

## **Procedures for Approval of New Programs and Modules**

### **Introduction**

Philadelphia University starts to develop all its quality assurance procedures, relying mainly on the documents provided by the QAAHE, which can be found on the web site [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

This document describes the procedures and criteria laid down by the Ministry of Higher Education in Jordan and applied in Philadelphia University for the consideration and approval of new programs of study leading to awards of the University. There should be a full and systematic review of proposals for new programs of study to ensure that the academic rationale is fully exposed and understood. That the intended learning outcomes are clearly stated, and that resources can be provided to deliver the program to standards acceptable to the University. Proposals also need to be examined as to their consistency with the University's current Institutional Plan.

The following procedures apply to undergraduate programs offered at Philadelphia University. They involve two separate stages :

Stage I : approval of the resource implications of new taught programs;

Stage II : approval of the academic implications of new taught programs.

This document provides information about each of the above stages. This information is to describe :

- what Faculties need to do to prepare for each Stage; which Faculty Committees are involved (where appropriate); and the timing of this work in Faculties.
- what information Faculties need to present to the University Committees involved in approving proposals at each Stage.
- The procedures and criteria used by University Committees to approve proposals at each Stage; which University Committees are involved; the timing for submission of proposals to University Committees at each Stage (including any final deadlines)

Proposals of new program (or module) must ensure that they have been discussed fully by the relevant **Department Council** and **Faculty Council** or equivalent body.

Faculties will continue to be wholly responsible to the **University Council and the Senate** for all matters of curriculum and academic content.

### **Links with Approval Bodies' Codes of Practice**

The University aims to ensure that its procedures for the approval of new Degree Programs are consonant with relevant parts of :

- The Jordanian Higher Education Accreditation Council's (JHEAC) Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education : Program Approval , Monitoring and Review.
- The Jordanian Higher Education Accreditation Council's Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standard in Higher Education for private universities: Jordanian Higher Education Specific Accreditation Norms (JHESAN)

### **Forms and Reports**

1- The following forms should be completed as the basis for new program submission :

#### **For new program proposals :**

- Proposal cover sheet (to be provided)
  - Approval form (to be provided)
  - Program specification form (as template) (to be provided)
  - Assessor's report (to be provided)
- The forms may be obtained from the Study Plan Committee of the University.
  - The proposal cover sheet should be completed where appropriate by the Faculty or other appropriate academic unit and submitted to the Faculty Program Accreditation Committee. The form will be completed by the Committee for submission to the Faculty Council and Study Plan Committee.
  - The approval form comprises two parts :  
Approval for Stage I  
Approval for Stage II  
Each section of the form must be addressed.

A named modular pathway may be proposed within an existing program, and given a sub-title to reflect its specialized contents. Once a new pathway has been accredited, it constitutes a route within a program, and cannot be considered a stand alone program in its own right.

A new pathway may lead to the award of a standard degree title with the pathway title in parentheses. A new pathway in an existing program shall consist of at least 50% pre-accredited modules (excluding dissertation module) from the existing program. A new pathway will not require assessors' reports for accreditation. A pathway may not alter the duration of a program.

Proposals of new pathways should complete sections of the accreditation documents marked with a \*P, and submit an updated version of the program specification for the whole program, amended to include the new pathway.

- A complete program specification should be submitted in respect of all new proposals.
- Assessors' reports should be completed.

### **Procedures of stage I and stage II of the Approval**

The following are the general procedures that are used for approving new Degree program in stage I and stage II:

- 1- proposals for new program of study and or new degree and for program withdrawals will be considered by the appropriate **Faculty program Accreditation Committee**, which is empowered to take the following action:
  - to recommend approval to **Study Plan Committee**;
  - to recommend approval to **Study Plan Committee** subject to revisions clarification of the proposal to the satisfaction of the Chair;
  - to refer back the proposal to the originating Faculty for further information or review.
- 2- The appropriate **Faculty Council** will receive a summary report of the **Accreditation Committee's** recommendations for information.
- 3- **Study Plan Committee** will receive a summary of the **Accreditation Committee's** recommendations and approve or refer back the proposal. The Committee will forward a list of approved programs to the president (or vice president) of the University.
- 4- Approval in principle by **Study Plan Committee** signifies that the University is committed to offering the program from the date indicated. The relevant Faculty may then proceed to detailed academic planning to publicizing the program and to the recruitment of students.
- 5- Approval of the proposal in detail by **Study Plan Committee** and of any required Regulation changes by the University Council will complete the process of formal approval .

The detailed procedures of Stage I and Stage II are described as follows:

#### **a ) Procedures for Stage I**

The primary **purpose** of Stage I of the new program approval procedures (mentioned previously) is as follows :

- to ensure that the rationale for the program is consonant with the overall aims of the University and of the Faculty concerned;
- to ensure that the program is likely to meet demand from all its 'spectators';
- to establish whether the necessary resources in physical and human terms are available or obtainable to offer the program.

The Faculty proposing the new Degree program submits for approval all proposal at Stage I. Such proposals are known as 'outline new program proposals'.

A device is available from the **Study Plan Committee** of the University on the development and approval of outline new program proposals. In the first instance, staff are asked to contact their Faculty's Scientific Committee.

The following are the steps and procedures of the approval of outline new program proposals in Faculties:

- The development of outline new program proposal should be considered and included in the Faculty Plans, and the resources for their delivery should be approved annually through the Faculty Plans. These proposals have to be approved by the Faculty Council, which also approves the wider Plan. The signature of the Dean of the Faculty is required on the New Program Proposal Form.
- The Library, Computer Center, and the Faculties Department must be involved in the preparation of outline new program proposals before the proposals have been adopted formally by Faculties. The Library and Facility Department budgets are based on student numbers and are focused on supporting existing programs. In their outline new program proposals, Faculties should identify and make provision to support any significant new Library or computing expenditures. Faculties need to initiate discussions at the earliest opportunity with the Library and Computer Center about learning support resource implications, and to submit the New Program Proposal Form to them in time for it to be considered properly. If learning support implications cannot be determined in time, it may not be possible to provide the appropriate Library/IT resources when required. This means that the program might not be able to run. Faculties are also reminded to keep the Curriculum Committee informed as quickly as possible of any *changes* in resource implications after approval (e.g. that the program is likely to be withdrawn, owing to insufficient student numbers). Once material have been purchased, their costs are normally re-charged to the appropriate Faculties, whether the program runs or not.
- Faculties should also liaise with the Estates and Facilities Department about proposed new programs, before submitting outline new program proposals for approval. This liaison is necessary to ensure that any space implications are taken into account.
- When the outline new program proposal is submitted as part of a Faculty Plan, the following information is required in the proposal and should be appended in full to the plan.
  - i) a case for support and rationale, which indicates:
    - the expected level of demand for the program;
    - its resource implications;
    - how the program contributes towards the University's mission.
  - ii) a New Program Proposal form for each proposed program.
- The 'chain of approval' at the University level is as follows:
  - Working Group on the Resource Implications of New Programs (WGRINC);
  - Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC);
  - Council Planning and Resources Committee (CPARC);
  - Council.

Final approval for Faculty budgets for the next academic session, including resources for any new programs, is recommended each year by the PBC at the end of second semester.

- In approving outline new program proposals, the University committees involved seek to assure themselves:
  - that the rationale for the program is consonant with the overall aims of the University and the Faculty concerned;

- that there is sufficient evidence of demand for the program;
  - that the necessary resource base in physical and human terms is available or obtainable;
  - that the program provided a match between potential students and anticipated career pathways on the one hand, and academic requirements, resources, and any professional demands, on the other.
- The University Council generates a report at the end of Stage I , to inform the various parties involved of the outcome. The report is copied to the Faculties concerned, the Learning Support Planning Module and the Facilities Department.

## **b ) Procedures for Stage II**

The primary **purpose** of Stage II of the procedures for new program approval is to assure :

- the academic and pedagogic coherence of curricula;
- that the standard of intended academic attainment is appropriate to the level of study;
- clear progression from one Stage to another;
- that the program is structured to provide an interesting and stimulating learning experience for students;
- that the program meets the requirements of any professional or statutory bodies (where relevant).

All proposals for new Degree programs have to be submitted for approval of their academic implications by the Faculty sponsoring the program, in addition to resource approval at Stage I. Such proposals are known as ‘detailed new program proposals’.

Advice is available from the **Study Plan Committee** of the University on the development and approval of proposals at Stage II. In the first instance, staff are asked to contact their Faculty’s Scientific Committee.

The following are the steps and procedures of the approval of outline new program proposals in Faculties:

- Faculties normally start to prepare detailed new program proposals in the session before they plan to offer a program. Detailed program can take a long time, and Faculties are advised to begin to process as early as possible.
- The Faculty in which a new program is to be proposed has to establish a Program Planning Team (PPT) to develop a detailed new program proposal. The PPT is responsible for the preparation of the program submission document, reporting to the Faculty, and the presentation of the proposals to the relevant Faculty and University committees.
- Detailed new program proposals must be considered by the Faculty Scientific Committee (FSC) then the Faculty Council (FC). When the Faculty Council is satisfied with a detailed new program proposal, it recommends its approval to the **Study Plan Committee** , which is a University-level committee. This committee reports to the University Quality Committee (UQAC) on the Quality Assurance of the program.

- Before recommending a detailed new program proposal to a **Study Plan Committee**, the Faculty Council should focus on the detailed content and structure of the program. The program specification and module descriptors play a key role in this consideration. Faculty committees will seek to assure themselves that :
  - the curriculum is academically and pedagogically coherent, with particular reference to available Quality Assurance benchmark statements;
  - progression from one level to another flows logically and the intended standard of academic attainment is appropriate to the level of study;
  - the program is structured to provide an interesting and stimulating learning experience for students;
  - the requirements and regulations of professional or statutory bodies have been addressed fully, where accreditation or recognition of a program is sought from such bodies;
  - the needs of different groups of students which might take the program have been addressed, such as full-time and part-time students;
  - the proposal follows University guidelines, and conforms with taught program Regulations and Ordinances. Any variation from Regulations or Ordinances must be requested specifically, and a rationale given.
  
- The Faculty Council may require amendments to be made to the detailed new program proposal, before it can be recommended to the University Curriculum Committee. The Faculty Council should specify deadlines by which these amendments must be made, and should ensure that the amendments are included and taken into account in the documentation submitted to the Curriculum Committee.
- The Faculty submits to the **Study Plan Committee** a checklist following its consideration of a detailed new program proposal. The checklist identifies issues, which have been considered at Faculty level.
- The detailed new program proposal should include the following information:
  - a complete **checklist**;
  - a **rationale** for the program;
  - if applicable, an indication of **any changes to the resource implications of the program**, particularly in terms of learning support resources, which have arisen since Stage I approval was given;
  - the **definitive program document**, which comprises;
  - a **program specification** for the program, including annexes (teaching methods matrix, assessment matrix, learning outcomes matrix);
  - a set of **program regulations**, which conform with the University's taught program Ordinances and Regulations. Any variations from these Ordinances and Regulations must be identified clearly and the reasons why they are needed must be indicated;
  - **module descriptions** for each module or module to be offered as part of the program (including modules taught by other Faculties or departments). If the proposal contains any recommendations for the approval of new or amended module(s), the associated module descriptors must be prepared. Hard copies of the new or amended descriptors must be sent to the Curriculum Committee as part of the proposal. The definitive program document must contain the full title and

duration of the program , and any requirement for a separate Foundation entry program code.

- The ‘chain of approval’ at University level is as follows:
  - Scientific Committee for the Faculty (FSC);
  - Faculty Council;
  - Study Plan Committee;
  - General and Special Accreditation Committee (GASAC);
  - University Quality Assurance Committee (UQAC);
  - University Council.

The University Quality Assurance Committee (UQAC) has the responsibility to establish the procedures and criteria to be used in the approval, monitoring and review of programs, and to monitor and keep under review those procedures and criteria. The UQAC does not itself expect to examine program proposals in detail, provided that it is satisfied that the procedures have been followed correctly.

- When a detailed ne program proposal has been submitted formally to the UQAC, it will be approved by experts external to the University for a Commentary. The Commentary is submitted to the UQAC for consideration alongside the program proposal.

The Quality Assurance Committee (UQAC) focuses on the overall coherence of the proposal, and its compliance with University and external regulations and policy. The annexes to the Program Specification and the program regulations play a key role in this consideration. The principal areas for the consideration of a detailed proposal by the UQAC are listed below:

- Does the program meet in concept, content, and delivery a standard appropriate to the award and to the level of award in question? The UQAC seeks to assure itself that the program fulfils therequirements of the Jordanian Higher Education Accreditation Council (JHEAC);
- Does the program conform to University Ordinances and Regulations, and follow University guidelines? Where a variation to the Ordinances of Regulations is requested, the UQAC considers its rationale carefully, and makes a specific recommendation about whether the variation should be permitte;
- Is the program coherent and internally consistent, in its curriculum and organisation?
- Is the program structured to provide an interesting and stimulating learning experience for students?
- Is the program supported by appropriate frameworks for organisation, admissions, assessment, resourcing, and quality assurance?
- Is the balance of assessment within the program appropriate? For undergraduate programs, does it reflect the University’s Guidelines on the Volume of Assessment for Undergraduate Programs and Modules?

- Is the program consonant with, and does it reflect University policies, particularly equal opportunities and wider access policies?
- Where appropriate, does the program provide a relevant and effective experience in the context of preparation for vocational/professional practice?
- The minutes of the UQAC are brief and focus on actions , whilst including sufficient information to enable the Curriculum Committee and the University Council to come to a decision on the recommendations without need for further documentation. The minutes are copied for information to the Faculty Council from which the proposal originated.
- The overall outcomes of the approval process is a recommendation that the program be:
  - approved without condition;
  - approved subject to minor modifications (these to be listed in the recommendation). In such cases , the UQAC will determine the time-scale and the procedure by which the conditions will be addressed and submitted for consideration;
  - not approved and that major amendments be made to the proposal. In such cases, representation to the UQAC will normally be necessary.
- At the conclusion of the approval process, the PPT lodges a copy of the definitive program document with the Academic Standards and Support Module. A copy must also be kept in the Faculty.
- Full approval at Stage II triggers the following actions:
  - Report of final approval is made by the UQAC to the Faculty concerned including Planning, Recruitment Publications, Admissions (i.e. JHEAC) Correspondent). Student Registry and the Learning Support Planning Module;
  - A full JHEAC Code id allocated to full-time undergraduate programs;
  - Program (and module) details are added to the University's central, computerised information system;
  - Entries are made by Admissions and Recruitment Publications to the hard-copy and on-line of the University Prospectus.

### **Checklist for Detailed New Program Proposals**

Before recommending a detailed new program proposal to the **Study Plan Committee**, a Faculty Council should have considered in detail the content and structure of the program. The program Specification and module descriptors play a key role in this consideration as a Faculty Council seeks to assure itself, in terms of quality, of the new program provision it wishes to offer.

The following Checklist should be completed by Faculties, following the consideration of a detailed new program proposal by the appropriate relevant Faculty Committees. It should then be appended to the detailed new program proposal document for submission to the **Study Plan Committee**.



The Checklist has been designed to assist the Curriculum Committee members in their deliberations by clearly demonstrating that the Faculty Council has considered the areas shown in the Checklist shown below.

## Checklist

<b>Name of Program :</b>		
<b>Name of Faculty and Department(s) Offering Program :</b>		
<b>Date From Which Program To Be Offered :</b>		
<b>Identifying Number (if available) :</b>		
<b>Date Approval Given By Appropriate Faculty Committee :</b>		
<b>Means of Approval at Faculty Level :</b> (i.e. Faculty Scientific Committee, Faculty Quality Control Committee, and Faculty Council)		
1	Does the Faculty consider that the curriculum is academically and pedagogically coherent, with particular reference to available standard benchmark statements?	
2	Does the Faculty consider that the progression from one level to another flows logically and the standard of attainment is appropriate to the level of study? Has reference been made to the QAAHE qualification descriptors when considering the level of the program as a whole and the University's level descriptors when considering the level of individual modules?	
3	Does the Faculty consider that the program is structured to provide an interesting and stimulating learning experience for students?	
4	Does the Faculty consider that the requirements and regulations of professional or statutory bodies have been fully addressed, where accreditation or recognition of a program is sought?	
5	Does the Faculty consider that the needs of different groups of students who might take the program have been addressed, such as full-time and part-time students?	
6	Can the Faculty confirm that the program proposal follows University guidelines and conforms to taught program Regulations and Ordinances?	
7	If any amendments to the program proposal were required by the Faculty Council (or Scientific Committee), have these been made and included in the documentation to be considered by the Curriculum Committee?	
8	Has the Faculty Council (or Scientific Committee) set any conditions which must be met before the program can be approved? If so, please attach the relevant minutes, which list these conditions.	
9	Have these conditions been met. And if not, when is it anticipated that they will be met?	
10	Are any changes required to previously identified/approved resource implications of the new program, particularly its learning support resources?	
11	Is there a clear rationale for the proposed new program?	
12	Has a program specification been included in the documentation to be considered by the Curriculum Committee?	
13	Has a set of Program Regulations been provided?	
14	Has a specific document for any variation to University Regulations or Ordinance been requested? If so, has an appropriate rationale been given?	
15	Has a full set of module descriptors been provided?	
16	Does the definitive program documentation contain the full title and duration of the program and any requirement for a separate Foundation Entry program code?	
17	Are there any other specific issues, which the Faculty wishes to draw to the attention of Curriculum Committee members? Please itemise these below:	

Signature of Chair of Faculty Council : .....

Date : .....

### **Module Descriptor**

The Module descriptor contains the components shown below:

<b>Module Number, Module title :</b>
<b>Providing Department :</b>
<b>Module Coordinatory(s) :</b>
<b>Year :</b>
<b>Credit :</b>
<b>Prerequisites :</b> <input type="text" value="Required modules or background"/>
<b>Prerequisite for :</b>
<b>Aims :</b>
<b>Teaching Method :</b>
<b>Learning Outcomes :</b>
<b>Assessment of Learning Outcomes :</b>
<b>Modes of Assessment :</b>
<b>Contribution of Program Learning Outcomes:</b>
<b>Syllabus</b>
<input type="text" value="Bulleted list providing an outline of the topics covered"/>
<b>Textbook and Supporting Materials</b>

### **Guidance for Completing the Module Descriptor**

The module descriptor that forms a definitive record of the module contains accurate information about the module delivered within the University. It is useful for quality assurance and program development purposes. The following points guide you for completing the module descriptor:

#### **1. Module Number** (six digits)

A unique 6 digits number assigned to each module by the Scientific Committee of the Faculty by which this module is offered.

#### **2. Providing Department**

The name of the Department and the Faculty, which administer the module.

#### **3. Module Title**

The title of the module

#### **4. Module Coordinator(s)**(maximum field length 75 characters)

The name of the staff member(s) within the Department offering the module who have responsibility for coordinating its delivery.

#### **5. Year**

A unique one digit number applying to the module, in terms of the level or difficulty of the study undertaken in that module and which implies a logical, structured progression of academic study. The Table below shows these levels. The level of the module will remain the same even if it is available to students, normally in different Departments, whose other modules are at a different level (for example, in the case of a third year Engineering student studying a Computer Skills 1 of First Year level).

Year Level	Number
First Year	1
Second Year	2
Third Year	3
Fourth Year	4

#### 6. Credit (1 digit number)

The credit value expressed in terms of a points system recognizing a successful outcome for a given number of teaching hours at a particular level.

#### 7. Prerequisite(s) (a list of one or more module numbers separated by commas)

The **code** of any module(s), which forms a *necessary initial requirement* or the equivalent for the study of the module, which will normally involve having undertaken assessment in the pre-requisite module (but not necessarily having achieved a pass mark in the module). Up to 10 codes may be entered.

#### 8. Prerequisite for (a list of one or more module number separated by commas)

The **code** of any module(s), that are taken after the completion of the module specified in (3) above. Up to 10 codes may be entered.

#### 9. Aims (about 50 words)

A statement of the overall academic goal, which the module is designed to enable students to attain. For example, “to adapt rapidly to changing technology and have the ability to recognize technological business trends”.

This point should be distinct from point (11) on Learning Outcomes, which should specifically relate to the knowledge and skills each student will have acquired on successful completion of the module. It should also be distinct from point (15) “Syllabus”, which should be a list of the subject areas covered in the module.

#### 10. Teaching Method (about 80 words)

Detail the teaching method in hours and indicate in which semester the module is run : Detail the types and number of hours of sessions provided: e.g. Lectures, Laboratory, Example classes, Student or Staff-led seminars, Tutorials, Group presentations in tutorials.

Indication of how, and in which sessions, feedback is given to students to promote learning; e.g. “knowledge disseminated in large lectures supported by and assessed in student-led seminars, with skills being taught, practised and assessed in laboratory sessions. Oral feedback given during labs and seminars: open session for feedback on research critique.

#### 11. Learning Outcomes (a numbered list)

A specification of the skills and knowledge, which a student will have acquired on successful completion of the module. This should be expressed in terms of:

1. Knowledge and understanding gained;
2. Intellectual skills gained;
3. Discipline-specific skills that will have been acquired;
4. Personal transferable skills gained.

*Note* : To save space only use the phrase, “Having successfully completed the module students will:” at the start of the text, *not* for each of the knowledge, discipline and key skills detailed. An example is shown below:

Having successfully completed the module students will:

1. be able to solve problems algorithmically
2. be able to design and code C++ programs to meet simple requirements, expressed in English.
3. be able to test and debug simple C++ programs.
4. have a clear understanding of the need for a development process.

## **12. Assessment of learning outcomes:**

To show how each learning outcome of the module shown in point (11) above is assessed. For example, the assessment of the learning outcome shown in point (11) above could be stated as follows:

Learning outcome(1) is assessed by tutorial and examinations.

Learning outcome(2) and(3) are assessed by laboratory tutorial and examinations.

Learning outcome(4) is assessed by examinations.

## **13. Modes of Assessment (including supplementary assessment)**(maximum field length 190 characters about 30 words.

The Mode of Assessment for the module should be designed to test the learning outcomes listed in point (11) above. You should

- Always include the percentage for each item of assessment.
- If the examination is not closed book, please state what sort it is, i.e. seen exam, open book exam.
- Details of individual items of program work required should be specified with appropriate weighting.

The following is an example of modes of assessment:

Two 1-hour midterm exams during the semester (51% each); course work (15%); tutorial contribution (5%); Final (unseen) written exam(50%).

## **14. Contribution to Program Learning Outcome**

A List contains the corresponding numbers of the points in the learning outcomes list of the whole program that are matched with those mentioned in point (11) above.

## **15. Syllabus** (a bulleted list, about 250 words)

An indication of the sub-areas of academic knowledge covered in the module, outlining how these areas will be developed during the module. For Example, the outline syllabus for the module 220111, Programming Fundamentals is :

- Overview of programming languages and the compilation process [1 hour]
- Fundamental programming constructs: Syntax and semantics of a higher-level language; variables, types, expressions, and assignments; simple I/O; conditional and iterative control structures; functions and parameter passing; structured decomposition. [14 hours]
- Algorithms and problem-solving; Problem-solving strategies; the role of algorithms in the problem-solving process; implementation strategies for algorithms; debugging strategies; the concept and properties of algorithms. [7 hours]

- Fundamental data structures; Primitive types; arrays; records; strings and string processing; [6 hours].
- Machine level representation of data: Bits, bytes, and words; numeric data representation and number bases; representation of character data. [2 hours].

**16. Textbook and Supporting Materials :**

List textbook(s) and any relevant books that may support learning.

### **Procedures for the Approval of Amendments to Existing Degree Programs and Modules**

The purpose of the procedures for the approval of amendments to existing programs and modules is to assure the maintenance of quality and standards, and to ensure that the necessary resources are available or obtainable, to support the changes.

Advice is available from the **Study Plan Committee** of the University on the development and approval of proposals for changes to existing programs and modules. In the first instance, staff are asked to contact their Faculty's Scientific Committee.

The following are the steps and procedures of the approval and proposals for Amendments to existing programs and module in Faculties:

- Faculties should use the module descriptor to amend modules. At the Faculty level, proposals should be considered and recommended by the Faculty Council. Where approval is sought through the Council, the signature of the Dean of the Faculty will be required.
- Before recommending a proposal to amend a program or module to Study Plan Committee, a Faculty Council seeks to assure itself that the various criteria, which applied when the program or module was first approved, would continue to apply if the change were approved, with a particular focus on the discipline-specific implications of the change.

It is important that the effects of the amendment on all parties involved have been discussed and addressed (e.g. that other Faculties or departments have been consulted about the change, if their students take a module as a core or optional part of their program, which the Faculty responsible for the module needs to change or without).

The Faculty Council also needs to consider the implications for JHEAC registration.

- Proposals for amendments to programs and modules will normally be processed through Chairperson's Action, when they are considered to be of a routine nature,. The decision on what constitutes a routine proposal for change is made according to the consultation with the members of the Quality Assurance and Scientific Committees

Examples of routine proposals include :

- changes to awards and modules which do not alter fundamentally the focus and/r purpose of the award or module (such as a minor addition to outline syllabus);
  - changes to program regulations which conform with the University's taught program Ordinances and Regulations, and which do not require an approved exemption before they can be implemented (such as modifications to the admission requirements for an award);
  - minor changes to the title of an award.
- Proposals for amendments to programs and modules should take the following form:
    - i) A brief covering statement for proposed changes to modules or for changes to program which do not affect individual modules: such as changes to program regulations. This statement includes

- the nature of the change, including its effects on existing programs or modules (e.g. where a change to a module is proposed, will the module continue to be offered as part of the same program(s) as before, and at the same Level(s)? Is there any change to its core or optional status? Where a change to a program is proposed, does the change require a new registration?);
  - the reason for the change;
  - when it is proposed that the change will take effect;
  - where it is proposed to amend or withdraw existing modules, confirmation that the changes have been discussed with all other Faculties for whose programs the modules under consideration form an approved part (either as core or optional modules). Whilst these Faculties do not have a veto on such changes, they must at least be given the opportunity to comment on the proposals, and to make alternative arrangements if necessary;
  - whether the change has implications for learning support resources (e.g. new books or IT equipment, or reduction/withdrawal of the same). If this is the case, the resource implications should be specified, following discussion with relevant staff in the Library and Computer Centre.
- ii) A revised Module Descriptor, if a change is proposed to an existing module.
- iii) If the proposed change requires amendments to any of the definitive program documents other than a module descriptor (e.g. to the Program Specification or associated annexes, or the program regulations), a full copy of the amended documentation will be needed at the next review of the program. The next review could be a Program Continuation Review, Academic Review, or professional body review.
- Where the proposal relates to a change to an existing module, the direct use of the module descriptor is necessary.
  - Where the proposal relates to a change to an existing program, which does not require changes to be made to module descriptors, or new descriptors to be added (e.g. where the change relates to program regulations or to the admissions criteria for programs), the information be submitted in hard copy to the Curriculum Committee. Only a brief covering statement will be needed for small or minor changes.
  - Where the proposal relates to a change to an existing program to introduce a new module or modules the procedures for the approval of new modules apply (as mentioned above).
  - The ‘chain of approval’ for new modules at the University-level is as follows:
- 1) **For proposals with *no* additional resource implications, over and above the budget agreed for the Faculty:**
- Scientific Committee for the Faculty concerned.
  - Faculty Quality Assurance.
  - The Study Plan Committee and the University Quality Assurance Committee (UQAC) and the Council, for changes to programs (as apposed to modules alone).



Any change to the title of an award of the University requires approval by the President of the University.

**2) For proposals with *additional* resource implications, over and above the budget agreed for the Faculty:**

- The above Committees **Plus**;
- Working Group on Resource Implications of New Programs;
- Planning and Budgeting Sub-Committee.
- 

The UQAC will consult the Planning section on all proposals to change programs or modules, to check whether they contain additional resource implications, before forwarding them for approval. This involves checking whether proposals have learning support resource implications.

In recommending proposals to amend an existing program or module, **Study Plan Committee** seeks to assure itself that the various criteria, which applied when the program or module was first approved would continue to apply if the change were approved. It also considers the effect of the proposal on other Faculties, if the proposal relates to module(s) which form an approved part of those other areas' programs.

- The Quality Assurance Committee for the Faculty concerned reports for the approval of amendments to programs and modules to the Faculty. The approval is then reported to Recruitment Publications and the Admissions Office, so that changes can be made, where appropriate, to published information about the University's programs. On approval of changes to existing modules, the Quality Assurance Committee also authorizes the addition of the revised module descriptors to the centrally held program details, which ensure that the student will be able to be registered on the amended module.
- The approval of new programs and changes to existing programs and modules specifies that a detailed new program proposal should include:
  - a completed checklist (of issues considered by Faculty Committees);
  - a rationale for the program;
  - if applicable, an indication of any changes to the resource implications of the program particularly in terms of learning support resources, which have arisen since Stage I approval given;
  - the definitive program document (Program Specification and annexes, program regulations, module descriptors).

**Academic Year 2003-2004**

**Procedure of Double Check on the Quality of Marking**

The following steps describe the procedure of double check on the quality of marking which is run by the Examination Working Group (EWG) in the Department.

Therefore, the EWG do the following :

- 1) Select randomly a minimum of 10% sample of scripts for each module.
- 2) Choose a second staff member in the field to give his own professional judgment on the equity and validity of marking.
- 3) In case there is a disagreement between the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> markers, they will choose a third staff member to arbitrate.
- 4) Report to the QMC the result of this process, which in turns report to the head of the Department for final approval.

