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Introduction

This handbook is intended as an additional source of information for Directors of Student Education (DSEs) and provides an overview of the quality assurance requirements for each academic year. It sets out the deliberative structure for taught student education and outlines the procedures/guidance for implementing the specific policy areas routinely referred to by DSEs. It also includes information on the programme approval process and timelines for programme development.

Please consult the Quality Assurance pages on the Student Education Service website for full details of the following:

- a list of quality assurance-related policies: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/QApolicies](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/QApolicies)
- QA forms commonly used by Schools: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/qaforms](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/qaforms)
- guidance on programme and module approval procedures: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/approval](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/approval)

Quality Assurance Team: contacts 2016-17

Faculty contacts

| Arts, Humanities and Cultures       | Charlotte Armstrong c.armstrong@leeds.ac.uk 38206 |
| Biological Sciences                | Lorraine Cross l.a.cross@adm.leeds.ac.uk 34801    |
| Cross Institution                  | TBC                                               |
| Education, Social Sciences and Law | Kate Swan k.swan@adm.leeds.ac.uk 33975           |
| Environment                        | Izzy Whitehouse i.j.whitehouse@leeds.ac.uk 30630 |
| Engineering                        | Louise Ward l.ward@adm.leeds.ac.uk 38973         |
| Leeds University Business School   | Niamh Tooher n.g.tooher@leeds.ac.uk 33408         |
| Mathematics and Physical Sciences  | Debbie Schofield d.Schofield@leeds.ac.uk 37300   |
| Medicine and Health                | or Marie Fordham m.fordham@leeds.ac.uk 37300     |

Head of Quality Assurance

| Jenny Lyon j.a.lyon@leeds.ac.uk 37856 |

General enquiries

| Eileen Foster e.f.foster@adm.leeds.ac.uk 32338 |
| Christine Golden c.golden@adm.leeds.ac.uk 34113 |

Code of Practice on Assessment

| Charlotte Armstrong c.armstrong@leeds.ac.uk |

Digital Delivery

| Izzy Whitehouse i.j.whitehouse@leeds.ac.uk |

External Examiners

| Charlotte Armstrong c.armstrong@leeds.ac.uk |

School Action Plans

| Louise Ward l.ward@adm.leeds.ac.uk |
Institutional Enhancement Initiatives:
- **Strategy Groups** – Assessment, Cross Disciplinarity, Digital Learning, Employability, Inclusivity, Internationalisation, Student Support
- **Working Groups** – time limited task and finish groups aligned to strategic priorities

Faculty Enhancement Initiatives:
- Blended Learning
- Internationalisation
- Employability
- Industrial Advisory Boards
### Programme and module approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Send electronically to your QA Team faculty contact:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Programme and module approval</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New modules, new programmes and major programme amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed paperwork for new modules, new programmes and major programme amendments, which have been endorsed by the School Taught Student Education Committee (STSEC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A completed Programme Approval Group (PAG) coversheet which sets out proposals for PAG consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module amendments and minor programme amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed reports of STSEC business detailing module amendments and minor programme amendments which require reporting to Faculty Taught Student Education Committee (FTSEC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes following each STSEC meeting (these can be submitted as 'draft' or 'unconfirmed').</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Deadlines

See the [timeline for taught programme approval](#).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals for approval of new PGT programmes to commence 2017-18</th>
<th>PAG meeting in Semester 1 (by November 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for approval of new UG programmes to commence 2018-19</td>
<td>PAG meeting in Semester 2 (by March 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality Check** for new UG/PGT programmes commencing in 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Check for new UG/PGT programmes commencing in 2017/18</th>
<th>PAG meeting or separate Quality Check in Semester 2 (by March 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**New module** proposals to commence in 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New module proposals to commence in 2017/18</th>
<th>PAG meeting in Semester 2 (By March 2017) for inclusion in online module enrolment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Internal Examiners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Examiners’ appointments for the session</th>
<th>By end of week 11 of Semester 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### External Examiners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment of new External Examiners for 2016-17</th>
<th>To be in place by November 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nomination of new External Examiners for 2017-18</td>
<td>By June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to External Examiner’s reports (UG)</td>
<td>4 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to External Examiner’s reports (PGT)</td>
<td>17 March 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programme Reviews

| Programme Reviews (UG and PGT) | 9 January 2017 |
SCHOOL TAUGHT STUDENT EDUCATION COMMITTEES
(STSEC or equivalent)

SCHOOL TAUGHT STUDENT EDUCATION COMMITTEES (OR EQUIVALENT)

Terms of Reference 2016-17

1. to review, evaluate and monitor the quality and standard of the School’s learning and teaching provision (including collaborative provision);
2. to encourage and disseminate good practice in learning, teaching and assessment, and in the assurance of learning and teaching quality and standards at School level;
3. to consider and recommend new modules, new programmes, major programme amendments, withdrawn/suspended and ad hoc programmes for approval by the appropriate Programme Approval Group;
4. to consider and approve programme amendments, module amendments and withdrawn modules for reporting to the Faculty Taught Student Education Committee;
5. to monitor the cumulative effect of incremental module and programme changes on the provision offered by the School;
6. to ensure School policies and procedures are consistent with those of the Faculty and of the University;
7. to nominate internal and external examiners for appointment by the Faculty Taught Student Education Committee;
8. to consider and respond to external examiner reports;
9. to consider and respond to issues raised by student representatives/Student Staff Forum;
10. to encourage innovation in learning, teaching and assessment and academic developments appropriate to the discipline/s;
11. to note Faculty and University-level changes to the Code of Practice on Assessment, and endorse School-level amendments for final approval by the Faculty Taught Student Education Committee.

Additional terms of reference may be added for individual School Taught Student Education Committees but those above may not be deleted.

Constitution

- Director of Student Education (Chair)
- Head of School (ex officio)
- Pro Dean for Taught Student Education in the Faculty (ex officio)
- Faculty Taught Student Education Committee representative
- LUU School Student Representatives
- Representative Programme Leaders
- Further members as appropriate (including School Education Service Manager)

It is anticipated that the constitution will be significantly wider than the minimum required and will reflect the main areas of taught provision and academic requirements of the School.

Reporting to: Faculty Taught Student Education Committee

School Taught Student Education Committee meetings should be scheduled in order to report their business effectively to Faculty Taught Student Education Committee meetings and Programme Approval Group meetings.
School Taught Student Education Committees should also consider all relevant Faculty Taught Student Education Committee papers in order to ensure appropriate dissemination of information/policy regarding learning and teaching.

**Operating Procedures**

1. School quality assurance procedures are subject to oversight and approval by the FTSEC in accordance with the University's policies and procedures.
2. STSECs are responsible for ensuring timely communication with other Schools where proposed changes to modules/programmes will also impact on wider provision.
3. **School documentation**
   - It is important that Schools keep accurate formal minutes and up-to-date working files of all Committees. Working files must include the following documents:
     - STSEC minutes and supporting papers, including: reports from any sub-groups or sub-committees;
     - consideration of new/amended programme and module proposals;
     - module and programme review documentation;
     - Student Staff Forum minutes and supporting papers;
     - Examination Assessment minutes and supporting papers including reports by any sub-groups or sub-committees (i.e. the School Special Circumstances Committee) and signed pass lists;
     - Minutes and supporting papers of any other School committees involved with taught student matters;
     - Most recent Professional and Statutory Regulatory Body report/response.

   Schools should have oversight of the following documents which will also be checked during the Student Academic Experience Review (SAER) process:
     - Diagram of the Committee reporting structure;
     - Action Plan in response to feedback on the student experience;
     - Code of Practice on Assessment;
     - Student handbooks;
     - Programme and module handbooks (including for Industrial/International variants and Collaborative programmes);
     - Module and Programme review documentation;
     - Student feedback on modules and programmes;
     - Arrangements for the consideration of advanced standing (APL/APEL);
Conventions Governing the Conduct of Committee Meetings

1. Declaration of Personal Interests
   In accordance with the policy agreed by Senate and Council in December 1985, members are reminded that they should declare at the outset of any discussion any non-trivial pecuniary or other private interest in a matter which is before the Committee.

2. Confidentiality of Discussions
   Members are reminded of the convention whereby the contributions made to debate by individual members are regarded as confidential, as are the details of an individual’s decision with regard to voting.

3. Reserved Business
   Statute V Procedure states:
   
   a) Students may be appointed to any authority or committee of the University save those primarily concerned with the personal affairs of individual members of the staff of the University or primarily concerned with the academic assessment of individual students or prospective students.
   
   b) Reserved areas of business are matters affecting the appointment, promotion and personal affairs of individual University staff members and matters affecting the admission/academic assessment of individual students. All students are expected to withdraw from the meeting when it is declared by the Chair that the meeting is about to discuss an area of reserved business.
   
   c) Where there are no student representatives on the Committee, reserved items (which appear on blue paper) are taken during the normal course of the meeting in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

4. Quorum of meetings
   In accordance with University standard practice Committees shall have a quorum of two-fifths of its voting membership.
School Taught Student Education (STSEC):
Annual cycle of business

Any business formally recommended for approval by STSEC should be subsequently forwarded to the QA Team for either reporting to FTSEC or consideration by the Programme Approval Group. Written STSEC minutes should clearly explain what has been endorsed at the STSEC.

STSEC meetings should be scheduled in order to report their business effectively to FTSEC and PAG meetings.

There are three FTSEC meetings each year (see page 23):
- Semester 1: October 2016
- Semester 2: March and June 2017

PAG meetings are normally arranged at the Faculty-level and the schedule is confirmed at the start of each session. However, interdisciplinary and ad hoc PAG meetings can be scheduled as business requires during the session. Please liaise with your QAT faculty contact to discuss PAG business and deadlines.

STSEC business
A number of items need to be routinely considered by STSECs each session (and some of these are then forwarded to FTSEC/PAG for approval or reporting, see the * key below).
Here is a list of such items which will be useful when preparing STSEC agendas:

1) Pre-sessional preparation: Confirm STSEC membership, identify and fill any gaps.
   Confirm with colleagues: the STSEC membership, schedule of meetings and business deadlines.

2) Semester 1 STSEC meetings:
   - STSEC Membership and Terms of Reference
   - Chair’s Action taken since the last meeting – detailed on appropriate report of STSEC business*
   - Responses to any external examiners reports*
   - Assessment Board minutes
   - Code of Practice on Assessment for 2016/17 (if not already approved)*
   - National Student Survey (NSS) and Programme Experience Survey (PES) results for the previous year
   - Any completed programme and module reviews (including reviews of collaborative provision)
   - Strategic Issues – consideration of any policies from FTSEC/TSEB
   - New modules**
   - New programmes**
   - Major programme amendments**
   - Module amendments***
   - Minor programme amendments****
   - Faculty Admissions Policies - both UG and PGT level*
   - Approval of any Internal Examiners for the forthcoming session*
   - External Examiner appointments
   - Student Staff Forum minutes
   - School Action Plan in response to feedback on the student experience (this will then be considered by a subgroup of FTSEC in December)*
3) **Semester 2 STSEC meetings**
   - Responses to any External Examiners reports*
   - Chair’s Action taken since the last meeting – detailed on appropriate report of STSEC business coversheet*
   - Strategic Issues – consideration of any policies from FTSEC/TSEB
   - New modules**
   - New programmes**
   - Major programme amendments**
   - Module amendments***
   - Minor programme amendments****
   - Identification of any remaining gaps for external examiners for the forthcoming session
   - Code of Practice on Assessment for 2017/18*
   - Student Staff Forum minutes
   - Annual School (Student Education) Review report

**Key**

*  **Items that need forwarding to your QA Team faculty contact**

**  QAT also require the final version of paperwork and a completed [PAG coversheet](#)

***  QAT also require a completed [Report of STSEC: module amendments](#) but do not need the full proposal paperwork.

****  QAT also require a completed [Report of STSEC: minor programme amendments](#) but do not need the full proposal paperwork.
Approval and communication of module and programme business

School Taught Student Education Committee (STSEC) minutes should be sent to your Quality Assurance Team faculty contact as soon as possible after the meeting (and noted as 'unconfirmed' or 'draft' if necessary).

Material to submit to QAT (alongside the STSEC minutes):

1) Module business
See guidance on taught module approval: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/modules
And forms at: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/qaforms

a) **New modules**: are approved by the Programme Approval Group (PAG). Please submit the completed module proposal form (as endorsed by STSEC) and a PAG coversheet to explain the proposal(s).

b) **Amended modules**: are approved by the STSEC and reported to the Faculty Taught Student Education Committee (FTSEC) using the Report of STSEC: module amendments form. The completed form must state the session in which the module amendment will take effect and include a rationale for why. The FTSEC does not require the full proposal paperwork.

c) **Withdrawn modules**: are approved by the STSEC and reported to the FTSEC using the Report of STSEC: module amendments form. The completed form must state the session from which the module withdrawal will take effect and include a rationale for why. The FTSEC does not require the full proposal paperwork.

d) **Suspended modules**: are approved by the STSEC and reported to the FTSEC using the Report of STSEC: module amendments form. The completed form must state the session in which the module will be suspended and a rationale for why.

2) Programme business
See guidance on taught programme approval: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/approval
And the programme proposal forms: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/programmeproposalforms

a) **Approval for a new programme**:
The completed programme proposal form (as approved by the School TSEC and with the required signatures of the Head of School and Faculty Dean) is submitted to a Programme Approval Group (PAG). Any new modules that form part of the programme can also be submitted at this point or they can come to a Quality Check for approval at a later date (the Quality Check must take place at least 6 months before the programme commences). The external review report on the programme and a response from the School is also required. All of this information must be submitted alongside a PAG coversheet to explain the proposals. See: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/programmeapproval

b) **Major amendment to an existing programme**:
*Major programme amendments involve changes to the structure of a programme which have the potential to impact on the programme level learning outcomes and the programme. See: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/majorprogrammeamendment*  
After endorsement at School level, the following need providing for the PAG to consider: The amended programme specification (either as a catalogue report or amended programme proposal form); any new or amended modules that form part of the revised programme proposal; and an external review and appropriate response from the School.

c) **Minor amendment to an existing programme**:
Minor programme amendments are approved by the STSEC and reported to the FTSEC using the Report of STSEC: minor programme amendments form. The completed form must include
a rationale for the changes, state the session in which they will take effect, and whether existing students on the programme will be affected by the change. The FTSEC does not require the full proposal paperwork.

d) **Programme withdrawals:**
Programme withdrawals are approved by the PAG following recommendation from STSEC. Submit a completed programme withdrawal form, indicating the session of the last cohort entry to the programme. See: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/programmewithdrawal](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/programmewithdrawal)

e) **Programme suspensions:**
Submit a completed programme suspension form (same form as programme withdrawal form) for consideration by the PAG: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/programmewithdrawal](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/programmewithdrawal)

f) **Programme title changes:**
Programme title changes are considered a ‘major amendment’ if they reflect changes to the programme content/learning outcomes. They are considered minor if they are for marketing purposes only. Please seek advice on individual proposals from your QAT faculty contact and faculty marketing manager.

g) **Study Abroad Arrangements:**
Any new arrangement for study abroad with a partner institution should be developed in consultation with the Study Abroad Office and submitted to the PAG. If the proposed student exchange is with a new institution, a Partner Report also needs completing. Further guidance can be found on the Study Abroad website. (See page 35 for further information)

h) **New Collaborative Arrangements / Articulation Arrangements:**
Any discussions on the proposed development of new or amended collaborative activity should be noted in STSEC minutes. The relevant forms then need to be completed – liaise with your QA faculty contact as appropriate. Forms (alongside a completed PAG coversheet) should then be submitted to the PAG for approval, and onward submission to the Collaborations and Partnerships Committee. (See page 36 for further information).

i) **Ad hoc programme variations:**
Set out how the proposed revised programme will be structured and how it will allow the student(s) to meet the programme learning outcomes. Submit this information to your QAT faculty contact who will seek approval from the relevant Pro-Dean or PAG. See: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/adpersonamadhoc](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/adpersonamadhoc)

j) **Ad personam programme variations:**
Complete the form requesting approval of an ad personam programme variation. Email it to the Examinations Team in Student Operations, who will take forward the request with the appropriate Pro-Dean (Student Education). See: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/adpersonamadhoc](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/adpersonamadhoc)
New and Amended Programmes: proposal by the School

For each proposed award (including, separately, for each fallback/intermediate award and any proposed variants), the proposing School is responsible for ensuring that:

- learning outcomes are specific; meaningful; achievable; relevant to the subject matter of the programme; at the appropriate level for each award; and clearly differentiated between all intermediate/fallback awards and variants;
- the programme is supported by the research strengths of the School and the curriculum is informed by recent scholarship and research;
- all of the documentation comprising the programme proposal is complete, including the full module proposals for any associated new modules;
- the programme meets the requirements of the Leeds Curriculum;
- for a new programme or any amendment that significantly changes the structure of a programme, an external review has been obtained and the proposal includes the review and any necessary response;
- for an amended programme, a written explanation and rationale for the change is provided;
- there has been consultation with any other School/Department whose modules form part of core or optional elements of a programme or where there is significant disciplinary overlap (especially in relation to programme/module titles);
- all fields in the programme catalogue are correctly completed with meaningful and accurate data, free from spelling or grammatical errors, and appropriate for a student audience;
- a named Programme Leader has been identified and nominated;
- the proposal has been endorsed and signed by the Head of School and (for new programmes or significant amendments) the Dean of the Faculty;
- the proposal is explicitly endorsed by STSEC, with the minutes listing each proposed/amended award/fallback/variant separately.

The role of ensuring that each of these elements is in place may be delegated to subgroups and/or to professional staff; but in endorsing the proposal, the STSEC warrants that these checks have taken place and that the proposal is academically sound and administratively complete.

New and Amended Modules: proposal by the School

For each module, the proposing School is responsible for ensuring that:

- learning outcomes are specific; meaningful; achievable; relevant to the subject matter of the module; at the appropriate level; and unique to this module;
- the teaching and resources will enable students to meet the learning outcomes;
- the form of assessment will enable students to demonstrate whether they have met the learning outcomes;
- all of the documentation comprising the module proposal is complete;
- for an amended module, a written explanation and rationale for the change is provided;
- all fields in the module catalogue report are correctly completed with meaningful and accurate data, free from spelling or grammatical errors and appropriate for a student audience;
- a named Module Leader has been identified and nominated;
- the proposal has been endorsed and signed by the Head of School and (for new programmes or significant amendments) the Dean of the Faculty;
- the proposal is explicitly endorsed by STSEC with the minutes listing each module code/title separately.

The role of ensuring that each of these elements is in place may be delegated to subgroups and/or to professional staff, but in endorsing the proposal, the STSEC warrants that these checks have taken place and that the proposal is academically sound and administratively complete.
Examples of minor programme amendments include:

1. Change to a programme title (when the change is for marketing purposes and does not reflect any changes to programme content, structure or learning outcomes. In these instances the advice of the Faculty’s Marketing Manager should be sought and the title change agreed with the Dean of the relevant Faculty.)
2. Adding or removing optional modules (when these amount to less than 30% of the credit weighting for any one year)

Please note that proposed changes to programmes of study on which students are currently registered (i.e., changes to be introduced for existing as opposed to future cohorts) require the consent of those students registered on the programme. Read more in major programme amendments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme title and code (include all variants/fallback awards/titles)</th>
<th>With effect from e.g. 2017/18</th>
<th>Include a brief description of the amendment</th>
<th>JH – co-teaching Schools advised? Y/N</th>
<th>Catalogue updated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT OF STSEC BUSINESS FOR FTSEC

MODULE AMENDMENTS*

School of [XXX]

[Date of School TSEC meeting or Chair's Action]

Schools should consider the following when making changes to modules:

1. Does the change impact on progression/award requirements (e.g. compulsory modules, Pass for Progression)?
2. Could the change affect any collaboration or accreditation conditions?
3. Do the module changes impact on a programme in such a way that a major programme change is required (e.g. affect programme level learning outcomes)? If so, a programme amendment will need to be considered by the relevant Programme Approval Group.
4. Do the changes need communicating to other schools? (particularly relevant to optional and discovery modules)
5. Have discussions taken place with co-teaching schools where necessary? (particularly relevant to Joint Honours programmes)
6. For discovery modules (previously electives), have relevant Discovery Theme Leader(s) been notified that a module in their Theme is being removed? (please email strandleaders@lists.leeds.ac.uk)
7. For operational reasons, any change to a module title requires a new module code to be assigned (and the old module code withdrawn).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module title and code</th>
<th>With effect from e.g. 2017/18</th>
<th>Include a brief description of the amendment</th>
<th>C/O/D¹</th>
<th>JH²</th>
<th>Catalogue updated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ State if the module if Compulsory/Optional/Discovery
² State if the module is included in a Joint Honours programme(s) and if the co-teaching school has been consulted

* Module amendments that affect credit weighting, level or have substantive changes to the module learning outcomes require a new module to be proposed and the existing module to be permanently withdrawn. Speak to your QAT Faculty contact for further information.

QAT/July 2016
Programme Approval Group (PAG)

**Terms of Reference**

1. To consider the approval of:
   
   i) new taught programmes of study
   ii) major amendments to taught programmes of study
   iii) new modules

2. To ensure that new and amended programmes of study:
   
   i) comply with the principles of the Leeds Curriculum
   ii) provide an appropriate developmental learning experience and that each level of study complies with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)
   iii) have learning outcomes appropriately aligned to the assessment methodology
   iv) comply with any relevant benchmark statement/s
   v) have been appropriately informed by the views of an external subject specialist
   vi) are appropriately resourced
   vii) have market viability
   viii) comply with any additional policy requirements (e.g., for collaborative, flexible and distributed learning, study abroad, placement, professionally accredited programmes of study etc.)

3. To ensure that new modules:
   
   i) provide an appropriate developmental learning experience
   ii) are at an appropriate level in relation to the FHEQ
   iii) have learning outcomes appropriately aligned to the assessment methodology
   iv) are appropriately aligned to a discovery theme (for discovery modules)
   v) are appropriate resourced

**Constitution:**

The Pro Dean Student Education or Nominee (Chair)
A representative of the Quality Assurance Team (Secretary)
The Directors of Student Education within the Faculty
The Faculty Education Service Manager and the Faculty QA Function Lead
The Faculty Finance Manager
The Faculty Marketing Manager
An academic representative external to the Faculty
A student representative
Co-opted members (to be agreed on a meeting by meeting basis depending upon the nature of the proposals presented)

(The consideration of inter-Faculty proposals will be undertaken by a Group specifically convened for the purpose, the constitution of which to be agreed by the relevant Pro Deans for Student Education).

**Reporting:**
Recommendations will be forwarded to the Portfolio Steering Group for endorsement, and reported to Faculty Taught Student Education Committee/s for information.
New modules: oversight by PAG
For each proposed new module the PAG will ensure that:

- the module has been discussed and recommended for approval by the relevant STSEC;
- the learning outcomes are at the appropriate level for each module and are commensurate with those for other modules at this level within cognate disciplines;
- the proposed forms of assessment will enable students to demonstrate whether they have met the learning outcomes;
- the proposed forms of assessment are commensurate with those for other modules at this level within cognate disciplines.

New programmes and major programme amendments: oversight by PAG

- For each proposed award (including, separately, for each intermediate award), the PAG will ensure that:
  - the programme fits with the strategic interests and academic vision for the Faculty;
  - the programme has been discussed and recommended for approval by the relevant STSEC;
  - the programme proposal is complete, including all required elements, in particular endorsement from the Head of School, Dean of the Faculty and an external review;
  - the learning outcomes are at the appropriate level for each award and are commensurate with those for other awards at this level within cognate disciplines.
  - the programme structure is coherent and will allow the learning outcomes to be met.
PROGRAMME APPROVAL GROUP (PAG) COVERSHEET

New programmes/major programme amendments*

New modules

School of [XXX]  
[Date]

For major programme amendments include details of any affected variant/fallback awards. Explain if the change impacts on progression/award requirements (e.g. compulsory modules, Pass for Progression) or if the change could affect any collaboration or accreditation conditions. For Joint Honours programmes you will also need to consult with the co-teaching school on the proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme title and code/ module title and code</th>
<th>Session implemented e.g. 2017/18</th>
<th>New/ Amended</th>
<th>For major programme amendments, include a brief description/rationale. Also explain any implications for progression/award requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation from the School Taught Student Education Committee

Date discussed at/recommended by STSEC

For Chair’s Action, state “Chair’s Action” and insert the date when the Chair’s Action will be reported to STSEC.

* See definitions of major/minor amendments overleaf
**Major Programme Amendments** are those that involve changes to the structure of a programme which have the potential to impact on the programme level learning outcomes and the programme title, i.e:

1. Any changes to the structure of the programme via the removal and/or addition of compulsory modules

2. The withdrawal, addition or re-designation of optional modules as co-requisites or pre-requisites (where such changes impact on a substantial number of optional modules - equating to 30% or more of the credit weighting for any single year of study, for example 40 credits at undergraduate or 60 credits at postgraduate level)

3. Changes to the programme title and/or award, where this reflects changes to programme content

4. Significant changes to the mode of delivery (e.g., via introduction of a Flexible and Distributed Learning mode or an alternative programme delivery location)

In the light of any such changes careful consideration must be given to a **potential impact on the learning outcomes and the title of the programme**, and whether these should be revised in the light of the changes proposed. All such major programme amendments will require an external review and are to be considered by the relevant Programme Approval Group. The Programme Approval Group also has responsibility for the consideration of all new modules.

All other programme and module changes are to be considered and approved by the relevant School Taught Student Education Committee/s and reported to FTSEC. Examples include:

1. Change to a programme title (when the change is for marketing purposes and does not reflect any changes to programme content, structure or learning outcomes. In these instances the advice of the Faculty’s Marketing Manager should be sought and the title change agreed with the Dean of the relevant Faculty.)

2. Adding or removing optional modules (when these amount to less than 30% of the credit weighting for any one year).

Read more in [major programme amendment](#)

---

1 Replacement compulsory modules, where these do not impact on programme level learning outcomes are not included.
Quality Check

A Quality Check for each new programme is undertaken at least 6 months before the programme commences, to ensure that all elements of the programme are complete and deliverable. The Quality Check is normally completed by the appropriate Programme Approval Group (PAG) when it considers any new constituent modules on the programme.

The Check involves consideration of the original programme proposal and all the modules contributing to the programme. It provides the opportunity to discuss the management of the programme and operational considerations, particularly arrangements for more ‘complex’ programmes involving collaborative provision, study abroad or placement arrangements.

http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/qualitycheck

Quality Checklist

At the Quality Check the following ‘Quality Checklist’ will be considered to agree the points set out below (as appropriate):

a) Review of Programme documentation, including module specifications, to confirm:
   1. The full programme content
   2. Any issues raised via PAG deliberations have been addressed
   3. Any issues raised by the external review have been addressed
   4. The appropriateness of learning outcomes at all exit award levels
   5. The appropriateness of assessment strategies (clearly aligned to programme learning outcomes)
   6. The appropriateness of the approach taken to the Leeds Curriculum (Broadening, Research Based Learning, Core Programme Threads)
   7. Confirmation of adherence to any relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statements
   8. Confirmation of adherence to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)
   9. Confirmation of status in relation to professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRB) accreditation
   10. Review of progress in relation to development of learning materials/objects

b) To confirm programme management arrangements:
   1. Confirmation of Programme Manager
   2. Confirmation of school programme management structure and arrangements for review
   3. Confirmation of supervision arrangements for the Final Year Project
   4. Confirmation of arrangements for personal tutoring
   5. Confirmation of assessment board arrangements
   6. Confirmation of external examiner arrangements
   7. Confirmation of operational arrangements (SES support)
   8. Cross-institutional programmes including joint honours

c) For programmes including a semester or year abroad
   1. Confirmation of language training, how language competence will be assessed and details of action to be taken when competence is insufficient
   2. Confirmation of the courses to be taken abroad and indications, using European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) credits, of how the work is commensurate with the credit rating assigned to the period abroad
   3. Confirmation of assessment and use in classification of work abroad and, where appropriate, equivalence of marking scales
   4. Confirmation of management arrangements for the exchange
   5. Confirmation of support arrangements provided for students at the exchange institution
d) For programmes including a placement:
   1. Confirmation of arrangements for the identification and allocation of placement activity
   2. Confirmation of management arrangements for the placement activity
   3. Confirmation of arrangements for the assessment of placement activity
   4. Confirmation of support arrangements provided for students on placements (referencing specified expectations)
FACULTY TAUGHT STUDENT EDUCATION COMMITTEES

Terms of Reference 2016-17

1. To encourage and disseminate good practice, innovation and flexibility of delivery in the student experience, learning, teaching and assessment and liaison with external bodies;

2. To encourage appropriate academic developments in the Faculty and ensure alignment with institutional strategic priorities;

3. To consider, and report as necessary to the Faculty Management Team, on strategic developments in student education across the Faculty and in relation to its work with other faculties, referring issues with resource implications;

4. To contribute to the development of institutional policy and procedures relating to student education and to monitor compliance with existing policy and procedures, reporting and making recommendations to the Taught Student Education Board as appropriate;

5. To encourage and disseminate good practice in quality assurance and the maintenance of academic standards, monitoring the operation of processes through review mechanisms including Annual School Review (Student Education) meetings and Student Academic Experience Reviews;

6. To seek opportunities to implement strategies underpinning the approach to student education within the Faculty, considering and monitoring reports and action plans from the Faculty’s Blended Learning, Internationalisation and Employability and other relevant working groups;

7. To oversee the implementation of the Leeds Curriculum within the Faculty;

8. To monitor the Faculty’s recruitment and admissions activity, via reports from the Faculty Recruitment Group;

9. To monitor the development of the Faculty’s taught student education portfolio via reports from the Faculty Portfolio Group;

10. To monitor the Faculty’s oversight and operation of assessment processes via reports from the Faculty’s Assessment and Standards Group;

11. To consider and respond to issues raised by student representatives.

Constitution

Pro-Dean (Chair)

Chairs of the School Taught Student Education Committees in a federal faculty or their equivalents in a unitary faculty

LUU School student representatives

2 cross faculty representatives

Up to 6 co-opted members

Library Learning Advisor for the Faculty

Faculty Education Service Manager (and other appropriate SES representation)

Faculty QA Functional Lead
# Taught Student Education Committees: 2016/17

## Faculty Taught Student Education Committee (FTSEC) meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty FTSEC</th>
<th>LUBS FTSEC</th>
<th>Medicine &amp; Health FTSEC</th>
<th>Mathematics and Physical Sciences FTSEC</th>
<th>Environment FTSEC</th>
<th>Engineering FTSEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Humanities &amp; Cultures FTSEC</td>
<td>Tues 18 October 2016 2.05pm</td>
<td>Tues 18 October 2016 10.05am</td>
<td>Thurs 20 October 2016 2.05pm</td>
<td>Fri 21 October 2016 10.05am</td>
<td>Thurs 20 October 2016 1.05pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUBS FTSEC</td>
<td>Tues 7 March 2017 2.05pm</td>
<td>Tues 7 March 2017 10.05am</td>
<td>Thurs 9 March 2017 2.05pm</td>
<td>Fri 10 March 2017 10.05am</td>
<td>Thurs 9 March 2017 1.05pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Health FTSEC</td>
<td>Tues 6 June 2017 2.05pm</td>
<td>Tues 6 June 2017 10.05am</td>
<td>Thurs 8 June 2017 2.05pm</td>
<td>Fri 9 June 2017 10.05am</td>
<td>Thurs 8 June 2017 1.05pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Physical Sciences FTSEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment FTSEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering FTSEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Social Sciences &amp; Law FTSEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Institution TSEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Taught Student Education Board (TSEB) and Steering Group meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taught Student Education Board</th>
<th>Portfolio Steering Group</th>
<th>Standards Steering Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taught Student Education Board</td>
<td>Portfolio Steering Group</td>
<td>Standards Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 5 October 2016 2.05pm</td>
<td>Wed 26 October 2016 9.00am</td>
<td>Tue 29 Nov 2016 2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 8 February 2017 2.05pm</td>
<td>Thu 10 January 2017 3.00pm</td>
<td>Wed 1 March 2017 9.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 3 May 2017 2.05pm</td>
<td>Mon 3 April 2017 3.00pm</td>
<td>Wed 10 May 2017 9.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 28 June 2017 2.05pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Action Plan

Schools are required to produce an Action Plan each year in response to feedback on the student experience. The purpose of this is to identify the key actions which will be undertaken to address the feedback provided by your students via surveys and other sources (e.g. module surveys, discussions at Student Staff Forums, comments by External Examiners). School Action Plans should close the loop on student feedback so that students can see what is happening as a result of their feedback.

Your School Action Plan should build on the plan agreed in the previous year and could be an updated version. Action Plans will be published on the ‘Responding to your Feedback’ website: http://students.leeds.ac.uk/feedback

Process

- In September, the QA Team circulates Action Plan templates to Schools that are populated with National Student Survey and Programme Experience Survey data. Schools then review their previous action plan and survey results at a Student Staff Forum and agree the updates which arise from survey results, feedback etc.

- The School TSEC considers/approves the Action Plan in October/November and forwards it to Faculty for final approval in December. Once approved at Faculty level the Action Plans are published on the University website (http://students.leeds.ac.uk/feedback).

- Schools should refer to their Action Plan throughout the session and particularly at Student Staff Forum meetings. The Action Plan should be considered a living document and updated accordingly to record progress against action points during the session.
Programme Review

POLICY:
The University requires schools to undertake an annual review of every programme.
http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/programmereview
http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/gaforms

Process

- Programme Reviews should be completed by: 9 January 2017.
- A programme review form is available for Schools to use for this purpose. The form includes both statistical information and analysis of feedback from a variety of sources. Schools may use more comprehensive/detailed report forms, provided the minimum information contained in this template is included.
- Good practice in programme review is for Schools to hold a formal meeting with all teaching staff on the programme and representatives from the student body where all of the review information is considered.

The programme review must consider:

- the standard programme data set, which will be distributed by the Quality Assurance Team. This includes: student progression and achievement data, and the programme-level information for the Key Information Set (KIS). Please note that Qlikview users can generate the progression data themselves using ProgRevQ;
- student evaluations through the programme survey and NSS;
- external examiners’ comments;
- Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) reports (where relevant);
- issues identified through module review which impact upon the programme.

Requirement

Any programmes which are new or which have been significantly amended since the previous review was conducted, any programmes which receive critical external examiners’ reports, and any programmes which attract student evaluation scores below the acceptable minimum will be deemed to pose a higher risk and therefore will need to be considered in greater detail. It is the responsibility of the Head of School and the Director of Student Education to ensure that any programmes identified as posing a higher risk according to such criteria are given particular attention.

For programmes taught in collaboration, or that are subject to articulation arrangements, there is an additional annex to complete.

Action points need to be identified – these should be brief and informed by the full range of data available to the Module Team. E.g. the National Student Survey (NSS), Programme Experience Survey (PES); student achievement statistics; Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body reports; mid-module surveys and reviews; external examiners’ comments; and Student Academic Experience Review (SAER) and Annual School Review (ASR) reports.

Reporting

Programme reviews should be considered by the STSEC and the outcomes publicised to students through the Student Staff Forum and the VLE or subsequent year’s programme handbook. The outcomes of the programme review process also provide the evidence base for discussion of the School’s portfolio at the Annual School Review (Student Education).
Module Review

POLICY:
A review must be conducted for every module following its delivery and this must be informed by a student evaluation survey that meets the University’s minimum requirements.

Module Review (UG and PGT):
http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/modulereview
http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/qaforms

---

Requirement
The review must include consideration of:

- the standard module data set as held in Banner;
- the collated student evaluation results;
- external examiner comments (where relevant);
- the need for improvement or enhancement.

An essential element of any module review is the evaluation contributed by students. The University has agreed minimum requirements for module evaluation surveys including a set of seven core questions which must be included. For modules which the survey shows less than 80% of respondents are mostly satisfied (i.e. respond ‘mostly agree’ or ‘definitely agree’) in any one of the three ‘gold measure’ questions¹, or where the student academic performance is below expectation, or differs significantly from previous years, the issue must be evaluated in depth in the Module Leader’s commentary. If these criteria are satisfied and there are no other issues requiring explanation then the Module Leader’s commentary may be briefer.

The precise arrangements for review at module level are the responsibility of the School.

Action points need to be identified – these should be brief and informed by the full range of data available to the Module Team. E.g. the National Student Survey (NSS), Programme Experience Survey (PES); student achievement statistics; Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body reports; mid-module surveys and reviews; external examiners’ comments; and Student Academic Experience Review (SAER) and Annual School Review (ASR) reports.

Reporting
Module reviews should be considered by the STSEC (or an appropriate sub-committee reporting to the STSEC) and the outcomes publicised to students through the Student Staff Forum and the VLE or subsequent year’s module handbook. The outcomes of the module review process provide the evidence base for subsequent programme review.

---

¹ The three ‘gold measure’ questions are: “Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of the module”; “The teaching on this module was of a high standard”; and “The module content was intellectually stimulating”.
Annual School Review (Student Education)

POLICY:
An Annual School Review (Student Education) will take place for all Schools every year unless a Student Academic Experience Review (SAER) is scheduled in that academic session.

http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/annualschoolreview

Annual School Reviews are an annual audit by the FTSEC with the purpose of:
- monitoring each constituent school’s engagement with rolling review processes and compliance with University Quality Assurance and Quality Enhancement procedures;
- discussing school engagement with key strategic enhancement priorities;
- providing a formal opportunity for the senior team to discuss taught student education matters including the programme portfolio and the efficacy of the response to student feedback;
- providing an annual opportunity to reflect on risks and weaknesses, identifying action to be taken forward where necessary;
- providing an opportunity to identify good practice worthy of wider dissemination;
- generating information and data to feed into the Integrated Planning Exercise (IPE) discussions.

The Annual School Reviews takes the form of a two-hour meeting, taking place within the School with representatives from the FTSEC, informed by a document audit undertaken by the Quality Assurance Team.

Reporting
A brief report of the meeting will be prepared by QA Team and forwarded to all representatives for comment before being reported to FTSEC and Faculty Executive Committee (FEC).

The Head of School and DSE are responsible for follow-up action within the School, whilst FTSEC and FEC are responsible for ensuring that actions have been followed up.

Attendance
Attendees from the School will include the Head of School, DSE, School Education Service Manager (SESM) other senior school staff as appropriate, and student representation. The team will include the Pro Dean, Faculty Education Service Manager (FESM) and representation from the Faculty from outside the School.

Agenda for 2016-17
The meetings will follow a common agenda, which includes discussion of:
- The previous Annual School Review report or Student Academic Experience Review report and progress against actions identified (a School formal written response should be provided against recommendations arising from SAERs).
- Progress against actions identified in the current School Action Plan.
- The School Taught Student Education Dataset.
- Consideration of School Programme Portfolio.
- Identification of agreed actions, good practice examples and identified risks.

There will also be the opportunity to discuss other matters of relevance to an individual School/Faculty.

The QA Team will provide documentation for the Annual School Review (Student Education) meeting.
Student Academic Experience Review (SAER)

**POLICY:**
Student Academic Experience Review provides the opportunity for a regular strategic overview of the entirety of a school’s student education activity. It is the principal means by which the University assures itself of the efficacy and robustness of each school’s quality assurance procedures and continued enhancement of the quality of the student experience. Every school/unit in the University will be reviewed over a 6-year cycle. The review also provides the opportunity to re-approve all taught (undergraduate and postgraduate) provision.

(Please note that review of research supervision is a separate activity and does not form part of the SAER).

Full details can be found at: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/SAER](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/SAER)

---

**Process**

- Each Student Academic Experience Review takes place over two days and is undertaken by a team from the Faculty together with an external team member (a subject specialist from another University), a cross faculty member, and representatives of the student body.

- The SAER will consider a reflective account (Self-Evaluation Document) produced by the School of its internal quality management processes. It also includes a consideration of school minutes, staff and student handbooks, module/programme reviews, and statistical information. The Review includes meetings with staff and students across the two days.

- A report of the review is produced and the School will be asked to respond to the report by producing an action plan to address any issues identified. The action plan will be considered by the Faculty Taught Student Education Committee (FTSEC) and the School's progress in meeting its objectives monitored. A follow up meeting will take place within 12 months of the receipt of the report, at the School’s Annual School Review (Student Education) meeting.
### Student Academic Experience Review (SAER) schedule: 2016 – 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Year 1 2016-17</th>
<th>Year 2 2017-18</th>
<th>Year 3 2018-19</th>
<th>Year 4 2019-20</th>
<th>Year 5 2020-21</th>
<th>Year 6 2021-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS, HUMANITIES &amp; CULTURES</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Ethics Applied (IDEA) Centre</td>
<td>Languages, Cultures &amp; Societies</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Philosophy, Religion &amp; History of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance &amp; Cultural Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Media and Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAHACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Molecular and Cellular Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSS INSTITUTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lifelong Learning Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION, SOCIAL SCIENCES &amp; LAW</td>
<td>Sociology &amp; Social Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Politics &amp; International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>Electronic &amp; Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Chemical &amp; Process Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Institute for Transport Studies</td>
<td>Earth &amp; Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LUBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHEMATICS &amp; PHYSICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Food Science and Nutrition</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE &amp; HEALTH</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leeds Dental Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Study Abroad Partnerships

POLICY:
The University has a process for regular review of institution-wide and School-based study abroad/Horizon year arrangements with its partner institutions. This provides the opportunity for discussion and approval of arrangements by the School Taught Student Education Committee.

The Collaborations and Partnerships Committee oversees arrangements for the review of School-based and institution-wide partners every six years, in line with the cycle of School Academic Experience Reviews (SAERs).

Guidance
The University sets out expectations for student support for those students on Study Abroad and Work Placements. This includes guidance for ensuring that the student experience is monitored and that any issues are identified and resolved on an ongoing basis.
See: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/placementstudyabroadsupport

Process
The reviews of study abroad arrangements should consider whether the exchange is balanced in terms of student numbers and continues to be in the strategic interest of the School and the University as a whole. Specifically, the review for School exchange arrangements should seek to establish:

- whether the provision and the partnership remains appropriate at the subject level;
- whether the partnership is active in terms of incoming and outgoing student numbers;
- the appropriateness of student support arrangements, based on student feedback;
- any impacts on student achievement, with reference to Pass/Fail information; and
- any action points informed by student feedback, staff experience of operating the exchange, and/or student achievement.

The cycle of review for School partnership arrangements will be prompted by the Quality Assurance Team, as part of the cycle of Student Academic Experience Reviews (SAER), based on a list of on-going partnerships provided by the Study Abroad Office. Reviews should:

- be led by the Director Student Education with support from the School’s Study Abroad Coordinator;
- use a template which includes questions as the basis for the review (provided by the Quality Assurance Team);
- be submitted for STSEC consideration and recommendation on whether to continue or withdraw the arrangement;
- be forwarded by the Quality Assurance Team for consideration by a group of representatives from the Study Abroad Office, Quality Assurance Team and other academic colleagues; and
- be forwarded by the Quality Assurance Team to the Collaborations and Partnerships Committee for decision and subsequent endorsement by Taught Student Education Board.
Internal Examiner Appointments

**POLICY:**
Every taught credit-bearing module must have an Internal Examiner, an identified individual who takes responsibility for the assessment on each module and for the marks awarded. This is usually the module leader, a contracted member of academic staff, who is automatically appointed to the role of internal examiner. Exceptionally, Schools may appoint another individual to act as an internal examiner, following the guidance available on the Quality Assurance Team website.

Internal Examiners must be appropriately qualified and experienced to take responsibility for marks awarded. They may not be current students. (Current research students may instead hold appointments as assessment assistants).

See: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/internalexaminers](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/internalexaminers)

---

**Process**
- Recommendations for the appointment of Internal Examiners will be made by STSECs each year to the FTSEC. A brief academic CV or statement of the proposed internal examiner’s role in and/or relationship to the examining duties concerned should be attached. Appointments will be considered by the Pro Dean for Student Education (FTSEC Chair) for the Faculty.

- Only CVs for new appointments need to be submitted. Nominations approved the previous session only need to be noted on the pro-forma unless there has been a significant change in circumstances.

- The pro-forma for nominating Internal Examiners is available for Schools to complete at: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/internalexaminers](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/internalexaminers)

**Assessment Assistants** are individuals who are not appointed as internal examiners, but who work under the supervision of the internal examiner to assist with the assessment of students’ work. The internal examiner remains responsible for the marks awarded and assessment assistants are only permitted under defined circumstances.

The arrangements for appointing, training and supervising assessment assistants are dealt with at the School level, and are the responsibility of the Head of School. A complete, detailed and up-to-date record of such appointments, and training received, must always be maintained by the School. For more information, see: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/assessmentassistants](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/assessmentassistants)
Appointment and Reappointment of External Examiners

POLICY:
External Examiners are an essential part of the University's quality assurance mechanism and must be appointed to all approved programmes. The role of the external examiner is to provide assurance to the University that its assessment system is fair and operated equitably and to ensure comparability of the University's standards with those in peer institutions. Full details can be found at: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/externalexaminers

Process
- Heads of Schools / Departments submit nominations for the appointment of External Examiners to the QA Team who will present the case to the Pro Dean for Student Education of the relevant FTSEC for approval on behalf of the University.
- The nomination should be submitted on the appropriate form and be accompanied by a detailed CV for the person nominated.
- Letters of Appointments are sent by QA Team to the External Examiner and a copy is forwarded to the School.
- The Director of Student Education needs to ensure that all programmes are covered by an external examiner and will be requested to confirm by November of each academic session whether the School intends to appoint any new external examiners.

The following guidance and forms are available at http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/externalexaminers:

Guidance
- Appointment of External Examiners
- External Examiner Handbook
- Details of payment fees and travel expenses
- Guidance on material to be sent to External Examiners

Forms
- Nomination form
- Request to amend duties form
- Extension to appointment form
- External Examiner's report form
Responses to External Examiner Reports

**POLICY:**
Each External Examiner must receive a formal School response to their report. School responses must be endorsed by the Faculty Pro-Dean for Student Education prior to dispatch.

---

**Process for 2016-17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July – August 2016</td>
<td>UG external examiner reports to be received in the Quality Assurance Team (QAT) (no later than 6 weeks after the date of the Exam Board meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 2 September 2016</td>
<td>Reminder emails/letters issued by QAT to <strong>all</strong> UG external examiners who have not submitted a report. <strong>If Schools do not want a letter to be issued, they must inform the QAT by 2 September 2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 30 September 2016</td>
<td>Second and final formal reminder letter issued by QAT to <strong>all</strong> UG external examiners who have not submitted a report. <strong>If Schools do not want a letter to be issued, they must inform QAT by 30 September 2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 4 November 2016</td>
<td>All School responses to UG external examiners (endorsed by Pro-Dean) to be submitted to QAT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>All PG external examiner reports to be submitted to QAT (no later than 6 weeks after the date of the Exam Board meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 20 January 2017</td>
<td>Formal reminder letters issued by QAT to <strong>all</strong> PG external examiners who have not submitted a report. <strong>If Schools do not want a letter to be issued, they must inform QAT by Friday 20 January 2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10 February 2017</td>
<td>Second and final formal reminder letter issued by QAT to <strong>all</strong> PG external examiners who have not submitted a report. <strong>If Schools do not want a letter to be issued, they must inform QAT by 10 February 2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 17 March 2017</td>
<td>All School responses to PG external examiner reports to be submitted to QAT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*External Examiner reports/responses are considered at Student Academic Experience Reviews (SAERs). Annual School Review (Student Education) meetings also consider issues arising from External Examiner reports as appropriate.*

---

* If for example a School prefers to chase external examiner reports themselves or if there is a specific reason why a report will not be submitted/be submitted late.
Code of Practice on Assessment

POLICY:
Each School will have in place a Code of Practice on Assessment (CoPA) which is updated annually and approved each academic session at the Faculty level.

http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/copa

The University provides a template Code of Practice on Assessment which Schools must use to develop their own CoPA. The Code of Practice on Assessment should be considered annually by the School Taught Student Education Committee and Student Staff Forum, before being presented to an appropriate faculty level group (often a subgroup of FTSEC) for final approval before the start of the session.

The 2016/17 session CoPA template and School CoPAs are available to download (from SharePoint) via: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/copa
Approval of Study Abroad Arrangements

POLICY:
When a school wishes to enter into a new arrangement with an institution and implement a student exchange agreement for a year abroad, the details of the proposed school partnership must be considered by the School Taught Student Education Committee, and then submitted to the appropriate Programme Approval Group. Schools should ensure that any new exchange or fee paying study abroad agreement for outgoing students is developed in consultation with the Study Abroad Office.

The School must initially contact the Study Abroad Office (studyabroad@leeds.ac.uk) to find out if a link already exists with the proposed partner.

See http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/newexchange for more information including proposal forms.

Process
- All proposals for new or amended partnerships should be made on the proposal form for a new study abroad arrangement. If the proposal involves an institution which is not already a Leeds exchange partner, then the ‘Partner Report’ must also be completed and submitted to the committees. Advice and information on the general suitability of proposed partners can be sought from the Head of Study Abroad, Dr Clive Souter (ext. 31734, email d.c.souter@leeds.ac.uk).
- When a School wishes to enter into a new or amended arrangement with an institution for study abroad, the proposal must first be considered by the School Taught Student Education Committee (STSEC), and then be submitted to the appropriate Programme Approval Group (PAG).

Guidance
The committees will consider the proposal with regard to
1. the academic coherence of the programme;
2. the linguistic preparedness of outgoing students;
3. the likelihood of student demand in both directions such that the exchange will be balanced;
4. the suitability of the partner institution, including national and international ranking and professional accreditations, where relevant;
5. the student support arrangements, as described in the partner report.

The PAG membership may be supplemented by colleagues with particular expertise in Study Abroad or from the Study Abroad Office for the purpose of the consideration. The Quality Assurance Team arrange this representation in conjunction with the Collaboration and Partnerships Committee.

No arrangement can be implemented unless it has been approved in full by the Programme Approval Group and reported to the Head of Study Abroad, who will negotiate the formal legal agreement and arrange for the partnership to be advertised to students.

Please note that guidance is also provided for Schools that have students who are unsuccessful in meeting the learning requirements for their Study Year Abroad: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/studyabroadapproval
In order to fulfil its mission, the University encourages collaborations with partner organisations (including those overseas) to deliver University awards, provided this takes place within the defined framework.

The University expects proposals for new arrangements to originate from consideration of the student academic experience at the discipline level. It is the responsibility of the proposing School/Faculty to develop proposals, with support from the Quality Assurance Team and (for arrangements involving overseas partners) the International Office.

Collaborative provision presents financial, academic, ethical and reputational risks, and presents additional challenges to the maintenance of academic standards and quality. Therefore, there are requirements for approval and review over and above those for non-collaborative programmes. The Collaborations and Partnerships Committee has responsibility for overseeing, at the institutional level, collaborative arrangements with new and existing partners. Proposals for new arrangements are considered by the relevant Programme Approval Group, including representation from the Collaborations and Partnerships Committee.

Support and guidance for those wishing to propose a new collaboration can be obtained from a variety of sources:

a. The School Director of Taught Student Education and Faculty Pro Dean for Taught Student Education.

b. Approval process: Charlotte Armstrong, QA Team ext: 38206.

c. For international collaborations:
   i. The relevant Faculty International Director.
   ii. The International Office (support with arranging site visits, due diligence enquiries etc): Susan Hunter and Amy Brookes, International Office ext: 34080/34023

d. Legal Agreements: Adrian Slater, University Legal Adviser.

e. UEG and Council Approval: Melody Mellor, University Secretariat.

Full guidance and relevant forms can be found at: [http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/collaborativeapproval](http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/collaborativeapproval)
Accreditation

Schools are required to declare which of their programmes are accredited by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs), what the accreditation or inspection arrangements are, and inform the QA Team of amendments. The QA Team maintain a database of all accreditations across the institution.

Schools are required to provide the reports and any action plans arising from accreditation visits to enable the Faculty QA Functional lead to upload the documents to a central repository.

Reports from the PSRBs are considered through academic review processes.

The QA Team review accreditation reports and produce an annual report to the Taught Student Education Board (TSEB) outlining the institutional status of PSRB and accreditations, and highlighting any issues of institutional significance.

More details can be found in the University Policy on PSRBs and accreditation at: http://ses.leeds.ac.uk/accreditation

The QAT contact for accreditation and PSRBs is Izzy Whitehouse: i.j.whitehouse@leeds.ac.uk
# New programme checklist

**Checklist** – Submitting a new programme of Study

- ✔ Date when programme is to begin
- ✔ Name of External Reviewer
- ✔ The External Reviewer’s Report and any reply if required
- ✔ Confirmation whether a new external examiner is needed or not
- ✔ Programme aims included
- ✔ QAA Benchmark Statement

- ✔ Proposal signed by the HoS and Dean of the Faculty
- ✔ New module reports

**Consultation**

- ✔ Evidence of consultation with other Schools (if the programme includes compulsory / optional modules from another School)
- ✔ Name of Programme Leader
- ✔ Details given as to the committees responsible for considering the proposal and overseeing the assessment arrangements; consideration of module and programme reviews and external examiner reports.
- ✔ Details of any contributing Schools

**Programme details**

- ✔ Details of accreditation requirements
- ✔ Arrangements for any period of study abroad (term/ semester / year) including student support
- ✔ Arrangements for industrial placements including student support, monitoring of placements etc.
- ✔ Arrangements for clinical placements including student support
- ✔ Details of the arrangements for the provision of distance learning (teaching materials/handbooks/ student support arrangements)
- ✔ Details of field work
- ✔ Details of project work
- ✔ Learning outcomes – how assessment and feedback will achieve them.
- ✔ Compulsory Final Year Project (included in all UG programmes)
Research Based Learning (RBL) and Core Programme Threads (CPT) evidenced

Discovery Themes: programmes that can accommodate Discovery Themes should offer Discovery modules - 20 credits at two or more levels to enable progression through the Themes).

Broadening (programmes that do not allow students to take Discovery Modules should allow students to broaden across two or more levels)

Assessment and Classification

Arrangements for the classification of the year abroad
details as to which modules should be passed for progressions

Programme specifications

Specifications for intermediate programme awards
Specifications for programme variants (e.g. Industrial, International, Enterprise)