Annex C: Approval and Withdrawal of Taught Programmes

1. Overview
This annex of the Code of Practice establishes the requirements and procedures for the approval of new taught 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, 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
- are research-led (where proposed by University Schools)
- do not present any unreasonable 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 Education Board and 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 Sub-committee (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 Education Committee (UG) or School Graduate Studies Committee (PGT)
(iii) Faculty Education Committee (UG) or Faculty Graduate Studies Committee (PGT)
(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.

---

1 With the exception of new programmes originating in the Partner Colleges, which are subject to Annex O of this Code.
2 For the purposes of this Code, Integrated Master’s programmes are regarded as undergraduate programmes.
3 For the purposes of this Code, Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma programmes are regarded as postgraduate programmes.
2.2 Submission to Executive Group

Except as indicated at 2.2.10 below, all proposed new programmes are to be considered in outline and approved in principle by the Executive Group before significant time is spent on their development.

The submission to the Executive Group, which should not normally be more than two pages, should be accompanied by a completed cover sheet, a pro forma for which is available at http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/index.html, should include a brief description of the proposed programme and address the matters identified at 2.2.1 – 2.2.8 below:

2.2.1 The relationship of the programme to the University's Mission and Plan and the School's Plan;

2.2.2 Evidence of need and demand for the programme as suggested by market research, to include projected student numbers

2.2.3 How it is proposed that the programme will be resourced. A business plan should be included as per the template provided by the Finance Department;

2.2.4 Any special resources required (e.g. staff, space, library, IT, learning technologies, training, timetable), and the implications of putting these in place;

2.2.5 The cover available in the School if key parts of the programme depend on an individual member of staff for their delivery;

2.2.6 A statement of which programmes, if any, will be withdrawn as a result of the new proposal.

2.2.7 Evidence of discussion/agreement with other Schools/subject areas which might be affected, together with information about collaboration, partnership and/or potential competition.

2.2.8 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 3.3 below for more detail.

2.2.9 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, for all new or significantly revised taught postgraduate programmes, the Graduate School.

Schools should also consult in advance with the following, as appropriate:

- Student Planning and Data Office for guidance on student numbers
- the Library for input on the availability of texts and access to relevant periodicals
- Admissions and Partnership Services for advice on student recruitment;
- Communications and Development Office with regard to advertising and prospectus entries
- The International Partnerships Office with regard to student placements in Europe or overseas, and for advice on internationalising the curriculum;
- Student Support and Wellbeing;
- and the Faculty Learning Technologists.

2.2.10 For Schools seeking permission to add a period abroad (with an approved partner institution), placement year, foundation year\(^4\) or an existing minor subject (e.g. a

---

\(^4\) Except where the foundation year element is to be delivered as part of a collaborative arrangement with an external partner institution or organisation. Such proposals must be put forward for approval as per the procedures for the
Where a proposed new joint honours programme is to consist of two already approved half degrees, there is no requirement to submit an outline proposal to Executive Group for approval. See 3.1.1 below for the relevant procedure for seeking approval of such programmes.

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 Education Committee (UG), or School Graduate Studies Committee (PGT). 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.

Additional guidance on the submission of outline proposals for new collaborative programmes of study is set out in section 3.3 below.

Following Executive Group approval of the outline proposal a detailed submission for a new programme should be drawn up by the School, to consist of the documentation indicated below, to be submitted to the School Education Committee where the programme is undergraduate, or to the School Graduate Studies Committee, where the proposal is for a taught postgraduate programme:

i) A programme specification in the approved format, available at http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/index.html;

ii) A module mapping document detailing the programme level learning outcomes delivered by each module, available at http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/index.html;

iii) For a new programme which is not similar to an existing programme, for example which includes the provision of a substantial number of new modules (see note), a supporting statement from an external academic adviser (or advisers, if appropriate to the proposal) should be provided (see Appendix A http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/annexc-appendixa.html), along with a response from the School to any issues raised.

Note: ‘Substantial’ in this case is defined as where new modules equate to 50% or more of the credit at the degree classification stages.

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

- Potential market for the programme;
- Curriculum content of the programme – are all subjects included that would be expected in order to achieve the award title, and does the programme fit together as a coherent entity?
- Does the programme content articulate/progress in an appropriate manner and at the correct level? (Refer to Credit Framework Annex 2 Level Descriptors at http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/credit-framework/creditinfoannex2.html for details.)

approval of Collaborative Academic Centres, available at http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/collaborative/procedures/collabprocedures.html
- Does the programme content reflect the relevant QAA subject benchmark statement(s) (if applicable)?
- Does the programme structure reflect the relevant QAA guidance on qualification characteristics/Foundation Degree qualification benchmark (if applicable)?
- Any other areas of note considered appropriate by the external adviser.

v) Where appropriate, a statement indicating how the programme reflects the requirements of professional or statutory bodies;

vi) For a new programme consisting largely of new modules, module specifications for all new or revised Stage 1 modules should be submitted as a minimum requirement. Specifications for modules to be taken in Stages 2 or 3/4 of such programmes may be submitted post-approval of the programme so long as (i) a brief description of the modules and their content is provided as part of the programme approval documentation; and (ii) the full module specifications are approved by the Faculty prior to any student entering the relevant stage;

vii) For a new programme consisting largely of existing modules (and, as such, may for example already contain a full diet of approved Stage 1 modules), module specifications for any new or revised modules should be submitted;

viii) 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;

ix) The relevant extract of the Staff-Student Liaison Committee minutes that notes the student discussion of the proposed programme specification (see Annex M Student Evaluation section 5.7).

2.3.2 Consideration of proposal by School Education Committee (UG) or School Graduate Studies Committee (PGT)

School Education Committees and 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);
- Adherence to the applicable QAA subject benchmark statement(s);
- Adherence, where applicable, to the QAA Foundation Degree qualification benchmark;
- Adherence, where applicable, to the QAA guidance on qualification characteristics;
- (Where appropriate to the proposal) 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 its 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;
- Engagement with the programme design principles as detailed in Appendix B (http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/annexc-appendixb.html) of this Annex;
- That the programme specification provides for a balanced workload of modules across the terms;
- Any other matters considered appropriate by the Committee.
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If it is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, the Committee may forward the proposal (i.e. all the documentation indicated at 2.3.1 above), either, where the proposal is for a new undergraduate programme, to the Faculty Education Committee, or, where the proposal is for a new postgraduate programme, to the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee, together with the recommendation that the programme and modules be approved.

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

2.3.2.2 Additional guidance on the consideration by Schools of proposals for new collaborative programmes of study is set out in section 3.3 below.

2.3.2.3 Consideration of Proposal by Faculty Education Committee or Faculty Graduate Studies Committee

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

- The approval of new modules;
- Any issues arising from the module mapping document;
- Any issues arising from the statement of the external academic adviser and the response of the School to this;
- Adherence to requirements of the Credit Framework, including compensation, trailing, condonnement and level (refer to Annex 2);
- Confirmation of the accuracy and completeness of the module mapping document;
- Confirmation of appropriate progression throughout the stages of the programme;
- That criteria for alternative exit awards are detailed in the programme specification;
- Appropriate engagement with the applicable QAA subject benchmark statement(s);
- Adherence, where applicable, to the QAA Foundation Degree qualification benchmark;
- Adherence, where applicable, to the QAA guidance on qualification characteristics;
- Engagement with the programme design principles as detailed in Appendix B of this Annex;
- (Where appropriate to the proposal) does the 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 proposal;
- Any relevant disability issues;
- Any related reports from PSRB accreditation visits as detailed in 2.3.2.5 below, 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 (i.e. all the documentation indicated at 2.3.1 above with the exception of the module specifications) 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.

5 Note: Faculty Boards are authorised to approve proposals for new modules and may authorise their Education Committees and Graduate School Committees to approve proposals for new modules on their behalf. Hence the Programme Approval Sub-committee will not undertake detailed scrutiny of the modules comprising a new programme.
2.3.2.4 Submission to PASC will be via the Faculties Support Office.

2.3.2.5 Accreditation Panels

Where the establishment of such a panel is a condition of accreditation by an external professional or subject area body, the Faculty Education Committee or Faculty Graduate Studies Committee (as relevant to the proposal) is authorised to establish a panel to consider the proposal in detail, to discuss it with the course team and to submit recommendations on the proposal to the Faculty Board. Such 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 with appropriate subject area expertise.

2.3.2.6 Additional guidance on the consideration by the Faculties of proposals for new collaborative programmes of study is set out in section 3.3 below.

2.3.3 Consideration by the Programme Approval Sub-committee (PASC)

2.3.3.1 The Programme Approval Sub-committee will receive all the documentation indicated at 2.3.1 above (with the exception of module specifications). PASC 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, see http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/uk-quality-code/index.html);
- Adherence to the University’s internal Codes of Practice for Quality Assurance http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/index.html and the Credit Framework http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/credit-framework/index.html;
- 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;
- That the programme specification provides for a balanced workload of modules across the terms;
- Confirm, where appropriate, 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.

2.3.3.2 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 School Director of Education or 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.

2.3.3.3 If it is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, the Programme Approval Sub-committee may report to the Education Board or the Graduate School Board, as appropriate, that it has approved the proposed programme on its behalf. The Education Board and the Graduate School Board will report annually to the Senate on the new programmes which have been approved under delegated powers.
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2.3.3.4 **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 (Education) or 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 (Education) or (Graduate Studies), as appropriate, on behalf of PASC. The Faculties Support Office should notify appropriate stakeholders\(^6\) 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.

3. **Other Relevant Matters of Note**

3.1 **Joint Honours**

Where the proposal is for a new programme leading to an award in two subjects (e.g. BA in X and Y), the following procedures apply:

3.1.1 Where a new joint programme is developed as a single coherent entity, a programme specification should be provided setting out the requirements and outcomes for the respective subject areas, along with any new module specifications. Such proposals should proceed as per the standard procedures set out above for approving new programmes.

3.1.2 Where an approved ‘half-programme’ specification already exists for one of the subjects, the proposal should include a programme specification in respect of the new ‘half programme’, any new module specifications (for Stage 1 only in the first instance) and a short rationale for the combination that indicates how the outcomes from each subject may reinforce each other.

3.1.3 Should the proposal be for a joint degree in two subjects where each of which joint programmes already exist, programme specifications need not be submitted for either of the ‘half programmes’. However, a cover sheet signed by the relevant Heads of School must be provided, including a short rationale for the combination that indicates how the outcomes from each subject may reinforce each other. (The completed cover sheet must be submitted to the Programme Approval Sub-committee via the relevant Faculty). PASC will note its acceptance of the rationale as part of the programme approval.

3.1.4 As is noted at 2.2.11 above, where a proposed new joint honours programme is to consist of two already approved half-programmes, there is **no requirement** to submit an outline proposal to Executive Group for approval.

3.2 **Non-University Campus/Location**

Where it is proposed that an existing University programme be taught at a new non-University campus location, a complete programme proposal and specification will be required but any existing module specifications need not be included.

---

\(^6\) To include EMS, Admissions, the QA Office and School
3.3 Collaborative Provision

Outline Approval by the Executive Group

3.3.1 The University will consider proposals for new collaborative programmes of study with Validated Institutions\(^7\) or leading to dual awards\(^8\) or joint awards\(^9\) only where the collaborative partner(s) have successfully completed the process of institutional approval set out in Collaborative Provision: Policies and Procedures: Part 1.

3.3.2 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.

3.3.3 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.

3.3.4 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.

3.3.5 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.

3.3.6 Following initial consultation with the appropriate cognate School, outline proposals for new programmes of study with Partner Colleges\(^10\) must be submitted by the Partner College for approval by the University’s Executive Group. The outline proposal will include evidence of an approved business plan and indicate that the College will be responsible for providing resources and facilities sufficient to staging the programme. The outline proposal should first have been approved within the Partner College. For further detail, Annex O [http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/annexo.html](http://www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/taught/annexo.html) of this Code should be consulted.

Memoranda of Agreement

3.3.7 The University policies and procedures for collaborative provision 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 Su-

---

\(^7\) 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.

\(^8\) A collaboration leading to a dual award involves the development of a programme of study that leads to the granting of separate academic awards by both the University of Kent and the partner institution.

\(^9\) 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.

\(^10\) Kent has collaborative arrangements whereby some of its students undertake programmes of study delivered by one of three local FE Partner Colleges.
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

3.3.8 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 appropriate School committee, Faculty committee and PASC as per the requirements of 2.3.1 – 2.3.5 above. Advance permission should be sought from the Chair of the Education Board where is it proposed that either the programme specification or module specifications for the proposal should be submitted in the format required by the partner institution rather than as per the University’s templates.

3.3.9 In addition to the requirements of 2.3.1 – 2.3.5 above, the following matters must also 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 infrastructure of support for student learning available at the partner institution;

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

iv) A statement of the proposed cross-institutional support structures;

v) 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.

vi) 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;

vii) The marking scheme and grade criteria agreed by Kent and the partner(s), including any proposed conversion scales for marks;

viii) An indicative statement of content of the modules to be delivered by the partner and a comprehensive module mapping document indicating the programme level learning outcomes to be met by the modules approved and provided by the Kent and the partner institution(s);

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.

3.3.10 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 3.3.8 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 reports of such programme approval events should be forwarded to PASC along with the programme proposal for its final consideration.

3.3.11 Following approval of the programme by PASC and the partner institution(s), the appropriate memorandum of agreement may be signed by designated senior representatives of the parties. The MoA must be signed prior to the commencement of the programme.

3.3.12 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

3.3.13 Where major changes 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

3.3.14 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. The proposals for new UG programmes are considered by the School EC; new PGT proposals by the School GSC.

3.3.15 Where, following its consideration of the programme and module 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 the guidance in Appendix C of this Annex).
- Rationale for the proposal
- Programme specification.
- Module specifications.
- Module mapping document.
- Staff management structure and CVs of core teaching staff
- Statement of available physical resources
- Self-assessment of the infrastructure of support for student learning and student welfare
- Requirements of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (where applicable)
- Reports from any previous stages of the approval process, where available
- Draft Programme/Student handbooks
3.3.16 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 and of the capacity of the prospective Validated Institution to 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 Board:

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 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.

3.3.17 Where a new programme of study or a significantly revised existing programme proposed by a prospective Validated Institution is subject to approval by a third party, the Faculty may consider establishing a conjoint panel with the third party organisation provided that the following conditions are met:

i) That the Faculty will normally be represented on the approval panel by at least two of its members, one of whom should be a member of the relevant Faculty Committee (Education Committee or Graduate Studies Committee, as appropriate to the level of the proposal) and a representative from a subject area cognate to that of the proposed programme;

ii) That chairmanship of the panel resides with the University;

iii) That, such as it considers appropriate, the University retains the right to appoint external subject area experts to the panel;

iv) That the agenda and areas covered by the approval event are considered sufficient by the Faculty to allow for full consideration of the proposal as per the requirements of this annex and the University’s Code of Practice;

v) That the written report of any such event is subject to the approval of the Chair of the panel (normally the member of the relevant Faculty Committee);

vi) That, following consideration by the Faculty, the proposal and the report of the conjoint validation event are subject to consideration by PASC before final approval is given by the University, as per the requirements of this annex and the University’s policies and procedures for the approval of collaborative provision.

3.3.18 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 set out in Appendix C to this Annex.

Approval of Programmes of Study with Partner Colleges

12 Or the relevant Faculty Committee, as per note 1 above, delegated to act on behalf of the Faculty Board.
3.3.19 The procedures for the approval of new programmes of study with Partner Colleges are set out in Annex O of this Code of Practice.

3.4 Amendments to Approved Programmes

3.4.1 Proposals for substantial changes to approved programmes of study must be considered and recommended for approval by the relevant School and the Faculty Education Committee or 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 or teaching methods, e.g. a change to the delivery mode from lectures to e-learning.
- A change in the volume of credit of the programme, as this will necessarily involve a change in learning outcomes.
- 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.
- A combination of minor changes that, when aggregated, can be considered to be a major change.

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 Faculty Support Officer (fso@kent.ac.uk) or the Quality Assurance Office (qa@kent.ac.uk).

3.4.2 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.

3.4.3 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.

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

3.4.5 Where substantial changes are proposed to approved programmes leading to dual awards or joint awards, as defined in 3.4.1 above, the approval of such amendments by PASC 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.

3.5 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 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.

3.6 New Programme Publicity and Recruitment
UNIVERSITY OF KENT
CODE OF PRACTICE FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE

A new programme may be advertised and applicants offered places on such programmes when, and only when, the programme has been fully approved by the Programme Approval Sub-committee of the Education Board and the Graduate School Board, except as authorised by the Executive Group or the Chair of the Education Board on its behalf.

The relevant Faculty shall publish approved programme specifications on its website.

3.7 Programme Withdrawal

3.7.1 Approval of a new programme of study will be withdrawn where the programme is not taught within three years of approval.

3.7.2 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 (including any students currently resitting), and submit it either, as appropriate to the proposal, to the Faculty Education Committee (undergraduate) or the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee (postgraduate) for consideration. The relevant 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 Examination Office (SRE), which will amend the status of the programme accordingly. The withdrawal will be noted by the Education Board or the Graduate School Board, as appropriate.

3.8 Programme Title Changes

The relevant Faculty Education Committee or Faculty Graduate Studies Committee will report all agreed programme title changes to PASC for note and dissemination to interested parties, as appropriate.

3.9 Programme Suspension

3.9.1 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 3.9.3 below), whether any offers have been made to applicants and details of the arrangements for allowing existing students to complete their studies (including any students currently resitting), and submit it either, as appropriate to the proposal, to the Associate Dean (Education) (undergraduate) or the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies) (postgraduate) 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.

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

3.9.3 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 3.7 above).

Further Guidance:

- Appendix D: Approval Diagram for New Programmes
- Programme Approval Timeline
- Module and programme specification approval risk table, which may be viewed in ‘Guidance’.
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:

Science Associate Dean (Education)
Social Sciences Associate Dean (Education)
Humanities Associate Dean (Education)
Science 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 Sub-committee may consider a submission outside of the meeting schedule.