the marks and credit contribute directly towards the degree classification. Both methods are used in the definitions above;
- QMUL is responsible for ensuring the quality of the educational provision, facilities and supervisory arrangements provided by the partner institution. This is managed through QMUL’s Quality Assurance Framework;
- The School of Medicine and Dentistry employs established procedures to meet the requirements of the GMC and GDC for clinical education. Responsibilities may be defined in individual Service Level Agreements with clinical partners;
- Individual schools/institutes are responsible for ensuring that appropriate arrangements are in place to support industrial and other placements;
- General responsibilities and expectations of partners involved in placement activities are set out in the Placement Learning Policy Matrix;
- Written agreements are not always required for placement learning arrangements where a student carries out a project of interest to the external organisation; however, QMUL staff determine and agree the intended learning outcomes for the project and carry out the assessment. In these cases, QMUL will supply the partner organisation and the student
with a document setting out how it expects the responsibilities associated with each placement to be undertaken and achieved.

Overview procedure for types [a] – [c]:
- Programme approval or programme amendment by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB).
- Following programme approval, the responsibility for assessing and approving the arrangements for the educational provision at the external organisation is normally devolved to schools/institutes, with reference to the guidance in the QMUL Placement Learning Policy Matrix and Placement Policy.
- Schools and institutes are expected to undertake a due diligence and risk assessment of the proposed placement providers;
- A Letter of Agreement will set out the roles and responsibilities of QMUL and the external organisation;
- A Learning Agreement will be signed by the student, student supervisor and placement provider. This will include the expectations, obligations and intended learning outcomes for the duration of the placement.

[d] Academic study placements (Study abroad and Exchange programmes)
In Study Abroad and exchange programmes the student is registered as a student at both the host partner institution and QMUL. The placement provides a period of academic study delivered by an overseas university, which is an integral credit-bearing part of a QMUL programme. Erasmus+ Student Exchanges are also included.

Key points for type [d]:
QMUL students may study for one semester or a full academic year at the partner institution;
- QMUL is responsible for evaluating the quality assurance processes and academic standards of the educational provision to be studied at the partner institution;
- Placements are either compulsory to the award of the QMUL degree, or an optional part of the award open to UG students from certain subjects;
- Placements normally use a credit and grade bearing assessment arrangement, where marks achieved at the partner institution are converted by QMUL and count towards the QMUL award;
- General responsibilities and expectations of partners involved in placement activities are set out in the Placement Learning Policy Matrix.

Overview procedure for type [d]:
Institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership through due diligence and risk assessment by the Partnerships Board (PB). The Memorandum of Agreement will include all the details of exchange arrangements.

Key areas for consideration in the approval process will be:
- an evaluation of the provision, academic standards and quality assurance arrangements at the partner institution;
- the mechanism for approving a programme of study at the partner institution (to ensure that all students complete the required number of credits at the correct level);
- the identification of arrangements for the reassessment of failed assessment at the partner institution;
- the conversion mechanisms for importing credit and marks to the QMUL academic record.
- QMUL has clear procedures in place to ensure that the study abroad and exchange programmes meet programme and academic regulations. For compulsory
placements these procedures are contained in the School Year Abroad Handbook. For optional placements the procedures are contained in the Procedures for supporting academic study placements and the International Partnership Office web pages.

- Schools are requested to nominate a single Study Abroad Co-ordinator for outgoing QMUL students to advise on and approve student study plans and maintain contact with students whilst they are on their study abroad placement.
- Study Abroad and Exchanges are managed by the Global Opportunities Office.

[e] Visiting Associate students studying at QMUL

Definition:
Visiting Associate students study for one semester or a full year at QMUL.

Key points:
1. Credits and marks achieved at QMUL may be transferred to the home university, in accordance with their procedures, but no award is made from QMUL;
2. Whilst some partners sending visiting Associate students to QMUL require a Memorandum of Agreement, others do not;
3. Where the partner institution does not require a Memorandum of Agreement, QMUL will supply the partner institution with a document that outlines the responsibilities of QMUL as a Study Abroad partner (at institutional level) in the absence of an agreement;
4. QMUL will agree which partner institutions it will accept Associate students from, and into which subject areas. These arrangements may be part of student mobility arrangements such as the Erasmus+ Programme.

Overview procedure:
- Institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership along with consideration of the requirements of the partner institution and partner approval through due diligence by the Partnerships Board (PB). Where the partner does not require a written agreement, QMUL will supply the partner institution with a document that outlines QMUL’s responsibilities as a Study Abroad partner.
- Visiting Associate student arrangements are managed by the Global Opportunities Office.

Other Internships
Other internship opportunities are also available to students outside their programme of study, where the work does not contribute to marks and credits on the student’s academic record. These are not included under the scope of this quality assurance policy.

Research agreements
Research agreements with external partners which might arise from strategic alliances with other universities and research organisations, both home and overseas, will follow the following approval process:

Overview procedure:
- Institutional strategic approval of the proposed partnership (PB);
- Review of the agreement documents by PB
- Where necessary review by the Joint Research Management Office (JRMO) or by Queen Mary Innovation (QMI) for IP issues;
- Review and sign-off by the relevant Head of School and by the Faculty Dean for Research.
Joint Research Centres: In order for a joint centre to be set up, the proposal would need to follow a more formal benchmarking process with evidence of joint work over a period of time. Approval to be granted by QMSE/PB.

**Agency agreements:**

**Definition:**
Agency agreements are formal arrangements between QMUL and an organisation or individual who is contracted by QMUL for marketing and recruitment of students, or related activity.

**Key points:**
- Agents and Educational Representatives operate on behalf of QMUL for marketing purposes and do not contribute to the delivery of programmes that lead to QMUL awards;
- Agents promote QMUL and provide logistical support to QMUL staff during visits abroad;
- Agents do not make offers of admission to students on QMUL’s behalf. The normal QMUL admissions process is completed in full by the students. Agents may provide assistance to International students during visa applications;
- QMUL is responsible for ensuring that there is no ambiguity surrounding the authority of the Agent to act on QMUL’s behalf. The Agent’s role and responsibilities must be made clear in order to avoid misunderstandings on behalf of potential applicants.

**Overview procedure:**
Approval of the proposed agency contract by Marketing and Communications, following due diligence by the Country Manager. The Contract will set out the details of the relationship with the Agent, and the following aspects will be considered during the due diligence evaluation (following agent appointment and monitoring guidelines and usually involving a site visit) and drawing up of the contract:
- The parameters within which the Agent is permitted to act on behalf of QMUL;
- The requirements for marketing materials to outline the relationship between the Agent and QMUL;
- That the Agent holds the necessary licences to operate on QMUL’s behalf;
- The arrangements for monitoring the performance of the Agent against agreed standards;
- The International Partnerships Office will use a standard agency agreement template; any changes to this template will be considered by PB;
- QMUL PB receives an annual report of any changes to the list of approved Agents, which will also highlight any issues of concern.
Annex C
Collaborative taught programmes leading to a joint award

Definition:
A Joint award is a partnership arrangement whereby QMUL and one or more partner institutions together provide a programme that leads to a single award made jointly by both, or all, participants. A single certificate signed by QMUL and the partner(s) confirms the successful completion of the jointly delivered programme.

Key points:
- Each partner must have the legal ability to award a joint degree.
- There is usually shared ownership of the curriculum and related IPR (Intellectual Property Rights).
- Students register with both/all institutions but one normally provides the lead for administrative purposes or students are free to select their designated home institution.
- Students have the right of access to learning resources at both/all institutions.
- The degree programme is subject to both/all institutions’ quality assurance processes, although there may be a pooling/sharing of processes.
- Joint programme regulations are normally required.
- There is a joint committee, responsible for overseeing and reviewing arrangements and which reports into the relevant structure at both institutions.
- There is a joint examination board/process which reports into the relevant structure at both/all institutions.
- Arrangements (including the student lifecycle) should be fully specified in the MOA.

Criteria for establishing joint awards
The following criteria will be considered when considering the strategic and business case for establishing joint awards:

i. Proposals for joint awards will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The proposal must demonstrate clear benefits for both QMUL and for the students on the programme of study. The strategic case should explain the ways in which the programme of study will be enhanced through the collaboration, and what synergies will be realised through this model of delivery. The benefits of the proposal should be proportionate to the overheads associated with establishing and supporting the programmes.

ii. The partner(s) should be of international standing at least equivalent to that of QMUL and the partnership should support QMUL’s Strategy. Evaluation of the partnership will be part of the due diligence process and will take into account: peer review, national and international measures. The proposal will need to make clear the rationale for the joint model of delivery.

iii. Partnership arrangements should be based on shared academic interests and complementary expertise. In the case of international collaborations, the programme should exploit academically the opportunity for students to enrich their learning experience across different cultures.

iv. QMUL retains full responsibility for any award issued in its name and will maintain an overview of the academic standards for each element of the programme.

v. The strategic case will need to set out the contribution made by each partner to the delivery and assessment of the programme. The extent of the contribution will be determined on a case by case basis.

Overview of the procedure
Joint awards are subject to QMUL’s approval process for collaborative provision, as follows:
1. Initial stage (provisional agreement to explore the partnership): this is made on the basis of a brief outline of the proposal to be sent to ARCS who will advise on issues that may need to be considered. Key points to consider at this stage:
   1. Is the partner legally empowered to award a joint degree;
   2. Details of the partner and a statement to cover compatibility with QMUL, status and ranking;
   3. What are the benefits of the programme, both to QMUL and prospective students;
   4. Relationship to QMUL Strategy/Faculty plans;
   5. Who will be the lead institution;
   6. Proposed start time for the programme;
   7. Contribution of the partners to the programme: for a joint award, the normal expectation is that there will be an equal academic contribution from each partner.

8. Further to ARCS feedback on the proposal, the academic lead should prepare a more detailed proposal and business case for approval by Faculty Executive/ Faculty Planning and Accountability Review (FPAR).

9. Stage 1 strategic approval: Partnerships Board (PB)/Queen Mary Senior Executive (QMSE) (depending on the complexity of the proposal) will grant strategic approval of the partnership. This is done on the basis of a Stage 1 Partnership and Programme Proposal form and a Due Diligence Process and risk assessment.

   Once a programme has passed Stage 1 partnership and programme approval PB will indicate when it can marketed.

10. Stage two approval of provision: Detailed academic approval by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB) on the basis of a Part 2 Programme Proposal Form. It is expected that TPB papers would be accompanied by a draft MOA.

   Following Stage 2 academic approval, the detailed Agreements or Contracts can be finalised and signed.

   Further information on each of the approval stages can be found in the Guidance for Collaborative Provision, in the Joint Programme section.

[f] Collaborative taught programmes leading to a double award/multiple award

Definition
QMUL and a partner institution collaborate to develop and deliver a single programme leading to separate awards from each institution. Arrangements involving more than two partners would lead to multiple awards in the same way.

Each certificate and/or transcript or record of achievement or Diploma Supplement indicates that a jointly delivered single programme is leading to two or more qualifications of the participant partners.

Key points:
1. Each partner delivers and assesses substantial elements of the programme;
2. Students are registered at both institutions throughout their studies;
3. Bespoke programme regulations are often required and are agreed by all partners;
4. Each partner is responsible for the assessment of the components that it delivers;
5. A decision is made about whether a single marking scheme is to be adopted by all partners or whether components will be marked in accordance with the local regulations and then rescaled to the scheme of each individual partner;
6. Separate degree certificates are normally issued from each institution;
7. The quality assurance processes to be followed are articulated in the Memorandum of Agreement;
8. QMUL will consider any implications of the double counting of academic credit towards the dual award.

Criteria for establishing double awards

1. The partner(s) must be of international standing at least equivalent to QMUL and the partnership should deliver clear benefits to both QMUL and the students on the programme. Evaluation of the partner’s partners’ standing will be part of the due diligence process and will take into account: peer review, national and international measures.
2. There must be a demonstrable need and rationale for the granting of multiple awards in order to facilitate the recognition of student achievement across different national jurisdictions.
3. Proposals for double awards must demonstrate the added value and strategic benefits of the partnership. These benefits must be proportionate to the overheads associated with establishing and supporting the programmes.
4. Students must be registered at both QMUL and the partner institution(s).
5. All promotional materials, programme documents, and certificates and/or transcripts that are issued by QMUL and partner institution(s) must clarify in an agreed form of words that the programme leads to double or multiple awards.
6. QMUL’s oversight of academic quality and standards on the programme must be in accordance with its normal regulations and policies. These will be stated in the detailed Memorandum of Agreement.

Academic regulations
QMUL academic regulations apply to the programme unless QMUL and the partner agree to adopt a special set of regulations for the programme.

Overview of the procedure: Follows the same stages as for the taught joint programmes.

Collaborative research degree programmes (joint awards)

Joint PhDs: Definition
QMUL together with one or more other degree awarding institutions, provides a doctoral programme leading to a single PhD award made jointly by the partner institutions.

Criteria for establishing joint awards
The following criteria will be considered when considering the strategic and business case for establishing joint awards:

• Proposals for joint awards will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The proposal must demonstrate clear benefits for both QMUL and for the students on the programme of study. The strategic case should explain the ways in which the programme of study will be enhanced through the collaboration, and what synergies will be realised through this model of delivery. The benefits of the proposal should be proportionate to the overheads associated with establishing and supporting the programmes.
• The partner(s) should be of international standing at least equivalent to that of QMUL and the partnership should support QMUL’s Strategy. Evaluation of the partnership will be part of the due diligence process and will take into account: peer review, national and international measures. The proposal will need to make clear the rationale for the joint model of delivery.
• Partnership arrangements should be based on shared academic interests and complementary expertise. In the case of international collaborations, the
programme should exploit academically the opportunity for students to enrich their learning experience across different cultures.

- QMUL retains full responsibility for any award issued in its name and will maintain an overview of the academic standards for each element of the programme.
- The strategic case will need to set out the contribution made by each partner to the delivery and assessment of the programme. The extent of the contribution will be determined on a case by case basis.

Overview of the procedure:

Initial Stage

Initial stage (provisional agreement to explore the partnership): this is made on the basis of a brief outline of the proposal to be sent to Research Degrees Office who will advise on issues that may need to be considered. Key points to consider at this stage:

- Is the partner legally empowered to award a joint degree;
- Details of the partner and a statement to cover compatibility with QMUL, status and ranking;
- What are the benefits of the programme, both to QMUL and prospective students;
- Relationship to QMUL Strategy/Faculty plans;
- Who will be the lead institution;
- Proposed start time for the programme;
- Contribution of the partners to the programme: for a joint award, the normal expectation is that there will be an equal academic contribution from each partner.

Stage 1 strategic approval: Partnerships Board (PB)/Queen Mary Senior Executive (QMSE) (depending on the complexity of the proposal) will grant strategic approval of the partnership. This is done on the basis of a Stage 1 Partnership and Programme Proposal form and a Due Diligence process and risk assessment.

Stage two approval of provision: Detailed academic approval by RDPEB on the basis of a Part 2 Programme Proposal Form. It is expected that RDPEB papers would be accompanied by a draft MOA.

Following Stage 2 academic approval, the detailed MOA with the partner and the Individual Doctoral Agreement can be finalised.

Double PhD arrangement: QMUL does not normally enter into double PhD arrangements with another institution.

Joint supervision

Definition: A student or cohort of students will spend a significant proportion of their programme receiving supervision at both QMUL and another institution or organisation (including industrial partners). Under such arrangements students may be registered only for an award from QMUL or for an award from the partner institution.

Such arrangements are considered on an ad hoc basis.

Arrangements for individual students are agreed with the Research Degrees Office and Joint Research Management Office (JRMO) as appropriate, and a signed agreement is required.

Arrangements for a cohort of students may require a new programme to be established and should follow the new programme approval process.
8. **Student-Staff Liaison Committees**

8.1 **Purpose**
The purpose of student-staff liaison committees (SSLCs) is to ensure that there is an effective channel for formal communication between students and staff in each school or institute, through which students can reflect and give feedback on their programme of study. SSLCs are an integral part of QMUL's systems and procedures for assuring academic standards and enhancing the student learning experience.

8.2 **Scope**
This procedure covers all students, part time and full time, undergraduate and postgraduate, taught and research including those on distance learning or collaborative programmes. It does not cover non-award-bearing continuing education.

8.3 **Associated documents**
Associated documents can be accessed from the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat (ARCS) web page: [http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/student-feedback/index.html](http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/student-feedback/index.html)
- Agenda template
- Minutes and action plan template

Students can also access comprehensive information, guidance and advice about the course representative system on the Students’ Union web page at [http://www.qmsu.org/coursereps](http://www.qmsu.org/coursereps). The Students’ Union will provide newly appointed representatives with a comprehensive handbook and training session at the start of the academic year.

8.4 **Terms of reference**
The Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) is constitutionally advisory to the Head of School/Institute or, in the case of the MBBS to the Dean (Education) and in the case of the BDS to the Head of the Institute of Dentistry.

SSLCs should have a clear remit. Senate recommends the following Terms of Reference: To consider and discuss matters relating to:
- The content and organisation of programmes of study and any proposed changes;
- The provision of academic facilities and general school/institute/QMUL facilities;
- School/institute social activities;
- Provision for student welfare including the operation of the personal tutor system;
- Arrangements for induction and study skills provision;
- Local monitoring of academic standards through consideration of the School’s Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP) for undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, and discussion of student commentary (see: [https://webapps2.is.qmul.ac.uk/apr/index.action](https://webapps2.is.qmul.ac.uk/apr/index.action))
- Consideration of external examiners’ reports, first destination statistics and results of module evaluation questionnaires and student surveys such as NSS, PTES and the Queen Mary Student Survey;
- Initial consideration of the commendations and recommendations of Periodic Review reports, followed by regular reports on action taken in response.
- Any other matters on which the SSLC wishes to express a view.
8.5 Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSLC</th>
<th>Student membership</th>
<th>Staff membership</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-medical</td>
<td>UG - 1 per year of course = &lt;20 students&lt;br&gt;2 per year if course = &gt;20 students&lt;br&gt;Joint Honours – 1 rep per year of each JH course with &gt;10 students or 1 per year if JH provision is low&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;br&gt;PGT – 1 rep per programme&lt;br&gt;PGR – 1 rep (minimum)</td>
<td>Head of School / Institute Director or nominee (ex officio)&lt;br&gt;Senior Tutor or equivalent (ex officio)&lt;br&gt;Other academic staff as agreed by SSLC&lt;br&gt;Other Professional Services staff (e.g. library) as agreed by SSLC</td>
<td>To be agreed by SSLC - consideration should be given to the appointment of a student co-chair (training is provided by SU)</td>
<td>To be agreed by SSLC – students can perform this role if agreed and they undertake training from the SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>UG – 2 per year of course&lt;br&gt;PGT – 1 per programme&lt;br&gt;PGR – 1 rep (minimum)</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.6 Election of student members

Student members of an SSLC should be elected by the particular student constituency. Elections are organised by the Students’ Union as follows:

8.6.1 Humanities and Social Sciences and Science and Engineering

- Course Reps for first years and PGT shall be elected at the beginning of semester 1.
- Course Reps shall be elected to serve for the duration of their course, unless:
  - the Rep decides to resign, in which case the post will be put up for election, either during a designated period in semester 2, or at the beginning of semester 1 of the next academic year;
    - 2)any student on their course issues a challenge during a designated period in semester 2, in which case the post will be put up for election;
    - 3)a serving Rep fails to attend two consecutive SSLC meetings, in which case they shall be considered to have resigned and the post will be put up for election at the next Course Rep Elections.
- Whenever a position falls vacant, due to resignation, the relevant SSLC may co-opt a Rep to serve until the next Course Rep Elections.

<sup>3</sup> Additionally, Joint Honours representatives should be invited to meetings of the SSLC in their partner School or to give their feedback via email.
• Elections for vacancies in continuing cohorts for the following academic year shall be held during semester 2 at a time decided by QMSU.
• Any un-filled positions at this point shall, in the first instance, be the subject of re-opened nominations at the beginning of semester 1 of the next academic year.
• Should a position still remain unfilled at this point, the relevant SSLC may co-opt a Rep to serve until the next Course Rep elections.
• Each School shall elect a Senior Rep to be a ‘School Representative’ to serve on a Faculty Forum to be chaired by the Faculty Representative (a part-time position elected annually during the QMSU elections).
• The position of School Rep shall be elected annually by and from eligible Course Reps within the School during semester 2 of the preceding academic year. (Eligible Course Reps being those continuing their term the following year i.e. not final year, nor those leaving office for other reasons).

Postgraduate Students (PGTs and PGRs)
• The majority of Postgraduate Taught courses at QMUL are one year full-time, therefore PGT Course Representatives shall be elected at the beginning of semester 1.
• Postgraduate Research students have varying terms of study, therefore PGR Course Representatives shall be elected at the beginning of semester 1.
• Each SSLC shall, where applicable, select at least one PGT Representative and at least one PGR Representative to attend the relevant Faculty Forum.

8.6.2 Medicine and Dentistry

Medicine
• There shall be 5 elected Pre-clinical Course Representative positions (years 1 and 2).
• Pre-clinical Course Representatives shall be elected at the beginning of semester 1.
• Post Clinical Course Representatives shall be elected during semester 3 for the following year.
• Intercalating Course Representatives shall be elected each year during semester 3 for the following academic year.
• All positions are elected for one year only.
• The annual Student Staff Conference replaces Faculty Forums within Medicine.

Dentistry
1. Course Representatives for Dentistry are elected from within the Dental Society (DentSoc) in elections conducted under the rules for Societies.
2. Elections take place in semester 3 for continuing students, for the following academic year, and at the beginning of semester 1 for new First Year (BDS1) students and Dental Hygiene Therapists (DHTs/DCPs – Dental Care Professionals).
3. All positions are elected for one year only.

Further information on any of the above can be obtained from the Students’ Union’s Education Representation and Policy Coordinator.

8.7 Organisation of meetings

8.7.1 Briefing of student members
For SSLCs to be effective their role must be made known to the student community (suggestion) and their members must feel able to participate fully in meetings. The Head of School or delegated person should ensure that student representatives are provided with written and oral briefings; these briefings could involve participation by experienced student representatives. Details of the SSLC, including a description of the student representatives’
role, should be included in locally produced student handbooks and reference should be made to the SSLC during student induction.

Training is also organised by the Students’ Union; more information can be provided by the Students’ Union’s Education Representation and Policy Coordinator.

8.7.2 Frequency and timing of meetings
SSLCs should meet at least once each semester with provision for further meetings if requested by members. Some SSLCs arrange their meetings to take place over a buffet lunch in order to encourage attendance and this practice, where possible, is commended.

Dates of meetings should be agreed by the SSLC and publicised widely in advance – normally by the Head of School and/or the Secretary to the SSLC.

8.7.3 Agendas
QMUL has an agenda template for use in SSLC meetings. This ensures that schools and institutes cover all the areas required by the university and external agencies such as the Quality Assurance Agency. All items should be included at every meeting, with the following exceptions:

- Approval of terms of reference and membership - first meeting of the year only
- New students’ arrivals experience – first meeting of the year. However, if there is a subsequent entry period, this item should be re-considered as appropriate

The agenda should be distributed to all members in advance of the meeting and displayed to all staff and students, e.g. via noticeboards or on QMplus pages.

Student representatives should be given sufficient time to canvas views and opinions from the cohort for the meeting as well as report back on outcomes. Schools and institutes should support this by giving representatives the opportunity to address students at the beginning or end of teaching sessions and allowing them to email students on issues – it is suggested that a distribution list is set up for each year to manage this.

8.8 Minutes, Annual Reports and Follow-up

8.8.1 Minutes and Action Points
The minutes should be completed promptly after the meeting and include an action points table – a template is provided by ARCS. Minutes should be sent to ARCS and the SU within four weeks of the meeting taking place.

It is expected that the minutes or an oral report from the SSLC are considered at the school or institute’s Teaching and Learning Committee (or equivalent) to ensure that SSLC’s recommendations can be reviewed and acted upon promptly.

The minutes of SSLC meetings are not deemed to be confidential. However where sensitive or confidential information need to be recorded these specific items may be marked as confidential. In this case a non-confidential version of the minutes of the meeting should be published. Where detailed discussion of the teaching of a particular module takes place, some SSLCs choose to exclude the identity of the teacher concerned from the minutes although the discussion should still be noted.

The SSLC Secretary should display minutes and the action plan of an SSLC meeting on school notice boards, on QMplus or the school / institute website or the minutes could be emailed to all students.
Students should be informed about the actions being taken to address the concerns raised. It is recommended that this is done via a ‘You said … we did’ webpage or document. Faculty Deans for Taught Programmes will also monitor issues arising from SSLCs and their resolution, reporting back as necessary to the regular open sessions that they hold with students from their faculty.

8.8.2 Annual Report
At the end of the academic year each SSLC should produce a short annual report of its work. This report should consist of the following:

- Table showing all action points raised over the year and the current status of actions (e.g. closed, ongoing etc.) – this should be the collated actions points table from each set of minutes
- Short commentary on any actions that are incomplete or ongoing to explain why this is the case
- Any good practice or positive developments arising from the SSLC that the school/institute would wish to highlight

8.8.3 Internal reporting
The Students’ Union will produce an annual report providing an overview of the issues raised by course representatives in the previous year, examples of good practice, and track trends. This will be considered at the university and faculty advisory groups with responsibility for teaching, learning and the student experience. Following this consideration ARCS in conjunction with the Students’ Union, will produce a summary report of key issues and examples of good practice for consideration at Education Quality Board and Senate.
9. Student module evaluation scheme

9.1 Purpose
Module evaluation is an important feedback tool to capture the student experience of teaching, learning and assessment. The collation of this feedback and consideration of the quantitative and qualitative data received should be considered as part of each school/institute’s programme monitoring processes, alongside other sources of information such as student data and academic input.

In order to ensure that students feel able to provide honest feedback, module evaluations should be anonymous and processes have been designed to ensure that individual students cannot be identified from evaluation responses.

9.2 Scope
Module evaluation is carried out for all undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes, including associate schemes, joint honours or distance learning programmes and CAPD Academic Development Programmes. It does not cover research degrees or non-award bearing continuing education.

9.3 Process

9.3.1 Overview
QMUL uses an internet-based survey management tool called Evasys to run the module evaluation scheme. This system allows QMUL to use both paper and online surveys as appropriate for the school/institute or teaching provision. ARCS has responsibility for managing the system and producing the data extracts and reports as well as organising the administration of the evaluations themselves.

Schools and institutes can ‘opt-in’ or ‘opt-out’ of using the centrally-administered system. The majority of schools and institutes use the centrally-administered scheme where ARCS manages the process from setting up the surveys, to identifying the modules to be surveyed and scanning the information into the system. Schools and institutes (or disciplines) that have opted out of the central scheme (for specific reasons approved by the VP SETL) have responsibility for setting up surveys and running data collection for themselves. However, they are still required to include the QMUL core statements and return the responses for these statements to ARCS (see below).

The standard QMUL questionnaire comprises eight core statements, marked on a five-point Likert scale and three open text questions, which all students are asked to answer. Schools and institutes can request additional statement/questions to be included as long as the questionnaire does not exceed two A4 sides if using a paper survey. There are no formal limits on the length of online surveys but schools/institutes are advised to adhere to a similar number of questions.

QMUL has adopted the five-point Likert scale because it is used in the NSS, and hence will give some limited comparison with NSS data.

There are two sets of compulsory core statements - one set for taught modules and another for dissertation/project modules. Schools/institutes should ensure they are clear on the relevant questions.

Whether a school/institute is ‘opt-in’ or ‘opt-out’, it is expected that it will have a clear internal procedure for running module evaluations that is operated in a transparent and consistent way.
and understood by students and staff. This procedure should be based on the following principles:

- Evaluations are carried out at an appropriate time (usually weeks 8-12 of the semester but other times may be agreed if modules run outside standard semesters)
- Student anonymity is maintained
- Students are informed about the purpose of evaluations and how to complete the surveys
- If using paper forms, teaching staff should not be present in the room when students are completing surveys nor should they handling completed evaluations. Instead a student volunteer should be selected to take the forms directly to the main student office or administrative contact

Schools and institutes should also have a clear internal process as to how the data produced by evaluations is reviewed and considered. It is expected that SSLCs are provided with this information in addition to other academic committees.

Schools and institutes should inform ARCS at the beginning of each academic year of the administration contact for module evaluation and the name(s) of people who should receive the module reports for review.

More details on the operation of the scheme, including the core statements, deadlines and guidance on use of data can be found at: [http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/student-feedback/student-module-evaluation/index.html](http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality/student-feedback/student-module-evaluation/index.html)

### 9.3.2 Paper vs Online

Practice over the years has shown that paper questionnaires receive a higher response rate than online equivalents. For this reason, many schools and institutes use paper forms despite the increased administrative burden this causes.

However, the nature of some provision means that it may need to be operated using online surveys. This may include collaborative provision, distance learning modules and project and dissertation modules. Students are contacted directly via their college email with a personalised link to the survey so it is important that school/institutes encourage students to check their email and complete the questionnaire in order to ensure good response rates. In addition, it is possible to add a block to the relevant module page on QMplus that will show students they have an evaluation to complete. The block is designed so that it only appears if there is a survey open – it is hidden at any other time. Please contact ARCS if you would like to add this block to your QMplus pages.

### 9.3.2 Informal feedback questionnaires

Several schools/institutes/disciplines run mid-semester informal module evaluation questionnaires in order that the current cohort can benefit from immediate action taken in response. Schools and institutes are encouraged to continue this good practice.

### 9.4 Evaluation and consideration of the data

A series of reports is produced from the data collected by schools/institutes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Production method</th>
<th>Time of report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full module report</td>
<td>Summary of all responses for individual module including open comments</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>After every evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core report</td>
<td>Averages for core eight statements organised by school/institute and level of</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>After every evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
programme. Used on website for module selection (not sent to schools/institutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module vs school/faculty averages</th>
<th>Individual module results compared to school/institute and faculty averages</th>
<th>Generated via Evasys</th>
<th>End of each semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/institute summary report</td>
<td>Aggregated school/institute results (all questions)</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>End of each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/institute average vs faculty average</td>
<td>Aggregated school/institute results compared to aggregated faculty results (core statements only)</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>End of each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/institute response rates</td>
<td>Response rates for each module set up for evaluation</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys / manual</td>
<td>End of each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR module summary reports</td>
<td>Full year aggregated results for each school/institute. Results compared to faculty and previous year’s scores.</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR module summary reports – associates</td>
<td>Full year aggregated associates responses for each school/institute. Results compared to aggregated associate results for faculty</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR high-low scoring modules</td>
<td>High-low scoring modules for each school/institute over year</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.4.1 Dissemination to staff

The full module report will be sent to the named contacts (see section 9.3.1) who are expected to review the data and determine if there are any concerns which the school/institute may need to address. Therefore, it is expected that the report recipients should be senior members of staff such as the Director of Taught Programmes. Once this review has taken place, schools/institutes can disseminate the reports to other staff for consideration. However, in some instances modules may have very low numbers of respondents. The Vice Principal (SETL) and the Deans' for Taught Programmes have agreed that in the cases of module reports with fewer than 5 respondents, Heads of School should determine whether or not to pass on the full report to module leaders to protect the anonymity of the students.

### 9.4.2 Dissemination to students

Module evaluation data should be made widely available to students in each school/institute/discipline. Summaries of module evaluation data should be made available on websites and discussed with students at Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLC). Verbatim free-text comments should not be shared with students unless the school / institute has ‘cleaned’ the comments to remove any remarks that could identify any individual, whether student or staff.

Schools and institutes should ensure that students are kept informed of the actions taken and outcomes achieved where problematic issues have been identified. When feeding back to students it is good practice to use the approach of ‘you said …. we did’.

After the SSLC has considered it, module evaluation data should then be seen by Teaching and Learning Committees, together with any comments from the SSLC. Any issues identified as needing more consideration should be forwarded to school/institute boards for further consideration.
Within faculties, the Dean for Taught Programmes (or equivalent) is responsible for monitoring module evaluation and its operation across all schools/institutes, and will also consider summary data for all module evaluation within the faculty. For the purposes of monitoring across the institution, summary data will be provided in the school or institute’s annual programme review, and may be included in the summary report on the Annual Programme Review process written by ARCS.

At the end of semester B, reports are produced for each module evaluated in the previous two semesters showing the quantitative responses for the eight core statements. These reports are published on the ARCS website so that they can be viewed by students during the module pre-selection process for the next academic year.

Further information can be found in the guidelines for the use of module data document on the ARCS website: