

## BRIEF GUIDE TO THE VALIDATION PROCESS

*For Internal and External Members of Validation Panels and those bringing Programmes to validation*

### **Preface**

This brief guide explains the key elements of the University's quality assurance and validation processes and provides a short description of the University's undergraduate and postgraduate modular schemes and awards structure. There is extensive further documentation covering these matters in more detail. Relevant extracts are sent to external panel members with papers for the validation event. Otherwise, full documentation may be consulted at [http://www.bolton.ac.uk/Quality/QAECContents/Validation/Documents/pdf/Valhandbook\(March09\).pdf](http://www.bolton.ac.uk/Quality/QAECContents/Validation/Documents/pdf/Valhandbook(March09).pdf) (in particular see 'Validation Handbook'). Further advice, guidance and help in gaining access to documents may be obtained by contacting the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Unit and asking for the Principal Quality Assurance Officer in the first instance (tel. (01204) 903052, email [l.yates@bolton.ac.uk](mailto:l.yates@bolton.ac.uk)).

This guide is produced by the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Unit and we welcome any comments and suggestions for improvement, which should be addressed to the Dean of Academic Quality and Standards.

<http://www.bolton.ac.uk/Quality/QAECContents/Validation/Home.aspx>

## 1. **Academic Development Approvals (ADA) Process**

All proposals for new programmes, for major amendments to existing programmes, for collaborative arrangements and for a range of other developments are subject to a planning and business case approvals process prior to coming to academic validation. Outline requests for planning approval for significant new developments are scrutinised by the University's Executive or Deputy Vice Chancellor and those approved are required to produce a more detailed academic and business case, known as the ADA1 (and/or ADA2, for collaborative provision proposals). Other developments (such as major modifications to current programmes, new award titles based on existing programmes, external awards) are subject to the same process, which can operate via the Deputy Vice Chancellor on behalf of the Executive.

The main criteria employed in judging from the ADA1/2 whether proposals should proceed to academic validation are: Fit with the University's Strategic Plan and Academic Portfolio Development; Viability; Quality; Demand. Proposers are required to provide information under a number of headings demonstrating how the development will meet these criteria.

The documentation used in the ADA process is provided to panels as part of the validation papers.

Further details of the ADA process can be found on the Quality Assurance and Enhancement website.

## 2. **Validation Planning**

Following approval of the ADA1/2 and notification to the Principal Quality Assurance Officer in the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Unit, developments are included in the validation schedule, internal panel members and a chair are selected and a validation planning process is initiated. This involves provision of information by the School, followed by a meeting between relevant staff, the panel chair and the Dean of Academic Quality and Standards and/or the Principal Quality Assurance Officer or nominee. This is intended to ensure that all parties have a common understanding of the nature and scale of the proposal, that the event date and programme are agreed and satisfy the needs of the validation process, that the documentation requirements and timescales for production are clearly understood and that the panel membership is established and confirmed.

## 3. **Definition and Purpose:- Criteria for Validation**

Validation of any academic proposal is a process designed to satisfy the University that its programmes of study and the awards to which they lead meet institutional and national expectations of the academic quality and standards associated with such programmes and awards.

Whether for a new or amended programme, or for any other development for which academic validation is sought, the key criteria to be addressed by the programme team and used to structure the validation event and the report of the event are given in Annex C of the University's Validation Handbook.

Whilst not all proposals will need to address all of the criteria to the same extent, the criteria **must** be used as the basic framework for developing, considering and reporting on proposals. This helps to ensure that all proposals are judged by reference to the same generic headings, whilst still allowing proposers and panels to explore particular strengths and issues encompassed by these headings, as they see fit.

To assist panel members (and programme teams) in obtaining an overview of whether the validation criteria have been met, Annex U of the University's Validation Handbook contains a proforma Validation Criteria summary checklist allowing brief remarks to be inserted against each of the criteria as appropriate, forming both an aide memoire and a summary judgements record. The Programme Handbook is similarly addressed in Annex J (The Content of Programme Handbooks) and Annex X (Programme Handbook summary checklist).

#### **4. Composition and Powers of Panels**

Depending upon the nature and scale of the proposal and of the resultant validation event, a panel will normally comprise an independent, internal, senior academic manager as chair, at least one internal member not associated with the proposal from a non-involved School or subject area, plus one or two external members nominated by the proposing School using the proforma in Annex W of the Validation Handbook and an accompanying curriculum vitae, which should demonstrate conformance with the criteria given in Annex O of the same document. All members are expected to be impartial, to have had no involvement with the proposal and to have had experience of validation and review or similar activities, whether internal or external to their own institution. The Deputy Vice Chancellor currently approves the involvement of specific external panel members from the information they supply.

External members are drawn from higher education institutions and from further education, industrial, commercial, public sector and professional contexts if they also have relevant and recent experience. The composition of panels are put to Senate and the Academic Quality and Standards Committee for comment. The status of all panel members is equal, with the chair having a casting vote where necessary. Panels make decisions in the form of recommendations to the University's Senate, which has the authority to accept or decline the recommendations, with or without requirements for further action.

#### **5. Role of External Panel Members**

The University relies on peer contributions to its programmes of study at a number of stages (programme design, validation, external examining, annual monitoring, internal subject/programme review, periodic modifications). This is in keeping with good practice in UK Higher Education and contributes to the maintenance and enhancement of the academic quality and standards of the University's taught programmes of study.

The input to these stages made by external peers is especially valuable and much appreciated by the University. In particular, we seek to appoint external members to validation panels who will be able to offer an informed, rigorous, critical and constructive scrutiny of any academic proposal, whether it takes the form of a new programme or modifications to an existing programme.

External panel members are particularly valuable in providing the necessary subject expertise and comparison with similar programmes of study elsewhere which helps to ensure that academic standards are being set at the appropriate level. They will therefore usually wish to concentrate on the aims and intended learning outcomes of the programme, the curriculum structure and content and assessment. They will also have useful inputs to make to the panel's consideration of learning resources (including staffing), whilst their input to discussions of learning and teaching, student support and guidance and quality management and enhancement will also be valuable, if not perhaps as pivotal as for the other matters.

External panel members with knowledge or experience of the intended career or further study destinations of students successfully completing the programme of study will also be valuable in being able to identify whether relevant personal and transferable skills are included within the stated learning outcomes and whether they are likely to be appropriately developed and assessed via the intended learning, teaching and assessment strategies.

## **6. Documentation**

The documentation required for all major validation events is described in Annex C of the Validation Handbook. For variations of major proposals and for other sorts of proposals, including pathway upgrades, new award titles based on existing programmes, flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning) programmes, external awards, minor programme modifications and major or minor changes to individual modules, Annex B of the Validation Handbook provides an overview of the documentation requirements for each particular case. In some cases specific additional requirements are identified whilst in other cases documentation already prepared for another purpose or extracts from existing documents may be submitted to assist the validation process. Similarly, depending on the nature and scale of the proposal, variability is permitted in the selected range of validation criteria and the depth of treatment during the validation process.

The description of a programme is provided in the Programme Handbook, for which the guidelines on structure and content are provided in Annex J of the Validation Handbook. This document is intended to comprise the definitive programme description both for the validation process and, ultimately, for students (and intending students). Following validation of the proposal and approval of the final definitive version of the Handbook (taking account of any conditions stipulated by the panel) the Programme Specification Document and module specifications will be published on the University's website.

The majority of programmes are now encompassed by the University's modular framework, which has an approved regulatory system and procedures and defined structures and processes for the assessment and

examination of students. Similarly, all programmes are subject to the University's overarching academic regulations and quality assurance procedures which set common requirements encompassing, *inter alia*, the composition and terms of reference of course committees, external examining, annual monitoring and so on. It is therefore not expected that the Programme Handbook will repeat such information but it should mention relevant aspects under the appropriate headings and refer to where full accounts can be found. Variations to standard University frameworks for such matters, to cater for collaborative arrangements and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning) programmes for example, and to assessment regulations (which must have been explicitly approved by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee prior to validation of the proposal) should be explained in full.

Briefing packs provided to panel members along with proposal documentation explain the purpose of the event, the context of the proposal and the key features of the process, as well as giving the panel membership and event programme.

## 7. **Operation of Validation Events**

Panel members will be asked to provide their list of issues to discuss with the programme team and School management both in advance of the event (in the panel's briefing pack) and again at the beginning of the event (by the chair). These issues will be included in the agenda for the event, which will be ordered according to the structure of the list of validation criteria in Annex C of the Validation Handbook. Where there are other dimensions to be considered, eg. in the form of a review of the existing programme, flexible and distributed (including e-learning), arrangements for collaborative partnerships, then these should be integrated within the agenda as appropriate.

The panel will normally meet with School/Partner management in addition to the programme team, may meet students and employers and visit facilities, according to the nature and scale of the proposal under consideration. Agendas for meetings with students and employers are given in Annex V and Annex Z3 respectively of the Validation Handbook.

In all cases the panel, under the guidance of the chair, should concentrate on the validation criteria listed in Annex C and summarised in Annex U, in the context of the proposal before them. The Programme Handbook is similarly addressed in Annexes J and X of the Validation Handbook.

Validation events should be conducted through a process of professional dialogue and constructive, critical and intellectually challenging debate, with due courtesy and respect for other points of view.

## 8. Outcomes of Validation Events or Processes

For all academic validation events or processes the outcome may be a recommendation to Senate to:

- (a) approve the proposal, with or without conditions and/or recommendations;
- (b) approve the proposal for a defined period with or without conditions and/or recommendations;
- (c) reject the proposal, with detailed reasons and recommended action.

**Conditions** are defined as either 'academic' - these **must** normally be addressed satisfactorily before the proposal can be approved and students enrolled, or as 'documentary' - these would not normally preclude approval and delivery of the proposal and the deadline set for them would usually reflect this position. There are also specific administrative requirements to be met subsequent to the event.

**Recommendations** are matters which the panel would like to see implemented to enhance the proposal but which they would not insist upon. Nevertheless, responses to recommendations are required with responses to any conditions. Conditions and recommendations may be followed up at subsequent subject/programme review events.

In making their recommendation to Senate the panel may additionally identify other issues for attention which they judge would contribute to the enhancement of the proposal.

The recommendation will normally be arrived at by consensus amongst the panel. Where a panel is undecided the chair will have a casting vote, if required, but will take due account of the views of the external member(s) before coming to a decision.

Reports of validation events are produced by the panel secretary (a) in summary outcome form normally within three working days of the event and (b) in complete form normally within four weeks of the event. These are circulated to defined individuals for comment before publication. Senate receives the summary report for approval of the panel recommendation, whilst the Academic Quality and Standards Committee considers the full report and identifies any important issues and good practice for follow-up action, both in relation to quality and standards matters and to the validation process itself. Summary reports are also considered by the relevant School Quality Committee of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee, with the aims of helping to ensure that outstanding matters are being pursued, that the main strengths and weaknesses of proposals are recognised and that practice is modified accordingly.

## 9. **Expenses and Accommodation for External Panel Members**

The University will normally pay a standard fee to external validation panel members. Travelling expenses (standard class where offered by the travel operator), car mileage allowance and subsistence expenses will be reimbursed, using prevailing rates. Overnight accommodation will be arranged where requested, normally using the hotel with which the University has a corporate agreement. Claim forms for fees and expenses are provided to external panel members with papers for the event and should be returned to the panel secretary when completed. A copy is also available as Annex Y to the Validation Handbook.

## 10. **Feedback on the Validation Process**

Immediately at the conclusion of any validation event panel members will be supplied with a questionnaire about the process with which they have been involved. Completed questionnaires are first assessed by the Dean of Academic Quality and Standards to determine whether any immediate action is required in response. Subsequently, the results of all questionnaire responses are summarised and considered by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee to identify any recurring issues or trends warranting attention.

## 11. **Quality Assurance Framework**

The University's quality assurance framework is comprehensive and is clearly articulated in the various sections of the document 'Guide to Policy and Procedures Relating to the Assurance and Enhancement of the Academic Quality and Standards of Taught Programmes of Study' (more conveniently known as 'The Red Book'). Quality management and enhancement has consistently been awarded high grades in Quality Assurance Agency Subject Review and positively evaluated in QAA Developmental Engagements and, more recently, in institutional audit.

The framework is underpinned by a definition of quality which stresses shared ownership and responsibility combined with openness in implementing given policies and procedures for assuring and enhancing academic quality and standards. In addition, there are defined individual postholders at programme, subject, School and University levels with particular responsibilities for quality and standards matters. These encompass programme and subject leaders, specific Principal Lecturers, Directors of Schools and the Dean of Academic Quality and Standards, who reports to the Deputy Vice Chancellor.

The committee structure pertaining to quality and standards embraces programme committees, School Boards and their committees and the University's Senate, assisted by its Academic Quality and Standards Committee and Sub-Committees and the Learner Experience and Professional Practice Committee. All main committees include student representation. Assessment Boards, aided by external examiners, make their contribution to the maintenance and enhancement of academic standards through the assessment process and its outcomes and the resultant

evaluations made by external examiners. The outputs from these activities feed into the various quality procedures managed by the responsible individuals, assisted by the relevant committees, as noted above.

The key features of these quality procedures are: initial validation; annual monitoring - encompassing external examiner reports and action in response; and periodic subject/programme review. Most programmes are reviewed along with other cognate programmes as part of an internal subject review process. This process is not connected to validation of new programmes or to approval of changes to programmes in existing approval, which are subject to separate procedures, but subject/programme review will draw upon the outcomes of such processes and evidence of their operation to inform the review.

Individual programmes may be reviewed in isolation, for instance if a limited period of approval was granted at initial validation, if serious concerns have arisen during programme operation which make such a review appropriate, or if the programme is a FE and/or external award and/or not subject to HEFCE funding and quality assurance scrutiny.

## 12. University Programmes

### 12.1 Summary

All programmes of study, whether or not they are formally within the University's modular framework, have programme-level learning outcomes and are made up of modules or units, which themselves have learning outcomes and linked assessment criteria and are credit-rated to a specific value and FHEQ level. Intellectual/cognitive demand, complexity of subject matter and learner autonomy in developing learning and other skills become more challenging as the learner encounters successive conceptual levels in their programme of study. This process is determined by the design features of the programme, especially the diet of core and optional modules and linked pre- or co-requisite modules.

The University offers a wide range of awards as outlined in section 13 below. The awards are listed in the University's Academic Regulations published on the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Unit's website. There are a number of other awards in our portfolio which are made by external bodies and not listed (e.g. ABC, OCR, Edexcel/BTEC awards on the QCF, OCNWR and NEBOSH awards).

In the wake of the publication of the QAA's 2008 edition of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, the University reviewed and slightly modified its award portfolio and credit requirements. The currently agreed credit requirements for University awards are published in the University's Academic Regulations and summarised in section 13 below. Panels will be given a clear understanding of the requirements for any awards under consideration for validation.

## 12.2 Levels of credit

Levels of credit follow the accepted national conventions. Those most generally used to define the main University awards are:

<b>QAA FHEQ</b>	<b>Typical Taught Award</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>
3*	FE Level 3 Foundation Certificate	Further Education HE Foundation Level
4	Certificate of HE/HNC	Year 1 degree
5	Diploma of HE/ HND/Foundation Degree	Year 2 degree
6	Honours Degree/ Ordinary Degree/ Graduate Certificate and Diploma	Year 3 degree
7	PgCertificate/PgDiploma Masters Degree	Masters
8	PhD, Professional Doctorate	Doctorate

\*QCF Level 3

QAA defines qualifications in terms of the level of knowledge, understanding and skills which holders of the qualification should be able to demonstrate. In constructing programmes of study leading to qualifications in the HE framework attention is therefore paid to the minimum amount of credit considered necessary at the 'output' level for a student to achieve the outcomes embedded in the QAA qualifications descriptors.

In designing modules to be offered at a particular level the main external points of reference are the QAA credit guidelines, supplemented by those published by the National Credit Consortia which followed on from the InCCA report and which largely derive from the NICATS levels descriptors. Thus, learning outcomes are written for modules which reflect the desired level and are tested by linked assessment criteria. The syllabus content and learning, teaching and assessment strategies are then designed to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes and to allow them to demonstrate their achievement through appropriate assessment tasks.

## 12.3 Volume of credit

The University attaches a number of credits to each module based on the amount of notional learning time assumed to be required of a typical student to enable them to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The notional learning time encompasses all activities associated with the module - class contact, private study, preparation of assignments, revision, examination. One credit is equivalent to 10 hours of notional learning time.

The standard module in undergraduate programmes is worth 20 credits. For postgraduate programmes there is more variability in the values used in programme design. Fractions and multiples of the standard module are permitted, which help to facilitate flexibility in programme design.

#### 12.4 'Stages' or 'parts' in taught programmes

Degree programmes are often referred to as comprising two 'parts'; Part One equates to the first year full-time or its part time equivalent ie. Level 4 in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. Part Two defines the second and third full-time years or their part-time equivalent, within which there is a defined 'Diploma' stage which equates to Level 5 in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. Part One would normally require 1.5 years of part-time study and Part Two a further three years.

Taught Masters programmes are framed in terms of the postgraduate certificate, postgraduate diploma and masters stages. All stages are in fact at the same (Masters) level. A full-time Masters degree would normally take a full calendar year of study (i.e. 3 semesters), whilst the part-time equivalent would typically be between two and three academic years duration.

#### 12.5 Structure of the undergraduate modular degree

The single honours degree and joint modes of study are defined by the study of a minimum volume of credit at each level within each of the 'pathways' being followed. Typical patterns are shown below.

	Part One *	Part Two *=		Degree
	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Total
Single subject	120	120	120	360
Joint mode	a. 60	60	60	180
	b. 60	60	60	180

*\* up to 20 credits at each level may be allocated to elective study outside of the chosen pathway(s)*

*= programme authorities may, in exceptional, individual cases, seek approval for a programme of study designed to comprise a minimum of 80 credits at Level 5 and a maximum of 160 credits at Level 6.*

*Concurrent study at adjacent levels is permitted to the extent described in the University's Academic Regulations.*

*Up to 40 Level 6 credits will be attributed to a project, dissertation, or other form of independent study.*

Classification of honours is generally based upon the better of either the best 200 credits obtained at Part Two, including at least 120 at Level 6, with a weighting of Level 5 credits at 30 percent and Level 6 credits at 70 percent, or the marks for the best 240 credits at Part Two, with Level 5 and 6 credits equally weighted. Some programmes subject to professional body accreditation will only count Level 6 credits, as may programmes which incorporate a significant proportion of AP(E)L at Level 5; in which case classification of honours will normally be based upon the simple, unweighted average of the Level 6 module marks from a minimum of 80 credits.

## 12.6 BTEC Higher Nationals

BTEC Higher National Diplomas and Certificates are offered by the University under licence from Edexcel and will normally comprise general credits as follows:

	Maximum Level 3	Maximum Level 4	Minimum Level 5	Total
HND (two years full-time)	20	120	120	240

Time taken to complete to honours degree level will depend upon the amount and level of specific credit allowed against the degree programme and may require between one and two further years of full-time study (i.e. 2 + 1, 2 + 1.5 or 2 + 2 models). Honours classification will be based on Level 5 and Level 6 credits or on Level 6 only, as described in 12.5 above.

	Maximum Level 3	Maximum Level 4	Minimum Level 5	Total
HNC (two years part-time)	20	120	30	150 -180

Completion to honours degree level would normally be undertaken by part-time study and usually require between two and three years.

Different models have been developed for the Higher Nationals and subsequent progression to honours. These models cater for different subject requirements, stemming from: the varying constraints placed on the Higher National curriculum in different subjects; the extent to which degree programmes are designed to build upon any preceding Higher National curriculum followed at the University; and professional body requirements.

## 12.7 The Structure of Taught Masters Degrees

Taught Masters degrees usually incorporate a postgraduate certificate stage, a postgraduate diploma stage and a Masters stage (comprising the project or dissertation), each stage normally being valued at 60 credits at Level 7. Classification is not offered, although a distinction category is available, as described in the postgraduate modular assessment regulations.

## 12.8 Arts or Sciences

Degree and postgraduate awards other than those specifically designated for particular subjects (eg Engineering – BEng or FdEng, Law – LLB, Business - MBA, Education - BEd or MEd, Enterprise - MEnt) are titled MA or MSc, BA or BSc, FdA or FdSc, depending upon the balance of their subject content. This is determined according to the usual conventions such that programmes in the arts and humanities and in some business, social, community and health studies subjects generally lead to the award of BA or MA. Programmes in science, computing, mathematics and other technological subjects will usually lead to the award of BSc or MSc. Where there is an equal balance of subject content in a Masters programme the award is often determined by the subject environment (eg MSc in Engineering Management) or by the intended subject matter of the project comprising the Masters stage. In undergraduate programmes made up of two pathways (joint mode) from different subject areas the student may elect for BA or BSc.

### 13. AWARDS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BOLTON

QUALIFICATION TITLE	INDICATIVE ABBREVIATION	FHEQ QUALIFICATION LEVEL	MINIMUM OVERALL CREDITS	NORMAL MINIMUM DURATION (ACADEMIC YEARS)		RANGE OF LEVELS ENCOMPASSED (MIN. CREDITS AT HIGHER LEVEL(S) AND MAX. CREDITS AT LOWEST LEVEL)							
				FT	PT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>(Pre-degree)</b>													
Foundation Certificate	FndCert	0/3*	120	1	1.5	-	20	120	-	-	-	-	-
<b>(Undergraduate)</b>													
Certificate of Higher Education	<i>CertHE</i>	4	120	1	1.5	-	-	20	100	-	-	-	-
Higher National Certificate	<i>HNC</i>	4	120	2	2	-	-	30	90	-	-	-	-
Higher National Diploma	<i>HND</i>	5	240	2	3	-	-	30	90	90	-	-	-
Diploma of Higher Education	<i>DipHE</i>	5	240	2	3	-	-	20	120	120	-	-	-
Foundation Degree	<i>FdA/FdSc</i>	5	240	2	3	-	-	20	120	120	-	-	-
Ordinary Degree	<i>BEng/ BEd etc</i>	6	300	2.5	3.5	-	-	20	120	120	60	-	-
Honours Degree	<i>BA/BSc/BEng/ BEd/BDes/LLB, etc (all Hons)</i>	6	360	3	4.5	-	-	20	120	120	120	-	-
<b>(Postgraduate)</b>													
Postgraduate Certificate	<i>PgCert</i>	7	60	0.5	1	-	-	-	-	-	20	40	-
Postgraduate Diploma	<i>PgDip</i>	7	120	1	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	30	90	-
Masters Degree	<i>MA/MSc/MEd/ MBA etc</i>	7	180	1 <sup>†</sup>	3	-	-	-	-	-	30	160	-
Master of Philosophy	<i>MPhil</i>	7	-	1.5 <sup>†</sup>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Doctorate	<i>PD</i>	8	540	3 <sup>†</sup>	6	-	-	-	-	-	30	150	360
Doctor of Philosophy	<i>PhD</i>	8	-	3 <sup>†</sup>	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

\*QCF Level 3 †Calendar year(s)

QUALIFICATION TITLE	ABBREVIATION	FHEQ QUALIFICATION LEVEL	MINIMUM OVERALL CREDITS	NORMAL MINIMUM DURATION (ACADEMIC YEARS)		RANGE OF LEVELS ENCOMPASSED (MIN. CREDITS AT HIGHER LEVEL(S) AND MAX. CREDITS AT LOWEST LEVEL)							
				FT	PT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>(Post-experience and Continuing Professional Development)</b>													
Foundation Certificate of Continuing Professional Development	<i>FndCert(CPD)**</i>	0/3*	1	any	any			←	→	-	-	-	-
Certificate of Continuing Professional Development	<i>Cert(CPD)**</i>	4	1	any	any	-	-	←	→	-	-	-	-
Diploma of Continuing Professional Development	<i>Dip(CPD)**</i>	5	1	any	any				←	→	-	-	-
Advanced Diploma of Continuing Professional Development	<i>AdvDip(CPD)**</i>	6/7	1	any	any	-	-	-	-	←	→	-	-
Graduate Certificate	<i>GradCert</i>	6	60	0.5	1	-	-	-	-	20	40	-	-
Graduate Diploma	<i>GradDip</i>	6	120	1	1.5	-	-	-	-	20	100	-	-
Professional Diploma in Education (Generic)	<i>PDE</i>	5	120	1	2	-	-	-	60	60	-	-	-
Professional Diploma in Education (Skills for Life)	<i>PDE</i>	5	120	1	2	-	-	-	30	90	-	-	-
Professional Graduate Diploma in Education (Generic)	<i>PGDE</i>	6	120	1	2	-	-	-	15	45	60	-	-
Professional Graduate Diploma in Education (Skills for Life)	<i>PGDE</i>	6	120	1	2	-	-	-	30	30	60	-	-

\* QCF level 3

\*\* These awards may in most instances be substituted with Professional Development Credits