***Transforming Programmes***

***Guidance for the External Advisor on University Validation Panels***

**Overview**

The University of Hull places considerable value on the input of academic peers in assuring the quality of our programmes and maintaining the standards of our awards. As part of our programme validation process, we require External Advisors to provide independent academic externality as full members of a University Validation Panel (UVP).

External Advisors will be required to provide comment on the programme and module specification(s). Comments received, along with the external advisor’s overall recommendation, will be considered by the programme team and UVP. External advisors are not required to attend panels in person, although may be asked to attend in certain circumstances. If attendance is required, the University will cover reasonable travel and accommodation costs.

The appointment of External Advisors will be made by the Faculty following the receipt of the ‘Nomination for an external member of a University Validation Panel’ form and accompanied by a current CV.

**Principles of Appointment**

External Advisors on the Validation/Curriculum Enhancement of University of Hull taught programmes are required:

• To have current academic subject knowledge relevant to the programme(s) being considered;

• To have current experience appropriate to the mode of delivery and level of the proposed programme;

• To be available to consider the programme specification(s) and to attend the University Validation Panel to which they are invited as an expert peer reviewer;

• A current external examiner may undertake the role of advisor for programme revalidations or curriculum enhancement, major modifications and where there is limitation of externality in the subject specialism;

• To assist the University of Hull in its responsibilities for the setting and maintenance of academic standards.

**Curriculum Validation at Hull**

 Programme proposals for validation/curriculum enhancement must demonstrate that they:

* Meet the Standards of the University as defined by its qualification descriptors, level descriptors and assessment criteria;
* Have intended Programme Competences that are appropriate to the subject benchmark and/or professional, statutory or regulatory body;
* Have a curriculum design that is appropriate to the intended programme competences, and to the target student body;
* Employ modes of learning, teaching and assessment which will enable the programme competences to be achieved by the students and achievement to be measured;
* Have appropriate arrangements for student support, including students with disabilities;
* Have the support of relevant internal and external bodies and advisors;
* Will be appropriately resourced.

**The Role of the External Advisor**

The External Advisor is a full member of the UVP. The University Validation process requires External Advisors to undertake detailed consideration of programme specifications in terms of the criteria for validation, namely:

* Rationale;
* Coherence and intellectual integrity;
* Programme competences;
* Compliance with internal and external regulatory frameworks;
* Depth, breadth and balance of subject, intellectual, practical and personal skills;
* Development of student learning;
* Diversity and suitability of assessment opportunities.

All External Advisors will be provided with, and must use, a pro-forma designed to support their critical reflection on the way in which these key issues are articulated in the programme documentation.

We ask you to provide written evidence to enable programme teams to develop and improve their provision; the University also wishes to identify any areas of good practice and this should be borne in mind when writing the report.

**Process and Timescales**

Once development consent has been granted, programme teams working with faculty quality teams should follow the process below. If Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) accreditation is taking place at the same time as the validation event, these timescales may be adapted following discussion with the programme team.

* Provide Faculty with completed programme paperwork which includes:
	+ - Full programme and module specifications
		- An External Advisor Nomination Form
		- A completed UVP Checklist
* On receipt of all completed paperwork, faculty quality teams will convene a UVP panel.
* Prior to the UVP, the Secretary will circulate the External Advisor’s report to all panel members for review. Following UVP agreement, Record of Outcomes and Record of Decision documents will be circulated to the programme teams for consideration and review. All conditions must be met within the times specified to the panel and before the programme can proceed to the Education Planning Committee for final approval.

**University Validation Panel Pre-Panel Feedback Pro-Forma**

# personal information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Name  |  |
| 2 | Position/Institution |  |

# Information about the PORTFOLIO

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | Title of Portfolio |  |
| 4 | Programme Awards and Titles |  |

# EXTERNAL ADVISOR COMMENTS

* *Please complete each section of the form below.*
* *The University is keen to identify good practice through its quality assurance and enhancement process and you are invited to identify strengths and good practice.*
* *Prompt questions are included but you should not limit your consideration of the issues to addressing these questions.*
* *Each box will expand as required.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4 | **Programme Design and Overview***Is the programme design clearly articulated? Is the programme inclusive and supportive of diversity? How is the programme regionally and/or nationally distinctive? Is the programme attractive to the intended audience?* |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5 | **Coherence and intellectual integrity***To what extent does the programme specification present a coherent programme of study? Is progression between levels clearly articulated? Are the Programme competences appropriate? Is there evidence that the programme is informed by up-to-date scholarship and research in the discipline, and/or by relevant professional or occupational requirements?*Is • I |
|  |  |
| 6 | **Programme Competences***To what extent are the programme competences clearly expressed and relevant to the award/module level and title? Have programme competences been articulated clearly at each level of study?**When considering programme competences please comment on whether these accurately reflect the QAA’s UK Quality Code for Higher Education (specifically the FHEQ and any applicable Subject Benchmark Statements).* |
|  |  |
| 7 | **Content and Skills***Please indicate the extent to which you believe that the balance of subject skills and content and intellectual practice and personal skills is appropriate to the award. Is the development of skills in the discipline clearly articulated? Will this curriculum prepare programme graduates for employment and life-long learning?* |
|  |  |
| 8 | **Development and assessment of student learning** *Are the learning and teaching strategies and assessment approaches appropriate to the content of the programmes and modules? Will they enable all students to achieve the programme competences? Does assessment embed the principle of transforming programmes (i.e active learning, problem based learning, programme focussed assessment, flipped classrooms, messy learning, and evidence of spiral curriculum)? Is there evidence of a collaborative approach to teaching and learning?* |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

## Other issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10 | Please feel free to make any other comments you feel appropriate in relation to the standard of the programmes or the quality of the learning opportunities they are likely to provide. |
|  |  |

## Feedback on the University Validation Process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11 | The University is committed to the continuous improvement of its systems to assure quality and maintain standards. Please feel free to make any comments about the effectiveness of this pro forma. Any such comments will be considered in the next review of the approvals process. |
|  |  |