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# Introduction

* 1. The purpose of this code is to ensure that the University’s procedures for the approval of new programmes are robust, transparent, streamlined and facilitate the development of programmes of study which fit with the University’s strategic direction, and those of the University’s educational partners where applicable, and these must offer high quality learning opportunities for students while maintaining the academic standard of the University’s awards. As such, this code forms a fundamental part of the University’s quality assurance framework. This code also reflects external expectations, specifically the Office for Students (OfS) and the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education.
  2. This code of practice is explicit that no programme may be advertised unless development consent has been granted, and that students must not be recruited to a programme, which has not been granted Full Approval. ‘Recruitment’ in this context means making an offer of a place (whether conditional or unconditional). Heads of academic units are accountable for ensuring that these two requirements are adhered to at all times in respect of programmes within their areas. Partner institution higher education managers (or equivalent) are accountable for ensuring that these two requirements are adhered to at all times in respect of programmes within their institutions.
  3. Part of the rationale of this code is to develop a system which can be flexible and responsive to exceptional needs, such as a programme that needs to meet tight deadlines e.g. where commissioned by a professional body. This will be achieved by introducing flexibility in the timing of the stages of approval, but not the requirements for approval. In all cases, the overriding principle will continue to be to ensure that the assurance of quality and maintenance of standards is paramount.

# Support and guidance

* 1. The Quality Support Service is committed to supporting faculties in the development and approval of programmes, through providing advice, templates, training and guidance, as required and facilitating links with those who are experienced in relevant skills, such as the writing of intended learning outcomes/programme competencies and the devising of assessment strategies.
  2. This code is designed to be facilitative and encourages proposers to draw on the support available from their faculty and wider University. Staff in partners are encouraged to work from the earliest stages with the relevant academic contact(s) at the University (or academic consultants in the case of ‘non-comparable’ programmes) as well as drawing on the support available from the faculty.
  3. NOTE: For each collaborative programme or set of programmes within an academic discipline, the University **must** provide a named contact who will be an academic member of the University faculty nominated as academic contact or equivalent. Where the University does not have subject expertise, an academic consultant **must** be appointed.

# Authority

* 1. The University Education Committee (EC) is the final arbiter of the application and interpretation of this code of practice.

# Delegation

* 1. Any action or power designated to a dean under this code of practice may be undertaken by a designated associate dean or chair of the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC) of the same faculty

# Scope of the Code

## On campus provision

* 1. Subject to 5.8 the term ‘on campus’ within this code of practice means taught programmes and modules and non-credit bearing provision delivered entirely by University of Hull staff irrespective of the location of delivery and including online delivery.

## Collaborative provision

* 1. The term ‘collaborative provision’ in this code means: programmes and modules which are delivered in whole or in part by the staff of a University partner irrespective of the location or mode or method of delivery, and leading to credit or an award of the University of Hull.

## New modes of delivery

* 1. A change in the mode of delivery of the programme (e.g. a move from part time to full time or vice versa) is considered as a major modification that requires development consent.
  2. The existing programme documentation **must** be submitted for full approval, revised (with tracked changes) to demonstrate how the programme will be delivered in the new mode (e.g. demonstrating how the programme structure maps to the time periods of the new mode). A completed feedback form by the external examiner **must** be included.

## New methods of delivery

* 1. A change in the method of delivery of the programme (e.g. a move from face to face tuition to blended learning or vice versa) is considered as a major modification that requires development consent.
  2. The existing programme documentation **must** be submitted for full approval, revised (with tracked changes) to demonstrate how the programme will be delivered in the new method (e.g. demonstrating any changes that have been made to the to the learning, teaching and assessment strategy). A completed feedback form by the external examiner **must** be included.

## New locations

* 1. The proposal to deliver an existing approved programme in a new location (whether an additional location or a replacement location), is considered to be a major modification that requires development consent.
  2. Where the location is one, which has not previously been approved for delivery of a programme leading to a University of Hull award, the full approval process requires a site visit. Details of the new location and the associated resource implications **must** be provided in the development consent application. The purpose of the visit will be to assess the suitability of the facilities for the delivery of the programme, and of the provision of learning resources given the location.
  3. Where the location has previously been approved for the delivery of other University of Hull approved programmes, the chair of EPC will determine the need for a \*site visit after consultation with the relevant University faculty and academic unit responsible for the proposed programme.
  4. A record of the visit and its recommendations **must** be recorded on a site visit report.

\**Site visits are co-ordinated by the Quality Support Service, in conjunction with the faculty and are designed to ensure the suitability of the location for the delivery of the provision. These may take place in person or by virtual means dependent on the nature of the application. They are used to consider resources for library, computing, teaching and student support. The aim of a site visit is to ensure that the student experience will be comparable with the experience at the main location of delivery. Where programmes are already being delivered at the new location, a site visit may only be necessary if the new programme is in a different discipline, which requires different resources.*

## New deliverers of existing programmes

* 1. Where a partner wishes to begin delivering a programme already approved for delivery by the University or another of its partners, the procedure set out above for ‘new locations’ **must** be followed subject to EPC being satisfied that the programme reflects current internal and external expectations.

## Dual awards

* 1. The University will only approve collaborative programmes, which lead to a \*Dual Award where partnership is directly with the awarding institution(s).

\**Dual awards are defined as an agreement through which a single programme of study leads to two awards of the same level, one awarded by the University, the other by the partner institution.*

## Language of delivery

* 1. With the exception of Dual awards, the University will not approve collaborative programmes where the language of delivery and assessment is not entirely in English.
  2. 5.13 above does not apply to foreign language programmes where the qualification is based on evidence of competency in one or more foreign languages.

## ‘Serial’ arrangements

* 1. The University will not approve programmes where any aspect of the delivery, assessment or support of the programme is to be carried out by a third party (i.e. an organisation which has not been approved by the University as a partner).
  2. ‘Support’ noted in 5.15 above means pastoral or personal supervision rather than purely administrative support or activity such as recruitment.

# Professional Accreditation

* 1. Where appropriate, and in consultation with the relevant PSRB/professional body, the processes of approval set out in this code will be conducted in parallel with the relevant PSRB/professional body.

# Externality

* 1. The University recognises the following forms of external opinion (‘externality’) to inform the design, development and approval of programmes:

1. An opinion of the comparability and appropriateness of the academic standards of the programme provided by someone, qualified to comment but independent of the University and partner institution (see 9.2-9.4) (hereafter ‘**independent academic externality or external advisor feedback’**).
2. The opinion of the person who may be asked to act as external examiner for the programme (see 9.5) (hereafter ‘**external examiner advice’**).
3. Independent externality from within the University but from another faculty or professional services directorate.
4. Engagement with students and alumni.
5. Engagement with employers and professional bodies.

# Stage 1: Development Consent

* 1. Development consent is the first stage of the approval of a new programme. It enables a number of fundamental matters to be addressed to ensure that the programme is appropriate for delivery leading to a University award and can be supported in a way, which will enable the quality of the learning opportunities to be assured, and the standards of the award to be maintained.
  2. The primary purpose of development consent is to determine whether proposals are in accordance with the University's strategic direction and comprise a sound business development.
  3. Specifically, the following issues **must** be addressed before development consent can be granted:

1. The extent to which the programme fits with the University’s and, where applicable, the partner’s, strategic direction and existing and future planned portfolio; this includes the issue of competition with existing and planned University provision,
2. The rationale for the development of the programme, its distinctive features and fit with existing provision,
3. The extent to which the programme is suitable for delivery leading to a higher education award (in particular bearing in mind the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications FHEQ),
4. Whether the programme leads to an award currently recognised for award by the University’s Senate,
5. The funding status of the programme,
6. The extent of fit with the existing resources of the University and partner (taking particular account of potential implications for timetabling and the need to develop any specialist resources to facilitate learning and teaching),
7. The identification of the appropriate University academic unit(s) which will oversee and support the programme,
8. Identification of whether the programme is ‘non comparable’ (collaborative provision only),
9. Fit with the existing legal agreement between the University and partner (where applicable),
10. Whether statutory or professional body accreditation is to be sought and the likely timescale and process involved.
    1. Each year faculties are required to provide a Planning Statement, which includes the key points of the Faculty Strategy relating to academic footprint – new areas to develop; existing areas to exit and associated timescales, especially when developments fall outside the approval cycle.

## Consideration of development consent applications

* 1. The development consent panel is empowered to make one of the following recommendations, to EPC:

1. That the application be supported on academic grounds (SAG).
2. That the application be supported with stipulations (SWS).
3. That further academic information is required before approval (FAIR).
4. That further business information is required before approval (FBIR).
5. That the application be rejected.
   1. All applications for development consent **must** be approved by EPC.
   2. A development consent panel **should** be held within 6 weeks of receipt of all documentation.
   3. Development consent panel membership comprises an independent chair (independent of the proposing academic unit) and three other panel members (2 of which **must** be an academic member of staff), who should not be members of the academic unit proposing the programme.
   4. Additionally, where the programme is collaborative provision, the panel **must** include a member of the Quality Support Service.
   5. Where an apprenticeship programme is being considered, a member of the Skills and Apprenticeships Service **must** be a panel member.
   6. Panel members have an important role to play in at least three key stages:
6. Before the event: giving the proposal preliminary scrutiny and identifying potential lines of enquiry,
7. At the event: contributing to the discussion of the viability of the proposal and in helping to formulate conclusions,
8. After the event: approving the panel outcomes and scrutinising any conditions set and to recommend that programmes proceed to full approval.
   1. The programme director, team and/or faculty representative/s **should** attend the meeting in order to provide points of clarification. The relevant academic contact or faculty representative **should** attend as a member of a partner institution programme team.
   2. The approval of development consent decisions is conveyed to programme directors by via EPC notification.
   3. The University recognises that proposals from partner institutions will not necessarily align with timing of the University planning round or approval cycle. Partner institutions **must** identify, in consultation with the Quality Support Service, the University academic unit, which it considers best suited in terms of subject comparability to support and oversee the development and delivery of new programmes. Following identification of the faculty, the partner **must** approach the associate dean (education) to facilitate discussion over the proposal and elicit the willingness of the faculty to support the proposal.
   4. Where it appears that there is no academic unit with sufficient subject comparability the collaborative provision is deemed non-comparable.
   5. The University recognises that there will be other occasions where there are compelling reasons for developing a new programme, which was not included in the approved Planning Statement. This may be the result of relatively short-term requests from professional or statutory bodies (such as the NHS) or corporate bodies. In such cases, the head of academic units **must** consult their planning contact in the Strategic Planning & Business Intelligence Service (SPBIS) and submit a development consent form.
   6. Proposals **should** be considered in the context of the proposals for major amendments to existing programmes, and for proposals to withdraw (temporarily or permanently) any existing programmes.
   7. Development consent **must not** be granted in the absence of a fully endorsed development consent application.
   8. The secretary to the panel **must** provide a record of the development consent panel decision, and the development consent application to the secretary of EPC.
   9. Development consent is valid for 12 months from the date it is granted, unless otherwise stated at development consent. An application for full academic approval **must not** be considered unless the programme has development consent as described in this section of this code.
   10. Where development consent has expired prior to the validation panel, the relevant Faculty quality team **should** request an extension through application to the Education Planning Committee. The request **should** include submission of the original development consent form and costing tool, with a rationale for the extension, including confirmation of the currency of the original documentation.
   11. If updates have been made to the original documentation then these changes **should** be detailed in the rationale. The Education Planning Committee will then advise if the extension is approved or, if a further development consent panel is needed to ensure currency of the planned programme development. Applications for extensions **should** ideally be submitted before the original development consent approval expires.

# Stage 2: Validation Stage

* 1. **Full approval** is the process through which the University confirms that recruitment to, and delivery of, a programme of study may commence. The following explains the process for considering proposals for full approval, and the criteria against which proposals will be assessed. Programme proposals will be scrutinised by a University Validation Panel (UVP), which will make recommendations to the Education Planning Committee (EPC), which will make the final decision whether to grant full approval.

## Externality

## *Independent externality*

* 1. This form of externality is essential to enable the University to satisfy itself, and therefore satisfy its stakeholders (including students, graduates and employers) that the academic standards are appropriate for the award being sought and comparable with equivalent qualifications at other HEIs. Such consideration draws on sector good practice reflected in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, and the relevant Subject Benchmark Statements.
  2. For the purposes of independent externality as defined by this code, the person nominated **must** be a suitably qualified subject specialist. A nominated individual **must** be either:

1. A subject specialist.
2. A current external examiner of the University for revalidation/curriculum enhancement, major modifications or where there is limitation of externality in the subject specialism.
3. Someone who has been an external examiner in the past five years.
   1. The independent academic external **may**, however, **not** be somebody who has been an external examiner, member of staff or a student of the University, or one of its educational partners, in the past five years.

## *External examiner advice*

* 1. Contact with the external examiner, if not the nominated independent external advisor, is appropriate, not least out of courtesy, to ensure that the person asked to act as external examiner is supportive of the programme given that they will be asked to comment on matters including academic standards in their annual report to the University. The advice of a current external examiner **must** be obtained during the development of the programme, prior to submission of the programme for full approval.
  2. NOTE: The definition of who can be an external for this purpose is explicit to ensure that they are sufficiently impartial (reflecting external expectations). The nature of the programme and discipline will dictate whether the person is the same as the one who provided market externality at the development consent stage prior to planning permission.

## Deadlines for full approval

* 1. The final version of the full programme proposal **must** be submitted to the Faculty Quality Team.
  2. For University Validation Panel records to be considered by EPC they **must** be submitted to the secretary of EPC no later than one week prior to the date of the committee meeting.
  3. EPC is empowered to grant block exemption to types of programmes, facilitating a fast-track approval, for example for programmes which are of relatively short duration.

## Submission of the proposal

* 1. The head of academic unit is responsible for determining the process through which proposals will be scrutinised within the academic unit prior to submission. This process **must** be agreed with the dean and **must** be designed to ensure that the proposal:

1. Is consistent with the development consent granted for the programme (including the ‘shelf life’ of that permission),
2. Contains the information required by this code of practice,
3. Adheres to University regulations and external reference points (unless specific exemption has been granted).
   1. Collaborative programme proposals **must** include the CVs of any staff who will deliver the programme who have not already been granted Recognised Teacher Status for the subject and level.
   2. Prior to submission the full programme proposal **must** be endorsed by:
4. The head of the relevant academic unit,
5. The partner institution HE manager or equivalent \*internal arrangement for scrutiny and sign-off as determined by the partner (where applicable),
6. The academic contact / consultant (where applicable).

\**‘or equivalent internal arrangement’ – partner institution are expected to have in place a mechanism for internal scrutiny and sign-off of programme proposals reflecting the importance of partner institution ownership of the quality of the provision before submission*

*to the University. Such scrutiny should focus on external expectations and University requirements, and ensure that the proposal remains consistent with the development consent granted for the programme.*

## Combined programmes

* 1. Where a programme proposal involves two or more academic units each delivering a subject as part of a combined degree the heads of academic unit are responsible for submitting a joint proposal, which has been scrutinised within each academic unit. Where the second (and/or third) academic unit is in a different faculty to the first, a copy of the proposal **must** be provided to the dean of the second (and/or third) faculty.

## Consideration of the proposal

* 1. The proposing faculty is responsible for establishing a University Validation Panel (UVP) to consider proposals in accordance with this code of practice. A panel **should** be held within 8 weeks of receipt of all documentation for the proposal.
  2. To consider a proposal for full approval, the panel **must** meet with the programme director and team proposing the programme. For collaborative provision this **should** include the academic contact. The meeting **should** involve the head of academic unit, and partner institution HE manager (or equivalent) where applicable.
  3. In the case of integrated and combined programmes the meeting **should** involve a representative of the second (and/or third) academic unit. Representatives of a second (and/or third) academic unit **should** also attend in an instance when the proposed programme is a Single Honours degree but one or more core modules are adopted or included in a programme from a second (and/or third) academic unit.

## UVP membership

* 1. Panel membership comprises an independent chair (independent of the academic unit) and three other panel members (2 of which **must** be an academic member of staff), who **should** not be members of the academic unit proposing the programme. In addition, the panel membership **should** include \*student representation.

\**The student representative could be drawn from either the University or a partner institution provided they are independent of the programme proposed.*

* 1. The programme director and team who have written the programme **should** attend the panel. Other members of faculty staff can attend at the faculty’s discretion.

## External Input

* 1. Panel membership **must** also include external input. An External Advisor’s comments **must** be submitted on the standard template at least two weeks prior to the date of the UVP. Where comments are not received, the UVP **should** be postponed or, in agreement with the chair, external comments can be considered post UVP but pre full approval. This **must** be recognised in the Record of Outcomes and Decision, with support from the external as a condition of approval.
  2. Where a programme has been classified as research containing taught elements, the panel **must** include at least one member of the Research Degrees Committee.
  3. Where an apprenticeship programme is being considered, a member of the Skills and Partnerships team **must** be a panel member.
  4. For programmes, which are accredited by a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body, a member nominated by the relevant PSRB **should** be invited to attend the panel.
  5. The Faculty **should** consider the benefit of including a representative from one or more of the following service areas:

1. Student Services Directorate
2. Strategic Planning & Business Intelligence Service
3. Registry Services.
4. Admissions Office
5. University Library
6. Teaching Excellence Academy
7. Quality Support Service
8. Marketing and Communications.

## Criteria for approval of programme approvals

* 1. Members of University Validation Panels **must** have regard to the validation principles, expectations and criteria determining whether to recommend approval.

## University Validation Panel decisions

* 1. If the proposed programme is within regulations (or has been granted exemption by EPC) and that independent externality has been received and been considered by the programme proposers, the UVP is empowered to make one of the following decisions:

1. To recommend to EPC that the programme be approved,
2. To recommend to EPC that the programme be approved with **conditions and/or recommendations** as defined below (see 9.35),
3. To defer and report to EPC that the decision be deferred pending further information,
4. To recommend to EPC that the programme be rejected.

## Approval

* 1. Where a UVP recommends to EPC that a programme be approved, the making of offers by Admissions Service (i.e. recruitment of students, capable of being legally binding on acceptance) is not permitted until the decision has been ratified by EPC. EPC **must** not approve any programme with conditions outstanding.

## Approval with conditions (assuring quality/maintaining standards)

* 1. The University Validation Panel **must** specify the deadline (or deadlines) by which the conditions **must** be fulfilled, explain the reasons why the conditions are required and indicate what evidence is required. The deadline(s) for conditions **should** be within 3 months of receipt of the UVP record.
  2. Conditions **must** be met prior to the programme being recommended to EPC for final approval.
  3. Further communication in a form determined by the chair **must** take place between at least the chair and secretary of the panel and programme proposer to enable the panel to satisfy itself that the conditions have been met. Where EPC has approved the programme with conditions, the chair of the UVP is empowered to sign the UVP Record to confirm that conditions have been met.
  4. Panels **may not** approve a programme with conditions – given the legal implications of approval and attendant risk to the reputation of the University if it delivers a programme which is not of the required academic quality or standards.
  5. If the panel considers that, there is a real risk to quality and/or standards it **must** either defer approval pending changes to the proposal or reject the programme. The need for a number of conditions would, in itself be an indicator of the need to defer or reject.

\**Revised programme proposals must clearly indicate the changes made in response to the conditions set by the panel, for example by using track changes.*

## Deferral and rejection

* 1. Where the panel considers that it would be \*inappropriate to allow recruitment to the programme to take place at this stage, it **must not** recommend approval to EPC.
  2. Where, in the view of the panel, the proposal raises new issues or issues of principle, which were not apparent at development consent, or where the proposal does not adhere to University regulations or other internal or external reference points without prior exemption, the panel **must** defer the decision, giving such advice to the EPC as the panel deems appropriate.
  3. Where the panel recommends deferral or rejection it **must** specify the reasons for its decision and, in the case of deferral, the further information required, and agree with the programme director a date for a \*\*further meeting to consider the proposal.

*\*inappropriate to allow recruitment’: where the concerns are unlikely to be addressed prior to commencement, or the number of conditions would be significant, the panel should recommend deferral of the proposal specifying what needs to be done to improve the proposal prior to reconsideration.*

*\*\*further meeting’: this means a further meeting of the properly constituted panel and not (for example) reliance on chair’s action. It is permissible for this meeting to take place electronically.*

## Recommendations – Enhancing Quality

* 1. The panel **may** make **recommendations**, which it considers will enhance the quality of learning opportunities to be provided by the programme. An annual overview of recommendations will be included in the Continual Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE) process.

## Identification of good practice

* 1. In making its decision, the panel **should** have regard to examples of innovation or good practice worthy of wider consideration. Such examples **should** be included in the panel’s report for consideration by EPC.
  2. Where examples of good practice have been referred to EPC by a panel or EPC has identified examples of good practice it **must** consider ways in which such examples might best be disseminated.

## Recording of Panel’s recommendations

* 1. The secretary to the panel must provide a concise report of the decision, specifying:

1. The decision,
2. Any conditions and the deadline by which each condition must be satisfied,
3. Any recommendations,
4. The confirmed date of commencement where approval has been recommended,
5. Recommended modes and sites of delivery,
6. Any examples of innovatory or good practice worthy of wider dissemination,
7. Further information required (in the case of deferral),
8. The date of any further meeting of the Panel and s academic unit,
9. Any advice to the Committee where issues of principle or similar are raised,
10. The reasons supporting any of the above.
    1. The record of the panel’s decision **must** be approved by the chair of the panel.
    2. Where a further meeting of the panel is held, an additional report **must** be made and added to the first report.
    3. The secretary to the panel **must** provide a copy of UVP Record of Outcomes and Decision, the final programme and module specifications to the secretary of EPC.

\**The UVP Record of Outcomes and Decision is designed to facilitate the oversight role of EPC by ensuring that it receives consistent information from each UVP. Copies will be received by EPC at the next available meeting but only once all conditions have been indicated as approved by the UVP Chair.*

## Decision by the Education Planning Committee

* 1. The recommendation of each University Validation Panel for approval of programmes will be considered at the next meeting of the University Education Planning Committee (EPC).
  2. The Committee **must** make one of the following decisions:

1. To approve the programme,
2. To defer decision pending further information,
3. To reject the programme.
   1. In making a decision under the above paragraph, the Committee **must** make clear how it is changing the requirements set out in the University Validation Panel’s recommendation.
   2. In making its decision the Committee **must** specify its reasons paying particular attention to any circumstance where its decision is in any way at variance with the recommendation of the University Validation Panel. Other than in cases where the proposal does not adhere to University regulations or other internal or external reference points (without prior exemption), or raises new issues of principle, the Committee **should** operate with the presumption that it will endorse the panel’s recommendation unless there are cogent reasons for not doing so.

## Notifying the decision

* 1. Where a programme has been approved, the EPC secretary, via the EPC notification, **must** send notification to the following areas or nominated representatives:

1. Programme Director,
2. Dean and Associate Dean (Education) of the relevant faculty/faculties,
3. External Advisor or Examiner
4. Head of Registry Services,
5. Head of Admissions Service,
6. Partner Institution contact (where applicable),
7. Quality Support Service,
8. Marketing and Communications Directorate,
9. International Office,
10. Director of Finance
    1. Approved versions of programme and module specifications will be stored by the Quality Support Service. Faculties are responsible for uploading the programme and module specifications to the Quality Support Service SharePoint site and for recording any subsequent minor modifications.

## Legal Agreement

* 1. Following approval of a collaborative programme by EPC, the Quality Support Service (QSS) is responsible for ensuring that the relevant legal agreement between the University and its partner institution is updated.

## Recruitment

* 1. Following the \*approval of a programme by EPC **formal** offers (i.e. offers which, if accepted, are legally binding) may be made.

\**This paragraph summarises the role of EPC in terms of monitoring the approvals process, and ensuring institutional oversight including through determining cases out-with regulations, and academic monitoring of programmes.*

# Glossary of terms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Accountable | Indicates that the designated person is held to account for an action taken, albeit that action may have been delegated to another – i.e. the ‘buck stops’ with the designated person. |
| Advisable (should) | Such a clause will be approved ‘good practice’; users must therefore be prepared to justify why they have chosen not to follow this clause. |
| Desirable (may) | Users must demonstrate that consideration has at least been given to this course of action. |
| Full approval | The second stage of the approval of a new programme – the academic case. Where a programme has been granted full approval by EPC, via the UVP, an academic unit may begin to recruit (i.e. make offers) to the programme. |
| University Validation Panel | The body empowered to recommend to EPC full approval of programmes. |
| Mandatory (must) | If an action must be performed in order to avoid sanction, then colleagues must state this clearly; a mandatory clause can be relied upon. |
| MRes (research) | 180 credit degrees classified as research but involving taught elements. |
| Development Consent | The first stage of the approval of a new programme – the business case. The primary purpose of development consent is to determine whether proposals are in accordance with the University's strategic direction and comprise a sound business development. Where a programme has been granted development consent an academic unit/partner institution is permitted to advertise the programme ‘subject to approval’. |
| Responsible | Indicates that the designated person has power to carry out a specified action. |
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