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**Message from the President and the Vice President (Education) of the Students’ Union**

The involvement of students on our approval and validations panels is a huge step forward for Royal Holloway, evidencing our innovative and inclusive approach that stands us out amongst other institutions – taking into account the feedback from our students and acting upon this.

Seeing as students are paying to study with us and are the people taking our courses, it makes complete sense to include them in the development of new courses and programmes, so it goes without saying that this is also a project close to my heart.

A revitalised academic representation system confirms that students well and truly are not simply the recipients of education, but the developers and co-creators. The dedication of students in embracing this role has been evident, particularly with the introduction of the VP Education position, and continues to increase. This affirms that the involvement of our students in the development of the curriculum is not only beneficial but rather essential to a sophisticated and engaging academic experience.

The feedback from staff and that of our students involved in this process in the previous year has been extremely positive and we have every faith that this enthusiasm and productivity will continue. It provides a fascinating insight for students, allowing them to gain a plethora of transferrable skills, drive the direction of the modernisation and diversification of courses and also, enjoy an incredibly exciting opportunity.

With the enhancement of our academic representation system and continued engagement from our students, this is an influential step forwards in student involvement in curriculum design and one that has enormous potential. It illustrates the potential in furthering the partnership between Royal Holloway and RHSU in representing the academic interests of students, and opening the door for their voice to be heard.

*Clem Jones, President, Royal Holloway Students’ Union*

*Jack O’Neill, Vice President, Royal Holloway Students’ Union*

**Message from the Head of the Academic Quality and Policy Office and the Head of Educational Development**

Royal Holloway University of London thrives on the skills, expertise, and enthusiasms of its students, its staff, and the wider community. To further develop this vibrant culture, the ‘Curriculum Consultants’ project is enhancing our academic curricula by benefitting from our students’ invaluable insights and contributions at all stages of their design. By ensuring that the aims, content, teaching, and assessment of our courses are the products of close collaboration between students, staff, and external experts, we will ensure that the aspirations and values of all are the foundations of our excellent education.

*Marina Beck, Head of the Academic Quality and Policy Office*

*Mark Crompton, Head of Educational Development*
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1. **OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMME APPROVAL AT THE COLLEGE**

All programmes of study offered by the College have to undergo an approval process prior to being offered to prospective students. These processes are well-established and ensure the following:

- That new programmes at the outset meet the required standards and provide students with a high quality of learning opportunities;
- That amendments to current programmes (revalidation) enhance the quality of learning and standards are maintained in terms of required learning outcomes at course unit and programme level.

Proposals for new and revalidated programmes of study are considered by a number of committees:

**Academic Planning Committee**
This Committee makes a decision about whether the (re)validation can proceed. This decision considers:

- the likely potential for recruitment of students;
- admissions requirements;
- target student numbers for the first five years of operation;
- resources; required
- timetabling requirements.

**Validation Panel**
The Panel considers academic approval of programmes and makes recommendations in this regard to the relevant Faculty Board.
Membership of the Panel:

- Faculty Associate Dean (Education) as Chair;
- two internal panel members from the Faculty in which the new/revalidated programme will be delivered;
- one external discipline specialist; and
- at least one student representative to provide a vital student-perspective.

Decisions of the panel include:

- that the programme be (re-)validated;
- that certain conditions must be met before the programme is approved to be delivered to students
- recommendations proposed for consideration by the programme team as they deliver the programme; these may or may not result in future amendments to the programme or to some aspect of the provision.¹

See also Section 4 below.

¹ For more details: [https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/iquad/services/academicqualityassurance/programmevalidation-newprogrammesandmajorrevalidations.aspx](https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/iquad/services/academicqualityassurance/programmevalidation-newprogrammesandmajorrevalidations.aspx)
2. EXTERNAL BENCHMARKS

2.1 UK Quality Code

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) who wish to offer programmes of study need to ensure that these meet the expectations set out in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). This code, which is in the process of being revised,

Articulate[s] fundamental principles that should apply to higher education quality across the UK, irrespective of changing national contexts. These include principles such as emphasising the role of providers in assuring the quality of the experience they offer to students, supporting student engagement, and ensuring external referencing is used to ensure the integrity of awards and the quality of provision.

It consists of the following three elements:

(1) **Expectations** - express the outcomes providers should achieve in setting and maintaining the standards of their awards, and for managing the quality of their provision.

(2) **Practices** - represent effective ways of working that underpin the delivery of the Expectations, and will deliver positive outcomes for students. These include:

- **Core practices** that must be demonstrated by all UK higher education providers as part of assuring their standards and quality
- **Common practices** that will be applied by providers in line with their missions, their regulatory context and the needs of their students. These are practices common to the underpinning of quality in all UK providers but are not regulatory requirements for providers in England.

(3) **Advice and guidance** - help established and new providers to develop and maintain effective quality assurance practices.

2.2 Competition and Markets Authority

In March 2015 the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) published consumer law advice for HE providers to help them understand their responsibilities under consumer protection law with particular reference to the information provided to undergraduate students about programmes of study and associated costs. In response to this the College developed a ‘CMA document’ for each programme of study.

These CMA documents:

- are provided to applicants at the point the College makes them an offer of a place;

---

• include the required information about the programme structure;
• detail information on extra costs which the student may have to incur during their studies, over and above their fees.

For the 2019-20 recruitment cycle these will be amalgamated with programme specifications and the latter provided to applicants.

These CMA documents/ programme specifications form part of the paperwork considered as part of the (re-) validation of a programme. Although the focus of the CMA advice is on prospective undergraduate students, the College’s view is that the guidance should apply equally to information that the College provides for postgraduate taught and taught doctoral students.

2.3 Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies

A number of current programmes at the College have been accredited by external Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs). This means that the programmes not only meet the requirements set by the QAA but also meet additional external requirements which may qualify graduates to work in certain professions, e.g. programmes in Psychology have accreditation from the Health Care and Professions Council and the British Psychological Society. PSRBs will normally only accredit new programmes once they have run for one or two years. However, it is important when validating a programme for which accreditation will be sought, to ensure that any PSRB requirements are met from the outset.

3. STRUCTURE OF PROGRAMMES

3.1 Structure of undergraduate programmes

Undergraduate Bachelor’s programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomenclature</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory (condonable fail)*</td>
<td>Courses that you must take but do not have to pass to progress to the next stage of your programme or to qualify for a particular degree title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory (non-condonable fail)</td>
<td>Courses that you must take and must pass for progression to the next stage of your programme or to qualify for a particular degree title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

French degree: students must pass the first year French language course in order to progress to the second year, and in the final year must pass the French language course to be awarded a BA French. Specialist pathway: For a BSc Management with marketing a
Optional (Condonable fail)*

Most programmes have groups of optional courses to choose from. These do not have to be passed for progression or degree title. For some minor/combined degree titles (e.g. with English with Philosophy) students are required to pass a certain number of credits in optional courses to qualify for the degree title.

These may also include courses in other departments across the College and even, where possible, courses at some other colleges of the University of London.

Undergraduate Bachelor’s programmes with a year out to work in business/industry or to study abroad (an international year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomenclature</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th unit</td>
<td>Such programmes have a 13th unit; students are given credit for the extra year, e.g. through completion of a report, or in recognition of courses taken while studying abroad. This extra unit forms part of the final year degree average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate Bachelor’s programmes that involve a modern foreign language as a major or half component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomenclature</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period of residence abroad (PRA)</td>
<td>Students can study or work while abroad and receive 30 credits for this. They also complete an oral examination on return and receive 30 credits for that. The extra 60 credits form part of the second year degree average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integrated Masters programmes (essentially a Bachelor’s programme plus a year at Master’s level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some include an option of an integrated year in business/industry, usually between their second and third year, and receive 30 credits for this which counts towards the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
industry/business

third year of the programme. This increases the programme to 5 years. See above in terms of requirements

With all the degrees above it is assumed that as students move through the years from first year (Level 4) to final year (Level 6 in the case of Honours degrees or level 7 in the case of integrated Masters), the knowledge and understanding they gain increases in depth, breadth and complexity, as do the skills. (See also below).

3.2 Structure of postgraduate taught programmes

| Full time study – one calendar year (52 weeks), September to September |
| Part-time study – two calendar years (but College regulations permit up to five years to complete such programmes on a part-time basis). |
| 180 credits at Level 7 | Course units worth 10, 20 or 30 credits |
| 120 credits are taught courses, 60 credits are for the dissertation/project (in line with national guidance) |
| Students normally complete taught courses during the autumn and spring terms and then work over the summer term and summer vacation period on their dissertation, which is submitted in early September. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failed dissertation</td>
<td>Students can be awarded a Postgraduate Diploma if they have passed all taught courses (120 credits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Structure of taught doctoral programmes

The College currently offers two taught doctoral programmes in Egham. One of these includes taught course units which need to be passed before the student is permitted to start work on the thesis element of the programme. Having passed taught courses to the value of 120 credits the student can choose to take an exit award of a Postgraduate Diploma, and with the addition of a project worth 60 credits could exit with a Master’s award.

3.4 Course units

3.4.1 Credit value and notional learning hours (NLHs)

As mentioned above all programmes of study consist of course units which have an associated credit value. What this means is that students who have successfully met the learning outcomes of the course based on their assessed work are deemed to have passed the course, and are awarded credit towards their degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notional learning hours (NLHs) for a course unit</th>
<th>Reflect a combination of hours a student is expected to be present in scheduled teaching sessions (e.g. in lectures, seminars), and also the hours that they are expected to spend studying independently.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 credit = 10 notional learning hours</td>
<td>15 credits = 150 notional learning hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2 Level of Study

As alluded to above course units are designed to be offered at a particular level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>First Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Second Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Final year of study for an Honours Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Final year of an integrated Master’s degree (MSci/ MEng), and postgraduate taught level (MA/ MSc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3 Learning outcomes

Every course unit, and indeed each programme as a whole, needs to have learning outcomes. These should define what a learner will have acquired (knowledge and understanding) or what they will be able to do (skills) on completion of the course unit or programme as a whole. The learning outcomes should be achievable, measurable and assessable.

Examples of good learning outcomes

**Latin**
Demonstrate a knowledge of basic Latin grammar and syntax

**Computer Science**
Calculate the complexity of basic algorithms

**Management**
Demonstrate independence and originality in developing problem-solving skills and applying them

**English**
Produce clear, accurate, artistically coherent and technically sophisticated written work, which articulates a combination of research and creative ideas

4. **VALIDATION PROCESS**

4.1 Formal event

As mentioned above the College, as a UK HEI, has to meet the expectations of the QAA UK Quality Code, in particular the following 4 expectations on the standards of awards and quality of the academic provision. These also represent four of the five conditions that have to be met for registration of the College with the Office for Students.

**Expectations for standards**
- The academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.
- The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards.
Expectations for quality

- Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student’s achievement to be reliably assessed.
- From admission through to completion, all students are provided with the support that they need to succeed in and benefit from higher education.

4.2 Panel composition and roles

The validation panel includes:
- Faculty Associate Dean (Education) or Faculty Dean as Chair.
- two members of the Faculty in which the programme will be delivered.
- An external advisor who provides written feedback for the event. They are external to the College and have the necessary discipline specific expertise to comment on the content, teaching, learning and assessment being proposed.
- a student representative as a full member of the panel

The roles of various members of the panel are set out in a separate document. The role of the student representative is to provide:
- a student perspective on the programme to be delivered and the academic and pastoral support to be provided based on reading of the programme documentation;
- input from a student perspective on issues raised during the validation meeting;
- input on the quality of the programme information to be provided to applicants and students.

4.3 Programme documentation

In order for the validation panel to approve a programme it needs assurance that:

I. it has been designed in such a way that it from the outset meets the required standards, and
II. it provides students with a high quality of learning opportunities.

The following documentation is provided:
- The programme specification: a high level document which sets out the overall aims and learning outcomes of the programme in terms of knowledge/understanding and the skills (subject-specific, general and transferable) to be gained, an overview of the teaching and assessment approaches, and high level details of the programme structure
- A Course unit specification for all mandatory course units and all, or a selection, of course unit specifications for optional or elective course units
- A Student handbook, based on the College’s handbook template, which the panel would expect to include the marking criteria to be used for assessing different types of work (e.g. presentations, essays)
- A dissertation handbook (optional)
- Where the programme includes a year in business, a handbook which sets out expectations of the student and the department in overseeing the placement
- Where the programme includes a period of residence abroad, a handbook.
- For programmes on offer in the Science Faculty it may be appropriate for the validation panel to also have sight of handbooks relating to field work or laboratory work as appropriate.
• If the intention is to seek accreditation for the programme in the future, the requirements of the relevant PSRB.

The panel will also be given links to the Quality Code and subject benchmarks or award characteristics which are relevant to the programme.³

4.4 Decisions of the panel

4.4.1 Standards of award

The validation panel has to assure itself that the programme under consideration meets the expectations for standards set out in 4.1 above. More specifically this means ensuring that the programme meets:

• the standards for the award as set out in the Quality Code, e.g. does the undergraduate programme meet the standards set out for an honours award in terms of the knowledge and understanding to be gained and the skills to be developed (See Appendix A).

• subject benchmark statements, primarily for undergraduate awards, which set out the knowledge and understanding and skills that graduates should have developed for the award of a degree in a particular subject, as well as learning, teaching and assessment methods that are appropriate for the subject. For example, a graduate of a creative writing degree may be expected to have acquired knowledge of ‘the range of relevant contemporary writing, together with a comprehensive grasp of literary history; this includes awareness of major writers and critical approaches’, they should be able to ‘communicate orally and through the written word concrete ideas’ and abstract concepts’, and be able to ‘present information to a professional standard, appropriate to context’. The programme should have built into it opportunities for ongoing assessment, which involves tutor and peer assessment as well as self-critique.⁴

• any additional requirements in terms of both expected knowledge/understanding and skill set if the proposed programme is to be accredited by a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body in future.

4.4.2 Quality of Academic provision

The validation panel has to assure itself that the programme under consideration meets the expectations for quality as set out in 4.1 above. The duty of the panel is to assess whether students admitted to the programme of study are supported academically and pastorally during their studies to achieve the best possible degree outcomes and the skills required to maximise their chances of employment.

The RHUL Good Curriculum Worksheet in Appendix B is provided to the panel to assist them in establishing whether the programme meets external as well as College curriculum requirements.

---

³ http://www.qaa.ac.uk//en/quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements
4.5 Validation outcomes and process

The validation panel makes one of the following decisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision of panel</th>
<th>Follow on activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved with no conditions (possibly with recommendations)</td>
<td>The Panel signs off the validation. Faculty Board approves the recommendation of the validation panel for the programme to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved with conditions (possibly with recommendations)</td>
<td>The programme team is given one month in which to address the conditions set. Assuming the Chair of the panel is satisfied that these have been met the validation is signed off. Faculty Board approves the recommendation of the validation panel for the programme to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not approved</td>
<td>The Panel will give the programme team guidance on what amendments need to be made for the programme to be re-considered for validation. Normally a second validation event will need to be held.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A5
General characteristics of a Bachelor's degree with Honours6

The descriptor provided for this level of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications is for any bachelor's degree with honours which should meet the descriptor in full.

Bachelor's degrees with honours are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a systematic understanding of key aspects of their field of study, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline
- an ability to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline
- conceptual understanding that enables the student:
  - to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of a discipline
  - to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline
- an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge
- the ability to manage their own learning, and to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects
- critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem I communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.

And holders will have the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:

- the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility
- decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts
- the learning ability needed to undertake appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature

Holders of a bachelor's degree with honours will have developed an understanding of a complex body of knowledge, some of it at the current boundaries of an academic discipline. Through this, the holder will have developed analytical techniques and problem-solving skills that can be applied in many types of employment. The holder of such a qualification will be able to evaluate evidence, arguments and assumptions, to reach sound judgements and to communicate them effectively.

Holders of a bachelor's degree with honours should have the qualities needed for employment in situations requiring the exercise of personal responsibility, and decision-making in complex and unpredictable circumstances.

5 As the revised UK Quality Code is still under development, the three descriptors outlined here are taken from Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards of the old UK Code, which is current until November 2018.
6 http://qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/the-existing-uk-quality-code/part-a-setting-and-maintaining-academic-standards
**General characteristics of a Master’s degree**

The descriptor provided for this level of the frameworks is for any master’s degree which should meet the descriptor in full.

**Master’s degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:**

- a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice
- a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship
- originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline
- conceptual understanding that enables the student: -
  - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline
  - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences I demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level
- continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level.

And holders will have:

- the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:
  - the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility
  - decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations
  - the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.

Much of the study undertaken for master’s degrees is at, or informed by, the forefront of an academic or professional discipline. Successful students show originality in the application of knowledge, and they understand how the boundaries of knowledge are advanced through research. They are able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, and they show originality in tackling and solving problems. They have the qualities needed for employment in circumstances requiring sound judgement, personal responsibility and initiative in complex and unpredictable professional environments.

---


General characteristics of a doctoral degree

Doctoral degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- the creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and merit publication
- a systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice
- the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems
- a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data, and be able to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- continue to undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level, contributing substantially to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches.

And holders will have:

- the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex and unpredictable situations, in professional or equivalent environments

Doctoral degrees are awarded for the creation and interpretation, construction and/or exposition of knowledge which extends the forefront of a discipline, usually through original research.

Holders of doctoral degrees are able to conceptualise, design and implement projects for the generation of significant new knowledge and/or understanding. Holders of doctoral degrees have the qualities needed for employment that require both the ability to make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields and an innovative approach to tackling and solving problems.

Doctoral programmes that may have a substantial taught element in addition to the research component (for example, professional doctorates), lead usually to awards which include the name of the discipline in their title (for example, EdD for Doctor of Education or DClinPsy for Doctor of Clinical Psychology). Professional doctorates aim to develop an individual's professional practice and to support them in producing a contribution to (professional) knowledge.

The titles PhD and DPhil are commonly used for doctoral degrees awarded on the basis of original research.

Achievement of outcomes consistent with the qualification descriptor for the doctoral degree normally requires study equivalent of three full-time years.
### APPENDIX B

**THE RHUL GOOD CURRICULUM WORKSHEET**

#### Celebrating Diversity in the Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the curriculum content cover a diverse range of viewpoints?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any viewpoints lacking?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the curriculum content designed to appeal to students from a wide range of backgrounds, e.g. from different cultural and national groups, those speaking different languages, etc?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could any students feel excluded?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the teaching methods (lectures, seminars, fieldwork, practical, on-line etc.) designed to accommodate students from a wide range of backgrounds and with varying needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this also true for the assessment types (exams, coursework, essays, quizzes, reports, presentations, performances, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any over-emphasis on one, or a few, approaches?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessment and Feedback in the Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there enough planned opportunities for students to obtain feedback on their progress during the course of an academic year? This could be by way of feedback on contributions in classes, or written and/ or verbal feedback on assessments. It could be on-line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the feedback be timely, allowing students to develop their skills before the next assessment(s) across and within course units in a particular year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the assessment tasks designed to effectively evaluate the appropriate skills as detailed in the learning outcomes for a course unit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the diverse assessment tasks give all students a fair opportunity to evidence their learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a fair assessment load: enough to provide opportunities to evidence learning, but not over-burdening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the assessment timings managed to prevent unnecessary clashes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Development in the Curriculum

| Do the activities develop students' skills for diverse choices in future employment? Do they provide experiences of workplaces and/or workplace skills and practices? |
| Are professional skills integrated across the curriculum to ensure access for all students? |
| Do students obtain guidance and feedback on their professional skills development? |
| Is the development of professional skills assessed? |

<p>| Do students have the opportunity for guided reflection on their progress? Do they plan their future development needs and aspirations? |
| Are there good links with the Careers and Employability Service, and employers? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Research-Informed Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do students have opportunities to learn about the latest research findings in their field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students learn about the research approaches relevant to their field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the links between research skills and professional skills made clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students design and perform their own research projects, for example typically in the final year of undergraduate study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the links between research experience and professionalism made clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a clear ‘Research Spine’ in the curriculum, through which students progressively develop their research skills in each academic year?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Support in the Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are students provided with support in developing their academic skills through activities in the curriculum? These might include writing in different styles, maths and statistics, information technology, giving presentations etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students provided with support in developing their academic skills through Personal Tutor meetings? This may not be clear from the papers: please ask the team developing the curriculum about this, or anything else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students provided with support in developing their academic skills by 'central' departments (e.g. CeDAS, Library etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>