Annex B: Approval and Withdrawal of Research Programmes

1. This annex of the Code of Practice establishes the requirements and procedures for the approval of new research programmes of study where proposed by the University's Schools either unilaterally or in collaboration with partner organisations, or where new programmes are proposed by partner organisations themselves. The requirements and procedures are designed to ensure that all such programmes:
   - are consonant with University policy as set out in the Mission Statement and the University Plan and that, where relevant, School Plans will be financially viable
   - have appropriate aims and learning outcomes
   - have structure and content appropriate to the aims and learning outcomes
   - will have available human and physical resources such as will ensure achievement of aims and learning outcomes
   - do not present any non-justifiable disadvantage to students with disabilities
   - are attractive to students

The procedures which follow are based on the principle that detailed consideration of proposed new programmes of study is best undertaken by academic staff in cognate disciplines and by those with expertise in quality assurance and curricula development, and that the Graduate School Board, rather than considering proposals in detail, should be assured that proposals have received appropriate consideration by the relevant School and Faculty Committees and by the Programme Approval Subcommittee (PASC).

2. Stages of Approval

The programme approval procedure consists of several stages of consideration by University committees, each of which has areas of specific focus:

(i) Executive Group
(ii) School Graduate Studies Committee
(iii) Faculty Graduate Studies Committee
(iv) The Programme Approval Sub-committee of the Education Board and Graduate School Board.

2.1 Approval Deadline

The deadline for programmes to come forward for approval by PASC will be Meeting 4 scheduled for May/June each year. Therefore, for both new and major revisions to programmes, specifications must be approved by the Faculty in time for submission to PASC and no later than two weeks before the date of Meeting 4.

2.2 Submission to Executive Group

All new programmes, except in those cases where the proposing School certifies that the new programme is cognate to an existing programme and that it can be resourced from within the existing resources of the School, are to be considered in outline and approved in principle by the Executive Group before significant time is spent on their development. Where the proposing School or partner organisation certifies that the new programme is cognate to an existing programme and that it can be resourced from within the existing resources of the School/partner, the proposal should take the form outlined in 3 below.
The submission to the Executive Group, which should not normally be more than two pages, should be accompanied by a completed cover sheet, include a brief description of the proposed programme and address:

2.2.1 The relationship of the programme to the University's Mission and Plan and the School's Plan
2.2.2 How it is proposed that the programme will be resourced.
2.2.3 A business plan drawn up as per the template provided by the Finance Department should be included.
2.2.4 Any special resources, (e.g. staff, space, library, IT, learning technologies, training, timetable), and the implications of putting these in place. An estimate of likely student numbers compared with the existing programmes with any market research/surveys on which this is based.
2.2.5 A statement of which programmes, if any, will be withdrawn as a result of the new proposal.
2.2.6 Evidence of discussion/agreement with other Schools/subject areas which might be affected together with information about collaboration, partnership and/or potential competition.
2.2.7 Confirmation of appropriate supervisory expertise for the programme (i.e. a list of approved supervisory chairs may be appended).
2.2.8 Proposals for new collaborative programmes of study will only be considered where the collaborative partner has first successfully completed the process of institutional approval set out in Collaborative Provision: Policies and Procedures: Part 1. Specific proposals for new programmes will only be considered by the Executive Group where the partner organisation(s) concerned have already achieved ‘approved institution’ status. See section 12 below for more detail.
2.2.9 In preparing the submission, Schools will need to consult the Quality Assurance Office, the Curriculum Development Team (UELT) and, where necessary, the Student Planning Data Office, Finance, Admissions, and Communication and Development (for marketing advice).
2.2.10 The Executive Group will require commentary on each new proposal from the Quality Assurance Office, the Finance Department, the Dean of the relevant Faculty and the Graduate School.
2.2.11 In considering the outline proposal, the Executive Group will determine if it has sufficient information upon which to base a decision. If so, it may grant approval for the proposal to be developed in full and considered formally by the relevant School Graduate Studies Committee. Alternatively, further information may be requested, or the proposal rejected. The Faculties Support Office will report these decisions to the relevant Head(s) of School and other interested parties in the Faculty.

2.3 Additional guidance on the submission of outline proposals for new collaborative programmes of study is set out in section 15 below.

3 Submission to School Graduate Studies Committee

Following Executive Group approval of the outline proposal a detailed submission for the new programme should be drawn up by the School. Detailed proposals for new programmes, accompanied by a completed cover sheet, should include:

Note: The programme specification will subsequently be used as a source of basic information about the programme by students, potential students and internal and external reviewers. The list of approved Supervisory Chairs required at section 1.10 of the specification will constitute the list of staff initially approved to act as Supervisory Chairs for students registered on the programme, but should not be regarded as the definitive list. Additional Supervisory Chairs may be approved by the relevant Faculty, and Schools will be responsible for reviewing the ongoing suitability of Chairs of supervisory teams.

The specification will include:

3.1.1 Minimum/maximum student intake and source of funding (i.e. HEFCE or other).
3.1.2 The School which will hold responsibility for programme management.
3.1.3 Evidence of need and demand for the programme.
3.1.4 Implications for learning resources including staff, library, IT and space.
3.1.5 Where appropriate, how the programme reflects the requirements of professional or statutory bodies.

3.2 Where approval is sought for a programme of study which relies in whole or in part on practice as research, the School must additionally evidence its commitment, resources and expertise in the following areas:
   i) The distinct practices of practise as research within the School’s own subject.
   ii) Ongoing staff practise as research activity.
   iii) Student research training in the area of practise as research, to include sessions on the relationship between practice and theory, ways of ‘reading’ practise as research and the documentation of practise as research.

3.3 For a new programme which is not similar to an existing programme, a supporting statement from an external academic adviser (or advisers, if appropriate to the proposal) should be provided (see Appendix B), along with a response from the School to any issues raised.

The external adviser’s supporting statement might usefully comment on:

- Potential market for the programme;
- Is the programme subject area appropriate and set at the correct level?
- Does the programme reflect relevant sector needs or professional requirements (as applicable)?
- Any other areas of note considered appropriate by the external adviser.

3.4 Where such a submission was required, the outline proposal, business plan and all accompanying commentaries as indicated at 2.2 above, as submitted to and approved by Executive Group.

3.5 The relevant extract of the Student Voice Committee minutes that notes the student discussion of the proposed programme specification (see Annex M: Student Evaluation, section 5.7).

4 Where a proposed new programme of study involves input from another institution, a representative of that institution may be invited to attend School and Faculty meetings at which the proposal is subject to scrutiny.

5 All new programme proposals should be accompanied by a statement from the proposers that consideration has been given, in anticipation of the needs of students with
disabilities, to potential adjustments that may reasonably be required to the curricula content, modes of delivery and assessment methods.

6 Consideration of proposal by School Graduate Studies Committee

6.1 School Graduate Studies Committees should address the following matters when considering proposals:

- Fit with the School plan or strategy;
- That resources are in place, or budgeted for, to support the proposal, as per the outline proposal and business plan approved by the Executive Group;
- Adherence to any professional body requirements (subject related);
- Does the programme structure reflect the QAA guidance on Doctoral Degree Characteristics (see http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Doctoral_Characteristics.pdf)
- Does the programme reflect current research or other advanced scholarship carried out by academic staff in the School?
- The external adviser's supporting statement and the School's response to this.
- Where a proposal is amended in the light of comments received by an external adviser, a statement should be provided indicating the nature of such amendments;
- Any other matters considered appropriate by the Committee.

If it is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, the Committee may forward the proposal to the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee, together with the recommendation that the programme be approved.

6.2 The mechanism for submission is via the Faculties Support Office online programme and module approval system.

6.3 Additional guidance on the consideration by Schools of proposals for new collaborative programmes of study is set out in section 17 below.

7 Consideration of Proposal by Faculty Graduate Studies Committee

7.1 The Faculty Graduate Studies Committee should address the following matters when considering proposals (consideration will be via the online programme and module approval system):

- Any issues arising from the statement of the external academic adviser, where relevant, and the response of the School to this;
- Confirmation of appropriate progression throughout the stages of the programme;
- That criteria for alternative exit awards are detailed in the programme specification;
- Does the proposed programme reflect current research or other advanced scholarship carried out by academic staff in the School?
- Confirmation that applicable resources are in place to support the proposed programme;
- Any relevant disability issues;
- Any related reports from PSRB accreditation visits, and the evidence of engagement with any issues raised therein;
- Any other matters considered appropriate by the Committee.
If it is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, the Committee may forward the proposal on behalf of Faculty Board to the Programme Approval Sub-committee (PASC) of the Education Board (EB) and the Graduate School Board (GSB), together with the recommendation that the programme be approved.

7.2 Submission to PASC will be via the Faculties Support Office.

8 **Consideration by the Programme Approval Sub-committee (PASC)**

8.1 The Programme Approval Sub-committee will address the following matters when considering proposals:

- That national standards, guidelines and requirements have been adhered to (i.e. the requirements of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education);
- Adherence to the University's internal Code of Practice for Quality Assurance for Research Programmes of Study;
- That the proposed programme is consonant with the University's mission statement and does not overlap redundantly with other existing provision;
- That the proposed programme is set at the appropriate standard for the intended level, with reference to the relevant FHEQ level descriptors (see Annex 2 of the Credit Framework);
- Consideration of the supporting statement of the external academic adviser, where relevant, and the appropriateness of the School response to this;
- That the final proposal remains congruent with the original outline submission for the programme and accompanying commentaries as approved by the Executive Group;
- Confirm that the proposed programme reflects current research or other advanced scholarship carried out by academic staff in the School;
- Any matters flagged by Student Support and Wellbeing;
- Any other matters considered appropriate by the Sub-committee.

8.2 Where PASC considers that it might be helpful to do so, for example where a proposed programme appears to be particularly complex or unusual, the Sub-committee may request the relevant Director of Graduate Studies to attend the approval meeting in support of the programme proposal and in order to answer any questions that the Sub-committee might raise.

8.3 If it is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, the Programme Approval Sub-committee may report to the Graduate School Board that it has approved the proposed programme on its behalf. The Graduate School Board will report annually to the Senate on the new programmes which have been approved under delegated powers.

8.4 **Conditions of Approval**

The Programme Approval Sub-committee may recommend approval of a proposal subject to the satisfaction of a number of conditions by a set deadline, normally in advance of its next meeting. Such programmes may not be advertised as approved nor students recruited until the conditions have been signed off as satisfied by the appropriate Associate Dean (Graduate Studies) on behalf of PASC. Failure to meet the conditions by the set deadline may result in the withdrawal of conditional approval and entail the resubmission of the programme proposal. The status of the conditional approval shall be reported to PASC at its following meeting, however, conditions may be regarded as satisfied, and the programme may be advertised, as soon as they have been signed off by the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies) on behalf of PASC. The Faculties
Support Office should notify appropriate stakeholders\(^1\) at the time the programme conditions are signed off, with a formal report to be submitted to the next meeting of PASC. The notification from the FSO should include the POS code.

9 Disabilities

The Programme Approval Sub-Committee (PASC) should be satisfied that new programme proposals or proposed substantial changes to an approved programme, as far as can be reasonably anticipated, do not present any non-justifiable disadvantage to students with disabilities. Student Support and Wellbeing will receive, via the Secretary to PASC, all new programme proposals and will provide an advisory commentary to the Sub-Committee on these matters if applicable. If less favourable treatment of disabled students is anticipated, PASC should, where it is considered reasonable to do so, agree an appropriate plan to secure access within a stated period of time. In such cases, Student Support and Wellbeing should monitor that appropriate measures are taken and targets achieved to ensure that justifications for less favourable treatment are not of a permanent nature.

10 A copy of the programme specification for each new programme which has been approved, together with a pro forma recording dates of approval by each of the Committees concerned, shall be retained by the relevant Faculty, which shall publish the approved programme specifications on its website.

11 Programme Withdrawal

11.1 Approval of a new programme of study will be rescinded where the programme receives no registrations within three years of approval.

11.2 If an existing programme is to be withdrawn from the University portfolio, the School must prepare a written rationale, outlining the reasons for withdrawal of the programme, whether any offers have been made to applicants and details of the arrangements for allowing existing students to complete their studies, and submit it to the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee for consideration. The Committee will make a recommendation to the Programme Approval Sub-Committee, which will formally record the programme withdrawal. The withdrawal will be reported for action by i) Enrolment Management Services (EMS), which will inform any applicants of the discontinuation of the programme, and ii) the Student Records and Examinations Office (SRE), which will amend the status of the programme accordingly. The withdrawal will be noted by the Graduate School Board.

12 Programme Title Changes

The relevant Faculty GSC will report all agreed programme title changes to PASC for note and dissemination to interested parties, as appropriate.

13 Programme Suspension

13.1 Where a programme of study is to be suspended, the School must prepare a written rationale, outlining the reasons for not continuing to offer the programme, the period of time for which it is to be suspended (see 13.3 below), whether any offers have been

\(^1\) To include EMS, Admissions, the QA Office and School
made to applicants and details of the arrangements for allowing existing students to complete their studies, and submit it to the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies) for consideration. If the suspension is approved the School will report the suspension for action by i) Enrolment Management Services (EMS), which will inform any applicants of the suspension of the programme, and ii) the Student Records and Examinations Office (SRE), which will amend the status of the programme accordingly.

13.2 When a suspended programme of study is to be offered once more, the School will report this to the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies), EMS and SRE, which will amend the status of the programme accordingly.

13.3 A programme of study may be suspended for no more than three years. After three years if the programme in question is not run it must be formally withdrawn (refer to section 11.2 above).

14 **Amendments to Approved Programmes**

14.1 Proposals for substantial changes to approved research programmes of study must be considered and recommended for approval by the relevant School and the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee, as appropriate, prior to submission of the specification for approval by the Programme Approval Sub-Committee (PASC). A substantial change to a programme specification includes:

- Any amendment resulting in a change to the programme intended learning outcomes or educational aims.
- A major change to the learning methods.
- A change in the volume of credit of the programme, as this will necessarily involve a change in learning outcomes.
- A combination of minor changes that, when aggregated, can be considered to be a major change.
- A change to, or the addition of, a different campus for delivery of the programme. In such cases the approval submission must be accompanied by a rationale from the School or Collaborative Partner, to include an indication of the resources required and confirmation that those resources will be available at the new campus.

Where there is doubt as to whether a proposed change to a programme specification constitutes a minor or substantial change, advice should be sought from the Faculties Support Officer (fso@kent.ac.uk) or the Quality Assurance Office (qa@kent.ac.uk).

14.2 Such changes should not be approved unless a revised programme specification, a description of the proposed changes and the reasons for the proposed changes have been submitted.

14.3 Proposals for minor changes to approved programmes of study, which involve no revision of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes, must be considered and recommended for approval by the relevant School and Faculty Committees.

14.4 Other interested Schools should be consulted as appropriate with regard to changes to programmes.

15 **Collaborative Provision**
Outline Approval by the Executive Group

15.1 The University will consider proposals for new collaborative programmes of study with Validated Institutions\(^2\), or leading to dual awards\(^3\) or joint awards\(^4\) only where the collaborative partner or partners have successfully completed the process of institutional approval set out in Collaborative Provision: Policies and Procedures: Part 1.

15.2 Proposals for new programmes of study to be provided by or in conjunction with partner organisations approved as per Collaborative Provision: Policies and Procedures: Part 1 must be considered by the Executive Group in the first instance as per the requirements of section 2 above.

15.3 Outline proposals for new programmes leading to dual or joint awards should be submitted by the cognate or liaising School. Such proposals must include written confirmation from a representative of each collaborative partner setting out their indicative agreement to proceeding on the basis of the outline submission and the attached business plan.

15.4 Outline proposals to offer an existing programme leading to a dual award with a prospective new partner must be submitted to the Executive Group for approval and must include written confirmation from a representative of each collaborative partner setting out their indicative agreement to proceeding on the basis of the outline submission and the attached business plan. All such proposed new partners must first have satisfied the requirements for institutional approval set out in Collaborative Provision: Policies and Procedures: Part 1 prior to the submission of the outline programme proposal to the Executive Group.

15.5 Outline proposals for new programmes of study with Validated Institutions may take the form used for such submissions within the Validated Institution. Such submissions should include written confirmation from the Validated Institution that the submission and the business plan for the proposal bear its and, where relevant, its parent organisation’s official approval.

Memoranda of Agreement

15.6 The University policies and procedures for collaborative provision require that require that an appropriate Memorandum of Agreement be drafted and signed by all parties concerned prior to the commencement of the programme (at Kent, the signatory must be a member of the Executive Group). The drafting of the Memorandum can begin once outline approval is given by Executive Group. The Programme Approval Sub-Committee will require confirmation that the Memorandum of Agreement has been signed in order to confirm final approval of the relevant programme. The MoA must be signed prior to the commencement of the programme.

Consideration of Programmes Leading to Dual Awards or Joint Awards

---

2 A Validated Institution is an institution which has received approval from the University of Kent to offer programmes devised, delivered and assessed by the institution, but approved by the University for University of Kent credit and academic awards.

3 In this context, a collaboration leading to a dual award involves the development of a new programme of study that leads to the granting of separate academic awards by both the University of Kent and the partner institution. This should not be confused with the process for establishing a new co-supervisory arrangement leading to a dual award, which may be set up only with respect to existing, approved programmes. The procedures for the establishment of a new co-supervisory arrangement may be found at https://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/collaborative/regsjointres/index.html.

4 A collaboration leading to a joint award involves the development of a programme of study that leads to the granting of a single award by two or more collaborating partners.
15.7 Following approval by the Executive Group of the outline proposal for a new programme leading to a dual award or a joint award, a detailed submission for the new programme should be drawn up by the School in collaboration with the partner institution and considered by the School Graduate Studies Committee, Faculty Graduate Studies Committee and PASC as per the requirements of 12.2 – 12.5 above. Advance permission should be sought from the Dean of the Graduate School where is it proposed that either the programme specification for the proposal should be submitted in the format required by the partner institution rather than as per the University’s templates.

15.8 In addition any matters identified by the School and/or Faculty Committees, the following matters must be presented and considered:

i. An assessment of the capacity of the proposed partner institution to implement a quality assurance system consistent with the requirement of Kent’s Code of Practice for Quality Assurance and Collaborative Provision: Policies and Procedures: Part 2, Section 5, Joint Awards or Section 6, Dual Awards;

ii. An assessment of the quality and availability of learning and research resources in the partner institution;

iii. An assessment of the quality of the student learning and research environment provided in the partner institution;

iv. The CVs of the core academic staff to be involved in the delivery of the programme at the partner institution(s);

v. A statement of the proposed cross-institutional support structures;

vi. Confirmation of the language(s) of instruction and assessment and whether, where applicable, the programme of study meets the requirements of Collaborative Provision: Policies and Procedures: Part 2, Section 2.6, Programmes Taught and/or Assessed in a Language other than English;

vii. An assessment of the compatibility of the regulatory framework of the partner institution with that of Kent; where necessary, specific conjoint regulations may be devised and approved by the parties;

viii. Where relevant, the marking scheme and grade criteria agreed by Kent and the partner(s), including any proposed conversion scales for marks;

ix. A written statement from the appropriate representative of the partner institution(s) that it has read and is broadly satisfied with the proposal as submitted by the Kent school for approval. Where a proposal is subsequently revised, endorsement of such revisions by all contributing bodies is required. Final approval by PASC may be contingent on a report on the outcome of consideration of the proposal through the partner institution's own quality assurance systems being received.

Guidance on the detail of the above requirements can be obtained from the Quality Assurance Office. In cases where a School is looking to establish a new dual award or joint award programme with a partner institution where Kent has already established such provision, the Quality Assurance Office should be consulted as to which, if any, of the above requirements might not be necessary for the proposal in question.

15.9 Where, on the basis of the submitted proposal, it is considered necessary by Kent (i.e. by EG, Faculty or PASC) or where it is a requirement of the partner institution or the relevant PSRB, a conjoint programme approval panel may be established to consider the proposal in detail, which may include consideration of the materials set out at 12.8 above. The University’s representatives on such panels should normally include the relevant Faculty member of PASC. Other staff, who should have not been involved in the development of the proposal, may also be nominated as required. The
Proposals to add a new partner institution to an existing dual award or joint award programme must be forwarded via the School and Faculty to PASC for approval. Proposed partner institutions must first have successfully completed the process of institutional approval set out in Collaborative Provision: Policies and Procedures: Part 1.

Amendments to Approved Programmes leading to Dual or Joint Awards

Where substantial changes (see section 12) are proposed to approved programmes leading to dual awards or joint awards, including any which involve revision of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes, the approval of such amendments by the Programme Approval Sub-Committee may be contingent upon confirmation from the partner institution that it has itself considered and is prepared to approve the proposed changes to the programme.

Consideration of Programmes of Study with Validated Institutions

Where an approved partner institution (i.e. an institution that has satisfied the requirements of Collaborative Provision: Policies and Procedures: Part 1) has received outline approval from the Executive Group to proceed with a specific new programme of study for validation (prospective Validated Institution), the programme proposal (i.e. the programme and module specifications) should be considered in the first instance by the appropriate School committee.

Where, following its consideration of the programme specifications, the School Committee is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, it may recommend that the Faculty establishes a panel to visit the prospective Validated Institution and meet with staff in order to consider the programme proposal in detail. The documentation required to be provided to such panels by the prospective Validated Institution is set out below:

- The proposed programme for the visit (see guidance in Appendix A to this Annex).
- Rationale for the proposal
- Programme specification
- Staff management structure and CVs of all teaching staff
- Statement of available physical resources
- Self-assessment of the infrastructure of support for student learning and student welfare
- Self-evaluation of the research culture within the partner organisation as relevant to the programme proposal(s)
- Requirements of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (where applicable)
- Reports from any previous stages of the approval process, where available
- Draft Programme/Student handbooks

Such Faculty panels will normally include at least two members from the University, one of whom shall be appointed as Chair, and at least one member external to the University. The Faculty panel is responsible for making a detailed assessment of the design, level, coherence and currency of the curriculum under review. The panel will also assess the capacity of the prospective Validated Institution to provide an appropriate research culture and assure the standards of the provision under review and to provide learning opportunities sufficient for students to achieve the intended
learning outcomes. Based on its assessment, the Faculty panel is empowered to make one of a number of recommendations to the Faculty Board⁵:

A. That the proposal be given permission to proceed for consideration by the Programme Approval Sub-Committee of the University (PASC), along with the panel’s report of the approval event;

B. That the proposal be given permission to proceed for consideration by the Programme Approval Sub-Committee of the University (PASC) subject to the prior satisfaction of specified conditions along with the panel’s report of the approval event. These conditions might include revisions to the proposal or provision of additional resources. The submission to PASC should include a statement from the prospective Validated Institution as to the steps it has taken to meet the Faculty panel’s conditions;

C. That the proposal be resubmitted in a revised form for further consideration by the Faculty panel;

D. That the proposal be rejected.

15.15 Detailed guidance on the terms of reference and conduct of Faculty panels convened to consider proposals for new or significantly amended validated programmes of study is available in Appendix A of this Annex.

⁵ Or the Faculty Graduate School Committee, where delegated to act on behalf of the Faculty Board.
Programme Approval Sub-Committee

Terms of Reference

- To receive proposals for both new and amended programmes of study from Faculty Education Committees and Faculty Graduate Studies Committees, for consideration as per the criteria in Annex C of the Code of Practice for the Quality Assurance of Taught Programmes of Study and Annex B of the Code of Practice for the Quality Assurance of Research Programmes of Study;

- To refer any suggested amendments back to the responsible Faculty committee;

- To recommend approval or approval subject to the satisfaction of identified conditions, on behalf of the Education Board, for both new and amended undergraduate programmes of study;

- To recommend approval or approval subject to the satisfaction of identified conditions, on behalf of the Graduate School Board, for both new and amended taught and research postgraduate programmes of study;

- To note where an existing programme is withdrawn and report this in the minutes;

- To consider other learning and teaching issues pertinent to programme approval as necessary, and make recommendations to the Education Board if applicable.

Voting Membership:

- Sciences Associate Dean (Education)
- Social Sciences Associate Dean (Education)
- Humanities Associate Dean (Education)
- Sciences Associate Dean (Graduate Studies)
- Social Sciences Associate Dean (Graduate Studies)
- Humanities Associate Dean (Graduate Studies)

In attendance:

- Graduate School Administration Manager
- Curriculum and Educational Development Manager
- Head of Quality Assurance

Secretary:

- Administrator, Quality Assurance Office

Process:

The voting members will agree a Chair who will fulfil this role for a period of one academic year.

Where the Sub-committee members cannot agree a recommendation on a programme proposal, the voting members present will be polled and a majority established. Where no majority view can be established, the Chair will command an additional casting vote. The meetings of the Sub-committee will be quorate when at least two Associate Deans (Education) and two Associate Deans (Graduate Studies) are present. When a meeting becomes inquorate, the Sub-committee’s recommendations will be subject to ratification by the absent voting members before they may be confirmed. However, any recommendations on programmes taken during the Long Vacation (refer to note below) will only require the
agreement of two Associate Deans (Education) and two Associate Deans (Graduate Studies), without further consultation.

**Note:** programme submissions will normally only be considered at a scheduled PASC meeting. The Education Board has confirmed that submissions may be taken electronically outside of the scheduled meetings only on an exceptional basis. The permission of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education (for undergraduate programmes) or the Dean of the Graduate School (for postgraduate programmes) must be obtained by the secretary of PASC before the Subcommittee may consider a submission outside of the meeting schedule.