Strategic Vision: Teaching Intensive, Research Informed (TIRI)
The University of Bolton is a teaching intensive, research informed higher education institution whose distinctive high quality, student-focused, undergraduate and postgraduate programmes attract applications from all over the world.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Authority of the Panel
On behalf of Senate the panel is responsible for scrutinising proposals for new or revised academic programmes of study that lead to University or external qualifications.

2. Duties of the Panel

   i.   In advance of meeting, to review, electronically, the Proposal Development Record for designated programme proposals, according to the Agenda and notification from the USP Secretary;

   ii.   To consider whether for each programme proposal there is sufficient evidence that *due process has been followed* at programme and School/ Division levels;

   iii. To attend the relevant meeting of the Panel and to be prepared to discuss the suitability of designated programme proposals for approval;

   iv.   In advance and at the meeting, to sample and review, electronically, the evidence held in each Proposal Development Record on the Moodle site or (in future) the SharePoint site.

   > The *essential process documents* for review (in this order) are:
   > - SEO Secretary's Report
   > - Report from the Academic Coordinator (SELE)
   > - Consultation Report from the External Advisor(s) / PSRB representative(s)
   > - For off-campus partnerships: the Partnership Operations Manual
   >
   > The *essential programme documents* for review are:
   > - The Programme Specification(s) with the learning outcomes map(s) and assessment map(s)
   > - The Module Specifications
   > - The Programme Handbook(s)

   The *process documents* available for sampling, electronically, as required, include:
   - Report of the consultation with students
   - Report of the consultation with employers / professionals
   - The Programme Approval criteria

The *programme* documents available for sampling, electronically, as required, include:
- Evidence to show how the proposal meets University requirements
- Programme/ Placement/ Mentoring Handbook(s)
- Staff CVs and module / leadership responsibilities
- Any curriculum mapping
- Information to confirm provision of learning resources
- Any specific programme regulations/ PSRB requirements
- Marketing materials
- Records of Academic Approval

v. At the meeting of the Panel: to consider and confirm whether for each programme proposal there is sufficient evidence that *due process has been followed* at programme and School/Centre level. To reach a clear decision, the Panel can sample, electronically, the evidence in the folder containing the Programme Development Record, on the Moodle site.

vi. To make recommendations to the University Senate on *whether or not to validate* of a programme proposal. The possible outcomes are:
- Approval for a 5-year period or until the next Periodic Review and Re-approval;
- Approval for a designated period that is less than 5-years;
- Non-approval with detailed reasons;
- Exceptionally, the Panel can require that the proposal is returned to an appropriate earlier stage. Detailed reasons would accompany this decision.
- Exceptionally the Panel can require that a proposal be considered at a Programme Approval event. Detailed reasons would accompany this decision.

vii. To identify any commendations;

Panels are invited to commend features of good practice. A feature of good practice is a process or way of working that, in the view of the Panel makes a particularly positive contribution in relation to: assurance of academic standards; the quality and/or enhancement of the learning opportunities forstudents; the quality of the information produced about the higher education provision.

viii. To produce a USP Report about each proposal for the Education Committee and Senate, the purpose of which will be to
- list the new and existing University qualifications and programme tiles approved during the meeting;
- provide assurance that due process has been followed;
- highlight features of good practice for dissemination across the institution.

3. Membership
Members:
- Chair;
- External Reviewer with experience of external quality assessment (QAA review, Ofsted Inspection, and when relevant, Quality Assessment by HEFCE/BIS Teaching Excellence Framework);

- 1 Student Reviewer nominated by the Bolton Students' Union, who must beindependent from the programme(s) requiring approval;
- 1 Internal Reviewer who will be members of University staff independent from theprogramme(s) requiring approval, with experience of programme approval and review;
- the USP Secretary.

4. Quorum
   Meetings shall be quorate when the following are present:
   - the Chair;
   - the External Reviewer;
   - One other member – either an Internal Reviewer or a Student Reviewer.

5. Appointment of Chair/ Deputy Chair
   The Chair will be the Academic Registrar or an independent and experienced Chair ofProgramme Approval/ Validation Panels.

6. Meetings
   Meetings shall be held nine times during each academic year, as determined by thevolume of business.

7. Committee Reporting
   The Panel reports to Senate through its sub-committee, Education Committee.

8. Review
Terms of reference are reviewed at the final meeting of the Panel annually and anychanges are subject to approval by Senate