	Programme Development, Approval and Review Policy
Document Type	Policy
Administering Entity	Academic Board, Programme Development and Review Committee (PDRC), Deans, Registrar
Latest Approval/Amendment Date	January 2024
Last Approval/ Amendment Date	October 2022
Approval Authority	Academic Board
Indicative time of Review	January 2029

1. **Introduction**

   a) The policy describes how SP Jain London School of Management (SPJUK or 'the School') develops, approves and periodically reviews taught programmes of higher education.

   b) The purpose of the policy is to ensure SPJUK's programmes reflect and support the School's strategy and meet the requirements of students, regulators and other stakeholders for academic standards and quality.

   c) The School's policy and procedure for monitoring and making changes to taught programmes is contained in the Programme Change Policy.

2. **Initiating a new programme**

   d) A new programme may be suggested or proposed in several ways: by the Dean; Programme Director; a member of academic staff; by the Board of Directors, the Industry Advisory Board or the Academic Board through the process of developing the Strategic Plan; or following discussion with professional bodies or people working in industry.

   e) Proposals for new programmes should be referred to Academic Board on the pro-forma attached at Appendix 1 which should outline how it will further the mission, employability and inclusion.

f) The pro- forma must outline the market demand and programme resourcing requirements including current, accurate and authoritative information and data that sets out the likely demand for the new programme, student markets, alignment with the School's Missions and Vision and teaching and learning objectives, and whether the School has the necessary resources, staffing profile and capacity to deliver the programme. Where there are students on cognate programmes, they will be consulted as part of this exercise.

g) The pro-forma will be considered by Academic Board, which will decide whether to proceed to programme development. Academic Board's decision will be reported to the Board of Directors for information.

h) Should Academic Board decide to go ahead with the development of the programme, it will delegate to the Programme Development and Review Committee (PDRC) the responsibility for this process. Pursuant to its Terms of Reference, PDRC is responsible for ensuring that:

- the proposed new programme meets or conforms to external requirements (including the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and the Sector-recognised standards published by the Office for Students);
- the proposed new programme's learning outcomes are clearly specified;
- admission requirements are appropriate to the level of the proposed new programme; and
- assessments have been designed to both facilitate formative learning towards demonstrating the learning outcomes, and to enable summative demonstration of the learning outcomes
- the programme furthers the mission and vision of the School.

2) **Detailed programme development**

a) The design and development process will normally be undertaken by a curriculum working group (CWG). Typically, the working group will be led by the member of faculty who is likely to become the Programme Director and comprise other academic staff, the Registrar or nominee and possibly also external experts from academia or industry. The PDRC will approve the membership of the CWG.

b) The curriculum working group is responsible for producing a Programme Specification for the proposed new programme as well as details of the programme's constituent modules. The working group must ensure these materials are consistent with the School's Academic Regulations and with relevant external reference points, including the Office for Students' Conditions of Registration on academic quality and standards and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. The CWG

may take advice from other external industry experts as well as the Industry Advisory Board as appropriate.

3) External Review

a) Once the development process is complete, PDRC will commission at least one external advisor with senior academic disciplinary expertise to review the proposed programme and provide an independent report on the relevant template. A particularly important part of this report is the reviewer's view as to whether the programme meets the OfS's ongoing conditions of registration B4 and B5 for academic standards (which reference OfS's Sector-recognised standards). PDRC will also commission a similar report from a professional reviewer which will focus on employability and skills.

b) While the external advisors' role is to provide a summative assessment of the proposed programme, rather than developmental feedback, the curriculum working group may wish to update the programme to reflect the reviewers' comments.

c) The proposed programme will also be sent to the Industry Advisory Board for their feedback.

4) PDRC consideration

a) PDRC will review the Programme Specification provided by the curriculum working group and the external advisors' report (including any changes made in response to the report) and consider whether the programme should be recommended to Academic Board for approval. PDRC's recommendation should be either:

- Approval for five years (the School's standard period of approval); or,
- Approval for a specified period (i.e. for less than five years); or,
- Conditional approval, depending on the fulfilment of requirements to the satisfaction of PDRC by a specified date; or,
- Referral for further development by the curriculum working group, after which the proposal may be resubmitted; or,
- Rejection, where PDRC identifies significant problems or shortcomings which it considers cannot be rectified without major changes.

b) The criteria PDRC will use to determine its recommendation are at Annex A. PDRC's decision should be accompanied by a clear rationale.

c) Where PDRC decides that a proposal should be referred or rejected, the proposal will not go forward to Academic Board.

5) Academic Board consideration

a) Academic Board will consider the recommendation from PDRC and determine whether the proposed new programme should be approved. Although Academic Board has complete discretion over programme approval, it is not expected to scrutinise the academic standards and quality of the programme in the same depth as PDRC, rather to focus on evidence that the process specified in this Policy has been followed diligently and comprehensively.

b) Where Academic Board decides that a proposed new programme should be referred or rejected against PDRC's recommendation to approve it, the proposal will be referred to PDRC for further consideration. Alternatively, Academic Board may decide to approve the programme with conditions not recommended by PDRC.

c) PDRC is responsible for monitoring the implementation of any conditions agreed by Academic Board and reporting to Academic Board on their implementation.

6) Periodic review

a) All programmes must undergo periodic review at least once every five years. Periodic review is to:
   i. ensure that the programmes at SPJUK are current and underpinned by best practice and up to date research where appropriate;
   ii. uphold the appropriate academic standards and provide a quality academic experience;
   iii. contribute to student outcome and employability
   iv. to identify good practice that can be shared
   v. identify areas for improvement and address these through updates to the programme or otherwise through an action plan.

b) Where appropriate, the School will undertake a benchmarking exercise as part of periodic review to the programmes of comparator institutions and their outcomes.

c) The Academic Board delegates the oversight and coordination of periodic programme review to PDRC. Where appropriate, periodic review will consider a group of cognate courses rather than the courses individually.

d) To enable the review, the programme director will complete the appropriate periodic review form which sets out an evaluation of the programme in the light of the above aims.

e) PDRC will convene a panel to undertake the review comprising at least one external advisor with senior academic disciplinary and one with professional experience and one member of SPJUK academic staff not directly involved in the programme's management and/or delivery.

f) In conducting the review, the panel will consider:

  i. the design and content of the programme including admission requirements, credit and currency;

  ii. the programme learning outcomes;

  iii. the assessment design of the programme and alignment to learning outcomes;

  iv. trend student performance data and student outcome data including admission, retention, completion and employability;

  v. the alignment of the programme with OfS's Conditions of Registration for academic quality and standards and other relevant external requirements or benchmarks;

  vi. whether the programme engages in emerging developments in the field of education and research

  vii. the quality of academic resources;

  viii. Staff student ratios;

  ix. Student feedback through module evaluations, surveys and the programme committee;

  x. whether the programme is designed to facilitate the needs of its cohort and support diversity;

  xi. whether the programme is delivered consistently across different mode of delivery, and

  xii. whether there are identified risks to the quality of the programme including with respect to compliance with external regulations.

g) The panel will recommend changes to the programme which will first be considered by the Programme Committee to ensure appropriate consultation and that current students' views are taken into account. They will also make appropriate recommendations on other issues where appropriate.

h) The panel will provide PDRC with a review report. PDRC will consider this report and determine whether the programme should be recommended to Academic Board for reapproval. PDRC's recommendation should be either:

  • Reapproval for five years (the School's standard period of approval); or,

- Reapproval for a specified period (i.e. for less than five years); or,

- Conditional reapproval, depending on the fulfilment of requirements to the satisfaction of PDRC by a specified date; or,

- Discontinuation.

i) The criteria PDRC will use to determine its recommendation will be developed by SPJUK during the NDAPs probationary period. PDRC's decision should be accompanied by a clear rationale.

j) Academic Board will consider the recommendation from PDRC and determine whether the programme should be reapproved. Although Academic Board has complete discretion over its decision, it is not expected to scrutinise the programme in the same depth as PDRC, rather to focus on evidence that the external review process specified above has been followed diligently and comprehensively.

k) Where Academic Board decides that an existing programme should not be reapproved against PDRC's recommendation to approve it, the programme will be referred to PDRC for further consideration. Alternatively, Academic Board may decide to reapprove the programme with conditions not recommended by PDRC.

l) PDRC is responsible for monitoring the implementation of any conditions agreed by Academic Board and reporting to Academic Board on their implementation.

m) Where discontinuation is recommended, this will be reviewed in line with the School's Discontinuation and Teach Out Policy.

Annex A

The following table sets out the criteria PDRC will use in determining its recommendation to Academic Board about the approval of new programmes. These criteria are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive; they illustrate what the information given to PDRC will tend to show or demonstrate to support a particular recommendation.

Approval for five years	PDRC is satisfied that this policy has been followed properly to this point.
	PDRC is confident that the programme will meets the requirements of external bodies (including regulators) for academic standards and the quality of students' learning experiences.
	PDRC is confident that the programme will lead to good outcomes for students.
	PDRC is satisfied that the programme aligns with the School's academic regulations and requirements.
Approval for a specified period	PDRC is satisfied that this policy has been followed properly to this point.
	PDRC is confident that the programme will meets the requirements of external bodies (including regulators) for academic standards and the quality of students' learning experiences, but it has identified or anticipates a change in the external or internal environment within the next five years which may lessen that confidence.
	PDRC is confident that the programme will lead to good outcomes for students, but it has identified or anticipates a change in the external or internal environment within the next five years which may lessen that confidence.
	PDRC is satisfied that the programme aligns with the School's academic regulations and requirements.
Conditional approval	PDRC is satisfied that this policy has been followed properly to this point.
	PDRC has identified one or more SMART actions which need to be taken for it to be confident that the programme will meets the requirements of external bodies (including regulators) for academic standards and the quality of students' learning experiences.
	PDRC has identified one or more SMART actions which need to be taken for it to be confident that the programme will lead to good outcomes for students.
	PDRC has identified one or more SMART actions which need to be taken for it to be satisfied that the programme aligns with the School's academic regulations and requirements.

Referral for further development	PDRC has not been given all the information specified in this policy.
	PDRC is not satisfied that this policy has been followed properly to this point.
	PDRC is not confident that the programme will meets the requirements of external bodies (including regulators) for academic standards and the quality of students' learning experiences. This might be because of a misunderstanding of these expectations and requirements on the part of the programme team, or because PDRC has identified weaknesses which it is not confident can or will be addressed in good time.
	PDRC is not confident that the programme will lead to good outcomes for students.
	PDRC has identified multiple inconsistences between the proposal and the School's academic regulations and requirements.
Rejection	There are significant gaps or weaknesses in the information given to PDRC.
	PDRC is not satisfied that this procedure has been followed properly to this point.
	PDRC has identified significant and serious inconsistencies between the proposal and the requirements of external bodies (including regulators) for academic standards and the quality of students' learning experiences.
	PDRC has identified serious and unmitigated risks to good outcomes for students.
	PDRC has identified significant and multiple inconsistences between the proposal and the School's academic regulations and requirements.

S P Jain London School of Management

Appendix 1: Programme approval form for development

This pro-forma should be used to request Academic Board's approval to develop a new programme.

Background information	
Programme sponsor	
Title	
Programme Type	Undergraduate / Postgraduate
FHEQ Level and credit requirements	
Award	
HESA Qualification	
Entry Requirements	
Mode(s) of study	FT/PT/Distance Learning
Internship requirement	
FT /PT Length (months)	
Intended Start Year/Month	
Articulation with SPJ Global programme	Y/N
Programme Details	
Aims of the Programme: A broad, general statement of educational intent, that indicated the overall desired goal of the programme (maximum 5000 characters)	
Alignment with mission and values	
Contribution to inclusion	
Outcome(s): Statements of intended learning set at an appropriate level	
Subject Benchmark(s): Enter the URL(s) for the appropriate benchmark statements from the QAA website	

Other Benchmark(s): Describe any other benchmarks not listed above (maximum 2000 characters)	
Proposed Accreditations (not applicable in all instances) Indicate here if you are intending to seek PSB accreditation for the programme.	

Employability	
Work Based Learning Opportunities:	
Further Study opportunities: What further study opportunities will be available to students who complete this programme?	
Future Employment: What are the job prospects for students who complete this programme? Which fields of work will this open up?)	
Industry Advisory Board input? (Yes/No)	

Marketing appraisal	
Reviewed by Marketing?	Yes / No
Target market	
Market profile	
Market potential	
Similar programmes elsewhere	
Potential student numbers	
Marketing activity	
External Stakeholders	
Views of current students on cognate programmes	

Resources	
Existing staff resources available	
Existing learning resources available	
New Resources required including staffing, physical, IT or learning resources	