



POLICY AND PROCEDURE ON PROGRAMME AND MODULE APPROVAL

Version No.	Description	Author	Approval	Effective Date
1.1	University Procedure and Guidelines on Course and Class Approval	Governance, Management and Policy	Senate December 2003	Dec 2003
1.2	University Procedure and Guidelines on Course and Class Approval	Governance, Management and Policy	Minor revision	Oct 2009
1.3	Policy and Procedure on Programme and Module Approval	Education Enhancement	Senate September 2019	Sept 2019
1.4	Policy and Procedure on Programme and Module Approval	Education Enhancement	Senate: Convenor's Action March 2023 Remove Ref to ARRG, changes to Section 2.2 and paragraphs 2.3.4, 2.5.7, 2.7.4, 3.1.2, 4.1, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, the Timetable Guide Page 4 to reference QAC approving programme regulations and updating hyperlinks.	March 2023

03/2023

Version 1.4

the place of useful learning

The University of Strathclyde is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, number SC015263

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 These Procedures and Guidelines for Programme and Module Approval provide staff with a guide to setting up new programmes and modules and the process for approving new and amendments to existing programmes and modules. This document has been written in alignment with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Course Design and Development) which states that:

'providers are responsible and accountable for the information they produce and for ensuring definitive course documentation remains current, transparent, focused on the intended audiences and complies with any external or legal requirements'.

1.2 Key influences

Since these guidelines were last updated a number of changes have taken place both within and outwith the University that affect the implementation of this guidance, namely:

- The number of students applying to the University with protected characteristics is expected to increase and therefore the needs of a range of students who are likely to engage with the programme or module must be considered in the process of design and approval;
- The development of a revised set of Assessment and Feedback Principles which encourage the effectiveness of assessment in aiding students to achieve the necessary knowledge and skills described in a module or programme's intended learning outcomes;
- TESTA (Transforming the Experience of Students Through Assessment) is now integrated within the University's Internal Review process (relating to reviews scheduled from 2019-20);
- The development of Unistats (previously KIS - Key Information Sets) which allows students to compare official programme data from all Higher Education Institutions and Colleges in the UK. This requires the University to publish up to date and accurate information associated with all Undergraduate programmes;
- The introduction of the Consumer Protection Law and associated guidance from the Competition and Markets Authority which means that students must be given as much information about programme content and structure, fees and academic regulations as early as possible to allow them to make an informed choice about which university they want to apply to;
- The number of online programmes and modules have increased across the University as the institution diversifies its offerings for students;
- The development of the out of cycle programme approval system, designed to enable the approval of programmes outwith the Senate meeting cycle where necessary;
- The focus on providing online programmes and modules has intensified with the need for ensuring quality standards in production and delivery are adhered to.

2. PROGRAMME AND MODULE APPROVAL POLICY

2.1 Board of Study Recommendation and Senate Approval

- 2.1.1 New programmes and major changes to existing programmes must be recommended by the relevant Faculty Academic Committee with delegated authority from the Board of Study and approved by Senate following the regulations being scrutinised and approved by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) . The Faculty Academic Committee recommendation must follow scrutiny by the appropriate Department/ School and Faculty committees in accordance with University policy and procedure set down in this document.
- 2.1.2 A significant change to a programme would normally be: a change to the programme title, significant restructuring of the programme, change to the content of the programme or changes to the accreditation status.

2.2 Regulations

- 2.2.1 Regulations for a new programme **must** be submitted to the relevant Faculty Academic Committee as part of the programme proposal following the guidelines produced by the Quality Enhancement and Assurance Team (QEAT). These guidelines are available on the [QEAT SharePoint site](#) and have been designed to maximise efficient scrutiny in partnership between Schools/ Departments/ Faculties and the QEAT . The guidelines and accompanying regulations template are there to ensure that regulations are developed correctly and consistently and to avoid them being rejected when submitted to QAC for scrutiny and approval. Every effort should be made to ensure that regulations are submitted with the correct module codes. **Please Note: QAC scrutiny and approval of regulations is required prior to publication in the final version of the University programme regulations and registration of students.**
- 2.2.2 Changes to existing programme regulations including the addition of new modules must, after scrutiny by the relevant faculty committees as necessary be submitted by the Faculty representative to the appropriate SharePoint folder with the existing regulations clearly marked up with the required changes in accordance with the [QEAT guidelines](#).
- 2.2.3 Regulations must be uploaded to the relevant Faculty SharePoint folder . QAC will offer three decisions: 'approved', 'approved subject to change' and 'not approved'. If 'approved subject to change' or 'not approved', QAC will provide an explanation for the decision via email . It is up to the relevant individual from the Faculty/ Department/ School to address these comments and re-upload to Sharepoint the amended version of the regulations for approval.

2.3 Timing

- 2.3.1** Regulations must be published annually in time for online registration on 1st August. The deadline for all submission of regulations is the end of the second week in June to allow for any amendments to existing regulations and for Faculties to review what is being published in advance of 1st August deadline. **Any significant changes such as changes to compulsory modules after this date will not be accepted for publication.**
- 2.3.2** Student Business send curriculum rules to Faculties in January to enable the availability of the provisional curriculum in the Spring. **It is important that what is inserted into the curriculum rules for existing programmes/ modules aligns with the regulations to be published the following August.**
- 2.3.3 New programmes and major changes to existing programmes for the following session require to be brought to Senate no later than **November**.
- 2.3.4 New modules and minor changes to existing programmes for the following session require to be brought to QEAT no later than **January**.
- 2.3.5 In order to make the most of the University's marketing and recruitment effort and to ensure robust quality assurance and alignment with Competition and Market Authority guidelines, the following timeline is provided as a guide for introducing new programs:

Timetable Guide (for implementation of new programmes in September)

Year prior to implementation of new programme:	
Development of business case	March – August
Final paperwork submitted to Boards of Study/ Faculty Academic Committees (FACs)	September
Programme regulations to be approved by QAC	November
Paperwork submitted to Senate for final approval	November
Year of implementation of new programme:	
Undergraduate deadline for completion of promotional material*	February
Postgraduate deadline for completion of promotional material*	April
Regulations published	August
New programme introduced	September

*Promotional material for open days and overseas exhibitions.

2.3.6 For the key dates, please see the University's [Calendar of Dates](#) .

2.4 Definition of major changes and minor amendments

2.4.1 A major change is defined as a change to the structure of the programme for example, the number of credits and credit levels. A minor amendment is defined as a like for like substitution for example a new module replacing an existing module.

2.5 Faculty Framework for New Programme Approval

The Faculty process for developing a new programme proposal follows the stages outlined below:

2.5.1 Academic case

Before drafting a complete proposal, Department/ School and/ or Faculty (if required) approval must be sought. This involves the submission of a summary case, a brief statement justifying the academic need for the new programme, its market, and an overview of its proposed structure and syllabus.

2.5.2 Business case

A detailed business case including risk assessment should be prepared once the programme concept has been approved by the relevant Department/ School.

Time should be built into this process to allow for any amendments, additional information, etc. that may be required before the proposal can progress to the next stage of the process. The Faculty Office will provide advice as necessary.

2.5.3 Programme Costing

Programme costing forms part of the business case, comprising the financial analysis element which considers the resources required to deliver the programme. The information from this exercise will be used to inform the decision-making process of whether a new programme should be created. It is imperative that the data being used to inform the programme costing exercise is relevant, accessible and up to date and that any assumptions made are clearly articulated. Data for academic and support staff time, timetabled hours, relevant direct and RAM costs require to be available, for example, and funding source(s).

The common principles which faculties must adhere to when costing a programme are set out in Annex 1. Faculties will have their own templates.

2.5.4 Risk Analysis

Risk is a key consideration for programme design and development. Risk-based approaches can determine the timelines and nature of programme approval. However, risk can also be considered in the context of a proposal's feasibility (for instance, based on operational, resource or recruitment considerations) or the impact on a provider's existing provision. Risk should be considered in relation to potential partners involved in the proposal, for example, with respect to delivery or accreditation, appropriate due diligence should be undertaken to ensure the suitability of these relationships ([UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#)).

The University takes a risk-based approach to programme and module approval. Please see section 2.12 in Procedures for Implementing a New Programme for risk assessment and management associated with developing a new programme. Annex 2 provides a risk assessment template that all Faculties are encouraged to use.

2.5.5 Faculty Approval Stage

This involves all aspects of the business case being reviewed by independent members of the Faculty, usually comprising the Faculty Manager (or nominee) and at least one member of the Faculty Academic Committee. The academic content of the programme and how it will be delivered will be reviewed by an academic committee.

It is important that a full set of documentation be submitted for scrutiny and that the approval process is formally recorded. The UK [Quality Code for Higher Education 'Course Design and Development'](#) states '*Approval processes should ensure that definitive course documentation is produced accurately and fairly describing the learning opportunities, intended student outcomes and support offered. Providers are responsible and accountable for the information they produce and for ensuring definitive course documentation remains current, transparent, focused on the intended audiences and complies with any external or legal requirements*'.

2.5.6 Student Lifecycle

Prior to new programme proposal submissions being forwarded to Senate and QAC, Student Lifecycle must allocate a module code for each module in the programme. Application forms for allocation of module codes are available on the [Student Lifecycle web site](#).

2.5.7 Senate and QAC

Once the Faculty Academic Committee has approved a new programme proposal, the recommendation accompanied by summary information and programme regulations are submitted to Senate for approval in the Faculty's report to Senate. QAC separately reviews the programme regulations and reports its recommendations back to the Faculty. QAC will offer one of three decisions as per para 2.2.3. If a programme has to be withdrawn from the regulations, Faculties must inform Senate before QAC can remove the programme(s) from the regulations.

In order for the regulations to appear in the next published version of the Programme Regulations **it is essential that the programme proposal is submitted in time for the Faculty Academic Committee to make its recommendation to the November Senate at the latest for implementation in the following academic year.** Please note: QAC scrutiny and approval of the regulations are required prior to insertion in the Programme Regulations and prior to Senate approval of the programme. The diagram in Annex 3 illustrates the various stages that a new programme proposal must go through before final approval for the programme can be granted.

Where a new programme is being developed as part of a collaborative agreement, the agreement will not be endorsed until the regulations have been scrutinised and approved by QAC and the programme has been approved at Senate.

Guidance on how to submit regulations to QAC is provided on the QEAT Sharepoint site. Further advice and information can be obtained by contacting regulations-amendments@strath.ac.uk.

2.5.8 Out of cycle new programme approval process

To reduce delays in getting new programmes to market, an electronic subgroup allows the Principal to approve new programmes on behalf of Senate, outwith the Senate meeting cycle.

Faculties must submit the appropriate quality assurance documents for scrutiny to the Senate Manager. Faculties should contact educationenhancement-quality@strath.ac.uk for an electronic copy of the Out of Cycle Approval Form. The completed form must be accompanied by the

business case, draft programme regulations and confirmation of fee approval. It must then be submitted back to educationenhancement-quality@strath.ac.uk. The documentation will be circulated electronically to the Subgroup. Once any comments have been addressed, approval will be sought from Senate Business Committee members on behalf of Senate. This process can take approx. 10 days. Faculties must include the approved new programme for homologation in their next Faculty report to Senate 'for information'.

2.5.9 Fees Strategy Group

Fees are conditional on the marketplace, competition and demand for the activity being offered. Tuition fees for new programmes must be approved approximately 18 months in advance of a programme going 'live' to allow for sufficient time to market the programme effectively. It is important that the fee is both consistent with the University's strategy and competitive in the marketplace. The fee together with any 'hidden' costs associated with the programme must be published on the programme web pages.

The Fees Strategy Group has responsibility for approving all fees on an annual basis. The Group reviews the University fee spine annually, taking into account inflationary increases and changes to the market in specific areas. The Group considers fees at UG, PGT and PGR level for each student market (Home, EU, RUK and International).

All new programmes must have their fees approved by the Fees Strategy Group.

2.5.10 Student Lifecycle

The final stage in a new programme going 'live' is the allocation of a programme code. A programme code will not be allocated without all the required approvals as outlined above having taken place. A [Programme Code Approval Form](#) must be completed before a code can be applied. This form, along with guidelines for completion, can be found on the [Student Lifecycle website](#).

2.5.11 MRes and other Masters programmes containing an element of taught modules

MRes or other Masters programmes which contain an element of taught modules as well as research are required to follow this approval process. The following criteria categorise programmes as taught, and such programmes should therefore be considered as above:

- programmes with any award, including an exit award (e.g. PG Certificate), comprised of taught credits; and/or
- programmes including taught credit for modules which would be delivered to cohorts of students, rather than through individual research supervision.

The inclusion of a small element of research skills training would not, by itself, categorise a programme as taught.

Any changes to the PGT Cert in Researcher Professional Development must be endorsed through the HaSS Faculty Academic Committee. Amendments to Faculty equivalents should be processed through the relevant Faculty's Academic Committee (acting with delegated authority from the Board of Study).

2.6 Responsibilities

2.6.1 Departments/Schools

Responsible for:

- Developing the academic case. The academic case is a short summary of why the programme

should be introduced as well as how the programme will be delivered. It also requires some outline detail on what the anticipated market will be for such a degree as well as the USPs of the programme as a whole.

- Developing the business case once the academic case has been approved.
- Submission of full programme documentation to Faculty Academic Committee and other Faculty committees as appropriate for consideration before being recommended for approval to Senate via the Academic Committee. Programme documentation must include the following documents: academic case (incorporating the programme regulations, programme specification and module descriptor form); business case; and, notification of proposed tuition fees.

2.6.2 Faculty Office

Responsible for:

- Asking Senate for approval of new programme in the Faculty report to Senate. If the programme has been approved outwith the Senate meeting cycle using the out of cycle process, then it must be reported 'for information' in the next Faculty report to Senate.
- Overseeing submission of regulations (using the regulations template, available on the QEAT Sharepoint site) with module codes once all the necessary Faculty approvals have been given.
- Submission of information to Fees Strategy Group – please contact Strategy and Planning strategyandplanning@strath.ac.uk.
- Overseeing submission of Programme Code Approval Form to Student Lifecycle Systems and Data Team.
- Overseeing submission of programme information to the Web team.

2.6.3 Marketing

Responsible for:

- Departments/ Schools should work with the Marketing and Communications team to ensure the marketing and promotion of the new programme once approved. Marketing will ensure the new programme is published in the Prospectus, on institutional websites and via other promotional mechanisms as appropriate, adhering to the legal requirements around the provision of information.

2.6.4 Recruitment and International Office

Responsible for:

- Carrying out a competitor analysis to check the fee level and likelihood of student intake and consult overseas agents to seek their view on the proposal.
- Promoting the new programme to an international market.

2.6.5 Student Lifecycle

Responsible for:

- Allocating module codes.
- Allocating programme codes.

2.7 Key Committees/ Working Groups involved in Programme and Module Approval

2.7.1 Faculty Academic Committee (acting with delegated authority from the Board of Study)

Responsible for:

- Scrutinising the documentation associated with the new programme proposal on behalf of the Board of Study.
- Recommending approval of the new programme to Senate requesting further information from the Department/ School.

2.7.2 Faculty Resources and Planning Committee (or equivalent)

Responsible for:

- Scrutinising the financial costing and resource implications of implementing the new programme.

2.7.3 Senate

Responsible for:

- Approving the new programme.
- It is the responsibility of the Senate Manager to confirm Senate outcomes to Faculties, copying the Web Team (who can now promote the programme on the Strathclyde web pages) and the Student Lifecycle Systems and Data Team.

2.7.4 QAC

Responsible for:

- Scrutinising the regulations associated with the new programme/ module in accordance with QEAT guidelines.
- Approving/ approving subject to change/ not approving the regulations.
- Publishing the regulations in time for online registration on 1st August on the website and on the QEAT Sharepoint site.

3. PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A NEW PROGRAMME

3.1 Preparing a Business Case: Format

The University expects the business case to be comprised of the following:

- The academic case incorporating programme specification, draft programme regulations and module descriptor form.
- Supplementary information particularly regarding rationale, resource requirements/availability and detailed programme content (details can be found in section 2 '*Preparing a Business Case: Information Required*').

3.1.1 Programme Specifications

Programme Specifications are required for all university programmes. Programme Specifications should summarise the main features of the programme in terms of:

- overall aims
- intended learning outcomes including personal/transferable/key skills
- programme structure
- teaching and learning activities
- assessment and feedback strategy (refer to Assessment and Feedback Policy)
- Level and Credit weighting and subject benchmarking information
- student admission, progression and learning support
- arrangements for programme evaluation and review.

The QAA Quality Code for Higher Education states that Programme Specifications '*constitute the approved definition of a course and module, which should contain sufficient information for stakeholders about intended aims and learning outcomes and about the approach to teaching, learning and assessment. Related documentation, such as prospectuses, institutional websites and other marketing information should be derived and updated with respect to this definitive documentation and adhere to the legal requirements around provision of information*'.

3.1.2 Draft Programme Regulations

Draft Programme Regulations must be submitted using the appropriate template for an Undergraduate Programme, an Integrated Masters Programme or a Postgraduate Programme available on the [QEAT SharePoint site](#). Draft programme regulations for new programmes must be available to QAC for scrutiny and approval no later than the November meeting of Senate.

Please note that late submissions will not be permissible, unless under exceptional circumstances. Examples of reasonable exceptional circumstances would be:

- Curriculum changes required to satisfy accreditation requirements;
- Curriculum changes following from Internal-Led (quinquennial) Review;
- Curriculum changes following feedback from External Examiners;
- Curriculum changes following student feedback;
- A member of staff leaves and there is no longer the expertise to deliver the module, in which case the regulations may need to be adapted;
- A new member of staff is appointed;
- Internationalisation agenda

3.1.3 Module Descriptor Form

The Module Descriptor Form must be submitted using the appropriate template. Module Descriptors should summarise the main features of the module in terms of:

- Educational aim

- Learning outcomes
- Syllabus
- Assessment of learning outcomes and feedback to students on assessment
- Recommended reading

3.2 Preparing a Business Case: Information Required

3.2.1 Basic programme information

- Information must be provided on the name of the faculty introducing the new programme, programme title, year of introduction and the educational reason for introducing the programme.
- The programme outline should also be provided, summarising the content and curriculum of the programme as a whole including how much content is already in place, how much is new and how new content will fit in with existing content.
- A Statement of Support must be provided indicating support for the proposal to proceed to approval. An indication of other Departments'/ Schools' involvement should be provided here.
- The place of the new programme within Faculty and University strategic plans must be provided.
- Information on the overall structure of the programme will be required; plus a statement on how existing material will be integrated with new material. For each module there must be a statement of the content, preferably in the form of a module descriptor form or separate module proposal including intended learning outcomes and details of assessment.

3.2.2 Rationale for Programme

Evidence of the need for the new programme, as perceived by the academic community, employers, government, industry and/or the relevant profession is required. Evidence of potential demand for the new programme, from e.g. prospective students, current students, potential sponsors, careers advisers, etc. is also required.

i. Aims and Learning Outcomes

Information must be provided on the aims, and intended learning outcomes of the programme including the personal/transferable/key skills that the students should develop.

ii. Modes of Delivery

A statement must be provided on modes of delivery and learning and teaching methods, both for the whole programme and for individual modules. A statement of staff/student learning/contact hours for the programme and for each module must also be given. For Distance Learning, online learning, Graduate Apprenticeships and other independent study programmes or modules, the mechanisms for providing student support must be explained.

iii. Draft Degree Regulations

A copy of the draft degree regulations must be attached when developing this business case. The guidance from QEAT should be adhered to when developing these regulations.

iv. Programme Specification

Departments/ Schools must attach the Programme Specification to the Business Case, using the template provided [here](#). Departments/ Schools should aim to review programmes in alignment with the annual programme review timeline.

3.2.3 Graduate Employability

- Evidence of the potential employment opportunities that graduates from the proposed degree may anticipate should be provided in this section.
- Details of any employer consultation(s) that have been carried out should be given including any details of potential employer sponsorship.

3.2.4 Market Appeal

i. Market

Evidence of market appeal should be provided, describing the market the proposed new programme is designed to appeal to. Evidence of why the proposed new programme will attract sufficient applicants should also be provided in this section.

ii. Overseas Recruitment

Information should be provided on the overseas agents consulted to recruit students to the proposed new programme. A summary of feedback elicited from these contacts should be provided.

iii. Feedback from Student Bodies

Details on feedback from current and prospective students, together with key information elicited from discussions with alumni should be provided here.

iv. Similar programmes

Evidence of similar programmes provided by other higher education providers within the UK and overseas should be provided here.

v. Programme Comparisons

- This section should provide information on the proposed new programme and competitor programmes in the areas of: entry requirements; structure and delivery; adherence to widening participation; and, how the proposed new programme will differentiate itself from similar competitor programmes.
- A statement must be provided which specifies if the programme is in direct competition with other programmes offered by the University/other institutions/the profession or vocational programmes offer elsewhere.

3.2.5 Professional Accreditation

Information should be provided on the professional bodies that the programme will be submitted to for accreditation.

3.2.6 Financial Analysis

i. Departmental/ School Financial Forecast

A financial forecast should be uploaded here to support the business case.

ii. Programme Fees

This section should detail fees forecast for the next 5 years. It should be noted that fees for all new programmes must be approved by the Fees Strategy Group and the Chief Financial Officer before the fee can be introduced.

iii. Estimated student numbers

A forecast of student intake numbers for the proposed new degree programme should be provided here, including SFC places if applicable.

iv. Forecast income and expenditure

A summary income and expenditure for each year of the proposed new degree should be provided here.

3.2.7 Resourcing

i. Staffing provision

A statement on the staff resources required for the programme must be provided. This should specify all the staff required for this programme i.e. academic staff; administrative staff; teaching assistants; other support staff. An indication of which bodies will contribute to teaching load should be provided here – sponsoring Department, other Departments/ Schools within the Faculty, other Departments/ Schools outwith the Faculty and providers outwith the University.

ii. Faculty Integration

This section should indicate if the proposed new modules can be used on other programmes within the faculty.

iii. Timetabling

A statement on the timetabling requirements of the programme must be provided. This should specify all UG and PG teaching activities that will require a centrally timetabled exam room. Departments/ Schools should inform the Central Timetabling team of requirements as early as possible.

iv. Learning and Teaching Infrastructure

- A statement on the accommodation requirements of the proposed new programme should be provided. It should specify whether the accommodation required is central pool or departmentally controlled, and information on the availability/ accessibility of this accommodation should be provided. Where appropriate, the requirements for laboratory space should be stated and how this will be met.
- A statement should also be provided on technology requirements to teach the proposed new degree with confirmation of how these will be addressed with the relevant Professional Services support and any specific requirements should be stated. Availability and accessibility should be indicated here. The Faculty Digital Learning Leads and Education Enhancement can provide further advice in this area. These areas should be consulted as early as possible in the process.

- Graduate Apprenticeship and Degree Apprenticeship programmes should seek endorsement of the programme proposal and delivery approach through the Graduate Apprenticeship and Degree Apprenticeship Steering Group.
- New online programmes should follow the online module quality assurance criteria as recommended by Strathclyde Online Learning (SOL). Business cases for new online programmes should be presented to SOL to ensure they have been costed appropriately.

v. Teaching Load

Teaching load estimates of all module sizes detailed in the draft regulations for the proposed degree should be provided here. This should include students from all degrees that share any of the modules.

vi. Further information

This section provides the opportunity to provide any supporting information for example identifying members of staff who will be responsible for delivering each module within the programme; and, where appropriate, who will be the programme organiser for each year.

3.2.8 Marketing Communications

i. Marketing and Promotion

An outline marketing plan should be provided in this section, in keeping with section 3 above. A prospectus entry date should be provided together with a date for submission to Marketing and Development Services for publication on the website and in the prospectus.

Whether the proposed new programme will be marketed by the Department/ School and/ or the faculty should be indicated here.

ii. Flexibility/Coherence

Learning pathways need to be identified for the programme as a whole - eg how much of this programme is prescribed and how much student choice is incorporated?

iii. Academic Standards

The overall level of the programme must be specified and reflected in the title of the final award and any awards available from earlier exit points. These awards must be compatible with the University Awards Framework at Annex 4. Each module must be assigned a level and credit rating compatible with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework. If a new programme is developed as a result of a collaborative agreement, please refer to the Policy and Code of Practice on [Collaborative Education Provision](#).

Reference should be made to any relevant external benchmarks such as:

- QAA subject benchmarking statements
- External Examiners
- Professional or Statutory Body requirements

iv. Student Assessment

Clear information on how the students will be assessed at each stage of the programme and for each module is required; these must be aligned to the learning outcomes. In addition, information on which elements count towards the final assessment and the weightings applied to these different elements is required. Reference should be made to the suite of [Assessment and Feedback Policy and Procedures](#).

v. *Programme Evaluation*

Information on the methods to be used to evaluate modules, pathways, principal subjects and the programme as a whole is required and information on the frequency of evaluation. Confirmation that Faculty arrangements for programme monitoring/review will apply.

vi. *Programme Materials*

Information is required in relation to the cost of programme materials such as lab equipment, textbooks, field trips etc. as detailed in the fees tab of each degree programme on the website.

3.2.9 Students

i. *Admissions Policy*

Information on for example entry qualifications, non-standard entry, Recognition of Prior Learning/ Credit Transfer, Tier 4 implications must be provided. Also any information on target student cohorts (where applicable) should be provided. Please refer to the University's Admissions Policy and the Procedure for Admitting and Monitoring Students within Tier 4.

3.2.10 External Influences

i. *Peer Judgement*

Comments/views from members of academic staff in other institutions may be provided.

ii. *External Examiners/Assessors*

Views of current and previous (if applicable) External Examiners and/or Assessors associated with the Department/subject area should be provided.

iii. *Professional Views*

Views from the professional body (where appropriate) should be provided.

iv. *Other External Influences*

Views from employers, careers advisers, etc. should also be provided where appropriate.

3.2.11 Resource

i. *Staff*

A statement on staff resources required must be provided here.

ii. *Library*

A statement on the availability of prescribed texts, books, journals, etc. must be provided. Academics must discuss the information requirements with the relevant faculty Librarian. The Library should also be informed of expected student numbers on the programme.

iii. *Computing*

A statement on the availability or accessibility of computing equipment and relevant support must be provided (where appropriate).

iv. *Audio Visual*

A statement on the availability or accessibility of relevant Audio Visual equipment and/or facilities must be provided (where appropriate).

v. *Equipment*

Any other equipment needs must be specified, together with a statement on the availability/accessibility of this equipment.

vi. Student Placements/Fieldwork

Where appropriate a statement on the requirements for student placements or compulsory fieldwork should be included in the programme proposal, together with a statement on how the associated costs will be met.

3.2.12 Risk Assessment and Management

A statement on risk addressing the following questions should be included:

- What are the key academic and business risks associated with introducing this new programme?
- What key factors, controls etc. will help to reduce the University's exposure to those risks?
- What management information, indicators and early warning flags will you use to help identify changes in the perceived level of risk?

4. PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A NEW MODULE

4.1 Preparing a New Module Proposal: Information Required

New modules and revisions to existing modules can only be introduced following approval by QAC on behalf of Senate. The information required for a new module proposal is similar to but less extensive than that required for a new programme proposal.

4.1.1 Core Information

i. Core Information

Information such as the module title, credit value, SCQF level, duration and mode of attendance should be provided in this section.

ii. Departments/ Schools involved in delivering this module

This section should indicate what percentage of the module is being taught by other Department(s)/ School(s) within the University.

4.1.2 Curriculum Cohesion

i. Programme Cohesion

Evidence of which degree programme(s) this module will form part of. This section should also provide details of the following:

- Module(s) replaced by this new module
- Pre-requisite modules
- Co-requisite modules
- Overlap modules

4.1.3 Educational case

i. Rationale for the new module

- Evidence of the need, as perceived by the academic community, employers, government, industry or the relevant profession.
- Evidence of potential demand, from e.g. prospective students, current students, potential sponsors, careers advisers, etc.
- Evidence of how the new module is distinctive and whether it overlaps or competes with any other module offered in the University or elsewhere.

ii. Educational aim

Provide a broad and general statement of the educational intent and overall purpose of the proposed module.

4.1.4 Format, Delivery and Assessment

i. Activity and Delivery

Evidence of the type and nature of activities and/ or teaching delivery methods. The number of contact hours for each module should also be given here.

ii. Learning objectives

The learning objectives of each module should be listed here. Guidance suggests that it is good pedagogical practice for a module to have between four and six learning objectives.

iii. Learning outcomes/ transferable skills

Information on the intended learning outcomes for the module including personal/ transferable/ key skills that the students should develop.

iv. Assessment (please refer to [Assessment and Feedback Policy](#))

Clear information on how the students will be assessed at each stage is required. Information on which elements count towards the final assessment and the weightings applied to these different elements must be provided. How the assessment aligns with the learning objectives and outcomes must also be included as well as how feedback will be provided to students.

v. Resit assessment procedures

Information on the intended resit assessment(s) should the student fail should be provided here. Further information can be found in the general regulations.

vi. Principles of assessment and feedback

Evidence of how the module adheres to the University's Assessment and Feedback principles (as outlined in the above policy) should be incorporated here and a statement around how feedback is expected to be delivered to the students.

4.1.5 Syllabus and resources

i. Syllabus

The intended syllabus for the proposed new module should be summarised here.

ii. Recommended reading

Information for the module on required texts together with confirmation of its availability through discussions with the Library/ Faculty Librarian.

iii. Resources

Information on resources that will be required for the module, such as software, equipment or accommodation requirements, which are not currently available.

iv. Module feedback

Information on the methods used to evaluate the module is required and on the frequency of evaluation.

v. Further information

Additional information that would be helpful to a module scrutiny team should be provided, such as supporting statements from other Departments/ Schools contributing to the module, detailed business case information, data, etc.

vi. Academic Standards

The module must be assigned a level and credit rating compatible with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework. Notes on level and credits are included in Annex 4. Reference should be made to any relevant external benchmarks such as:

- QAA subject benchmarking statements
- Professional or Statutory Body requirements

- External Examiners' feedback

4.1.6 External Influences

- i.* Where appropriate, comments and views from members of academic staff in other institutions, the External Examiner, Professional Bodies, employers and careers advisers should be provided.

4.1.7 Resources

i. Staff

There should also be a statement identifying members of staff who will be responsible for delivering the module.

ii. Other

There should be a statement confirming the availability of appropriate library, computing and audio-visual equipment and accommodation resources.

iii. Student Placements/Fieldwork

Where appropriate a statement on the requirements for student placements or compulsory fieldwork should be included in the new module proposal, together with a statement on how the associated costs will be met.

4.1.8 Competition/Duplication

i. Distinctiveness of Module

A statement on the distinctiveness of the module must be provided. Does it overlap or compete with any other module offered in this institution? Elsewhere?

4.2 New Module Approval Process and Timetable

4.2.1 Faculty

Before being submitted to the Faculty Academic Committee it is normal practice for Departments/ Schools to scrutinise new module proposals particularly with regard to academic matters and resourcing matters. Once approval has been reached the proposal is submitted to the Faculty Academic Committee. The Faculty Office can advise on which Committees require to scrutinise module approvals and the timetable involved.

4.2.2 Module Codes

Prior to submissions being forwarded to QEAT, a code must be allocated for each new module by the Student Lifecycle – Systems and Data team. Requests should be submitted via the 'Module Requests' facility in Pegasus.

4.2.3 QAC

- QAC will scrutinise and approve changes to programme regulations needed to accommodate new modules. Changes to existing programme regulations including the addition of new modules must be uploaded to the QEAT Sharepoint site in accordance with the guidance. Please note: QAC scrutiny and approval of regulations on behalf of Senate is required prior to changes in the Programme Regulations.

- Once the Faculty Academic Committee has approved a new module it passes the regulations for the programme to the QEAT to arrange for scrutiny and approval on behalf of Senate. In order for the regulations to appear in the next edition of the Programme Regulations it is essential that a new module proposal is submitted, via the Faculty Committees. The Faculty Office will provide advice as necessary and will have details of the timetable involved. However, time should be built into this process to allow for any amendments, additional information, etc. that may be required before the proposal can progress to the next stage of the process.

4.2.4 Module Catalogue

- Information provided to Student Business on the application form for a module code allocation is used to provide much of the information about modules in the Module Catalogue. It is important that this information is provided promptly and accurately – entries in the Module Catalogue must match the module code in the programme regulations. Curriculum and learning outcome information for the Module Catalogue is input by the appropriate Department/School.

PROGRAMME COSTING GUIDANCE

1 Faculty programme approval procedure

1.1 Each Faculty takes steps to satisfy itself that a new programme will be academically sound and financially viable. Each Faculty has set out the procedure for programme approval, including the details of the decision-making bodies which approve aspects of the programme and the timescales for obtaining that approval. The procedures for the academic aspects of that are to be reviewed.

1.2 Each Faculty will maintain records of:

- The decision making body which determined that the programme should be developed and why.
- The decision making bodies which approved the academic content and financial viability of the programme.
- The final approval by the Board of Study. (It is noted that this may be included in a minute which is submitted to the Board by one or more Committees).

2 Faculty programme costing model

2.1 As part of the formal faculty approval process for new and existing programmes, the Faculty Programme Costing model includes:

- Fit with University and Faculty strategy
- Evidence of market demand and information on sector competition pricing rationale, including fees and scholarships/discounts projected student numbers
- Total income calculated by predicted student numbers times fee less scholarships plus any SFC or other grant.
- Estimated set up and launch costs* for year 0
- Estimated delivery costs* for Years 1 to 3 (5 for an integrated master's programme) [*Launch and delivery costs include but are not limited to:
 - Academic staff time
 - Support staff time
 - Direct non-pay costs such as consumables, work placements, PVG, Agents' commission, etc
 - Indirect costs –marketing, recruitment, RAM
 - Estates costs
 - Percentage contingency of Direct costs (both salary and non-pay) to cover unforeseen costs]
- Out turn: annual and cumulative Assessment of risk

[A template for assessing risk is appended in Annex 2.].

3 Faculty programme review


3.1 Each Faculty takes steps to satisfy itself on a 5-year cycle that an existing programme remains academically sound and financially viable. The procedures for the academic aspects of that are to be reviewed and those for the financial aspects developed based on the Costing Guidance provided in this document.

ANNEX 2 Risk assessment and management: Worked example

			MSc in Food Security				
#	Risk	Controls	Assessment	Likelihood	Impact	Rating	Action
1	Effort is invested in programme development but the programme is not approved	Each Faculty operates an "approval of the concept" stage of programme approval which minimises effort invested in a non-viable proposal and ensures that each programme is strategically aligned.	Strong market demand in the food and drink industry well-documented nationally and internationally (e.g. a Scottish government priority area, focus of the Made in China 2025 plan and the World Class 2.0 plan). University describes itself as "technological": Food Security is certainly that; the programme is also aligned with the University's socially progressive aims	1	2	2	None
2	Programme is not financially viable	Each Faculty operates robust procedures for programme approval involving independent reviewers.	Dept X's financial analysis has been refined by Faculty Manager and reviewed by two members of FRAP. Some questions on expenditure to be addressed by Dept X. However, review of programme costing is not well embedded in the Faculty and training of reviewers is required.	1	3	3	Dept X to address reviewers' questions
3	Promotional material does not meet CMA requirements (e.g. additional fees) and University is found to be in breach of legislation	Each Faculty operates a rigorous programme approval process designed to capture all costs to the student	Section on "Additional fees" not showing on University webpage for programme	3	3	9	FMs collating "Additional fees" information for all UG, PGT and PGR programmes

							FMs to ensure that programme approval process includes collection of information on additional fees
4	Programme does not recruit additional students (e.g. market already saturated; programme not sufficiently distinctive, so that it simply redistributes students across the University portfolio; fees too high; mode of delivery inappropriate; market too narrow).	Each Faculty seeks market advice from RIO (including views of international agents, where appropriate) before developing a programme. Each Faculty is assisted by RIO in determining appropriate fees for programmes, taking account of University/subject rankings and information on fees set by competitors. A University group is responsible for setting fees on the basis of a well-evidenced recommendation from the Faculty.	Market demand – see 1. However, no views of international agents are recorded on C-CAP. Fees set as for other Dept X PGT programmes. 2018-19 intake: Scots: 55 RUK: 5 EU: 18 International: 28	1	3	3	Consult agents on demand in their areas
5	Appropriate resources not available within the University to support programme delivery (e.g. staff expertise and capacity, specialist equipment)	Each Faculty operates a rigorous programme approval process designed to ensure robustness	Delivery depends on appointment of new lecturer in Food Security. Some questions on equipment costs to be addressed by Dept X.	4	4 16		Dept X to present business case for post asap. Dept X to identify any specialist equipment (including software) not already available.

6	Appropriate resources not available outwith the University to support programme delivery(e.g. placement opportunities, practice-based tutors)	Each Faculty operates a rigorous programme approval process designed to ensure robustness of programme proposal	Not applicable (i.e. no external resources required)	1	1	1	None
7	Quality of programme poor, resulting in damage to University reputation	Each Faculty operates robust procedures for programme approval, both involving independent reviewers	Academic content and structure approved by FAC Sep 2018	1	3	3	None



ANNEX 4

UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE AWARDS FRAMEWORK

The awards structure for undergraduate and postgraduate awards is as follows:

Award	Credit Requirement	Minimum Level Requirement
Certificate of Higher Education	120	100 credits at Level 1
Diploma of Higher Education	240	100 credits at Level 2
Bachelor Degree	360	60 credits at Level 3
Honours Degree	480	90 credits at Level 3 and 90 credits at Level 4
Integrated Masters Degree	600	120 credits at Level 5
Graduate Diploma	120	120 credits at Level 3 or Level 4
Professional Graduate Diploma	120	Graduate entry and all credits at Level 4
Postgraduate Certificate	60	50 credits at Level 5
Postgraduate Diploma	120	100 credits at Level 5
Masters Degree	180	150 credits at Level 5
Masters by Research	180	170 credits at Level 5