Quality at
Dun Laoghaire Institute of Art, Design and Technology

Procedure for the Periodic Review of Programmes _ programmatic Review

Document Reference & Version No	Procedure for the Periodic Review of Programmes - Programmatic Review Draft V.3
Purpose	To guide staff on the process for the self-evaluation of a validated programme
Commencement Date	Version 1 November 2005 Version 2 November 2009 Version 3 October 2015 (working document)
Date of Next Review	
Who needs to know about this document	Registrar, Heads of Faculty, Heads of Department, Programme Co-ordinators, all academic staff, all students
Revision History	Revision of V.2009
Policy Author	Registrar
Policy Owner	Academic Council

1. Introduction

The periodic review of a programme refers to a process which is conducted at particular time intervals to consider the development of the programme over the previous period, with particular regard to the achievement and improvement of educational quality. In addition to reflecting on the objectives of ongoing monitoring activities (*ensuring that a course of study is being provided effectively, maintaining academic standards and offering students a fair and reasonable opportunity to engage with the intended learning in a stimulating education environment*) it is an opportunity to assure the learning outcomes reflect up to date knowledge in the community of practice; that the curriculum design and structure is effective; that contemporary best practice in student-centred learning is reflected in the teaching and assessment practices; that there remains a demand for the programme; that graduates are able to secure employment in their field of qualification; and that the programme remains viable. In order to investigate a programme thoroughly and consider these dimensions IADT employs a complementary model of self-study and an evaluation by independent peer evaluators. The programme review process is very similar to the process for the validation of new programmes.

2. Appointment of a Programmatic Review Team

a) The Head of Faculty and relevant Heads of Department appoint a Programmatic Review Team. All members of staff working on the programme are eligible to be members of the team. The team must include at least one student member.

b) They set a terms of reference for the work of the team, to include

    i. Timescale for the conduct of the self-reflection

    ii. Nature of the evaluation – one or more programmes

    iii. Team leader(s)

    iv. Report writer(s)

    v. Stakeholder identification

    vi. Methodologies for the collection of stakeholder feedback

    vii. Methodologies for consideration of the programme against the review criteria

    viii. Identifying the nature of evidence required to provide a rationale for proposed changes

c) The Head of Faculty is responsible for oversight of the work of the Programmatic Review Team

d) The allocation of any necessary resources to the review

3. Work of the Programmatic Review Team

3.1   Self-Evaluation

The Programmatic Review Team is tasked with analysing the programme and its provision over the previous 3-7 year period to establish if it still meets programme validation criteria and programme review criteria. Self-Evaluation is the analysis of a proposed study programme, relevant data collected and stakeholder feedback against set written criteria, possibly leading to a revision of the drafted intended learning outcomes, and the development of a modified or new study programme, which is presented in a written document. This is then considered by a panel of experts/peers.

3.2   Collect Stakeholder Feedback

Key tasks are:

- Identify stakeholder categories, which normally include students, graduates, employers, fellow teachers, support staff of the institute, etc.
- Identify representatives of stakeholders
- Identify a method of collecting feedback, which ensures that it sufficiently comprehensive and reliable. Mixed methods are usually most robust and include surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.
- Collate and analyse data

3.3   Conduct a SWOT Analysis

Conduct a confrontational SWOT analysis, focussing on internal and external dimensions.

- Analyse the information collected from stakeholders in a SWOT analysis of the programme using the confrontational matrix below, or an alternative model
- Conduct a separate SWOT using only the reflections of the programme review team
- Compare stakeholder priorities to those of the programme team
- Evaluate competing interests
- Evaluate stakeholder priorities
- Decide what to include and what not to include in the SWOT for presentation in the final document

Establish:

- Should the programme continue or be closed down
- If it should continue are there any changes required in the programme

The SWOT analysis, identifying Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats should lead to action plans for improvement, and a revised programme document according to

the improvements identified. At the end of the self-evaluation report conclusions should be presented.

	External Opportunities (O) List 4-5 External Opportunities 1 2 3 4	**External Threats** (T) List 4-5 External Threats 1 2 3 4
Internal Strengths (S) List 4-5 Internal strengths 1 2 3 4	S-O "Max-Max" Strategy Strategies that **use strengths to maximise opportunities**	S-T "Max-Min" Strategy Strategies that **use strengths to minimise threats**
Internal Weaknesses (W) List 4-5 Internal Weaknesses 1 2 3 4	W-O "Min-Max" Strategy Strategies **that minimise weaknesses by taking advantage of opportunities**	W-T "Min-Min" Strategy Strategies **that minimise weaknesses and avoid threats**

3.4   Conduct a simple comparative benchmarking exercise

a) List similar programmes, and include national and international examples.

HEI	Programme Title	Number of places	Entry Requirements	Fees	Duration	Graduate Employment Rates	International links and Exchanges

b) List distinctive features of the Programme compared to other programmes
   i. For Students
   ii. For the Institution
   iii. For the country/region

3.5   Self-reflection against the Programmatic Review Criteria

The self-evaluation team drafts a document to accompany a revised programme document which addresses each of the revalidation and programmatic review criteria (not necessarily systematically, or by listing each criterion). The report draws on the stakeholder feedback, the programme teams own reflections, the SWOT analyses and the benchmarking exercise.

The self-evaluation report is a critical reflection of the programme in terms of its management procedures and the manner it handles in using learning outcomes as a central value in the strategic development of the curriculum. Therefore, the self-evaluation report should not be only descriptive, but needs to be evaluative and synthetic, that is, it should evaluate strengths and weaknesses. It is expected that Programmatic Review Team will make use of various pedagogical resources in enhancing a learner-centred approach, for example considering greater diversity in the type of teaching and assessment strategies to be used. The Teaching and Learning Committee maintains an up to date resource listing that will be of assistance. At the end of the report conclusions should be presented.

A template for a programmatic review document is available. Appendix One, provides a list of questions which a Programme Review Team may find helpful to pose to itself during the review a programme. A Programme Review Team should expect to respond to questions of this nature at PVC and/or during the evaluation by an independent panel.

3.6   Issue the Self-Evaluation Report
On completion of the Self-Evaluation Report, the Programmatic Review Team sends the document to the Head of Faculty, who on acceptance of the Report sends it to the Office of the Registrar. Should the Report raise resource implications, including issues of staff training, the Head of Faculty also brings a financial plan to the Executive for Approval.

4. Programme Validation Committee

a) Following receipt of the Self-Evaluation Report the Registrar reviews the document to ensure it fully addresses the programme revalidation criteria and programmatic review criteria.

b) Should there be any resource implications raised by the Head of Faculty, the Registrar will await written confirmation of Executive Approval before requesting the Programme Review Team to present the document to the next meeting of PVC.

c) PVC considers the document in light of the revalidation and programmatic review criteria and recommends to the Registrar if the Self-Evaluation and revised programme proposal is ready to be considered by an independent peer review pane.

5. Independent Panel Review

5.1   Establishing a Programme Review Panel

The Registrar is responsible for appointing the Validation Panel. The two criteria for membership of a panel are:

a) Relevant competence
b) Independence from IADT and any of the internal parties

The panel typically comprises three to six persons:

* Senior academic from another HEI to act as Chair
* Academics from a HEI with expertise in the area of the proposed Programme
* Industry/Business expert(s) to reflect employer needs
* Student or recent graduate from another HEI

Panel members are asked to make formal declarations regarding any conflicts of interest.

5.2   Programmatic Review Criteria, including Programme Revalidation Criteria

The independent expert panellists evaluate the reviewed programme to assess how it meets the following key revalidation criteria[1]:

* *Strategic Mission*: Does the programme align to the current strategic plan and objectives of the Institute?

* *Access/Entry* Standard: Does the *prerequisite learning* for participation in the programme and any other assumptions relating to the programme's *target learners* remain explicit?

---

[1] Drawn and adapted from QQI *Validation Policy* 2013

- *Outcome Standard*: Do the *minimum intended programme learning outcomes* remain consistent with the relevant *awards standards* and the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) *award-type descriptors*?

- Learning: Is there evidence that the programme

    - enabled its *learners* to attain the *minimum intended programme learning outcomes*[2] through
        - a student-centred learning environment which reflects best pedagogical practice
        - reliable, diverse and innovative assessment
        - the provision of appropriate learning supports and a comprehensive effective academic policy infrastructure
    - workload was fair and accurately reflected in ECTS weightings
    - provided a stimulating learning environment, cognisant of diverse learner needs
    - provided graduates with fair employment in their field of qualification
    - learning outcomes reflect up to date knowledge in the community of practice
    - curriculum design and structure is effective

- Social impact: Is there evidence that
    - there remains a demand for the programme
    - the programme makes a contribution to society
    - that the programme remains viable

5.3   Panel Evaluation

a) The panel members come to a consensus view as to whether the revised programme meets the criteria specified and whether the self-evaluation has been an effective reflection.

b) Where a programme does not meet the criteria, the panel will advise that the programme should only progress conditional to certain amendments being made.

c) The panel also focuses on general strengths and weaknesses in the programme, and also the review process and makes recommendations on improvements, or commends features of good practice.

---

[2] The concept of minimum intended programme learning outcomes and its relation to teaching, learning and assessment are explained in QQI's *Assessment and Standards 2013*.

d) Whilst it is expected that a proposed programme would not be put forward for independent panel evaluation unless it had been through earlier rigorous considerations, and therefore typically a panel's findings will be in some form of affirmation, it is expected that there may be exceptions where a panel may advise that a programme not be revalidated.

5.4   Panel Visit
Each panel member will receive a soft and/or hard copy of the documentation.

During the visit to the Institute, the Panel will typically follow a full-day agenda as follows:
- Initial session, private to Panel
- Panel meets with President, Registrar and Head of Faculty and/or other senior staff
- Panel meets with Head of Faculty/ Head(s) of Department and academic staff associated with the proposal
- A tour of Institute facilities follows
- Panel meets in private session to consider its findings
- Panel meets with President, Registrar and Head of Faculty to orally convey a summary of its findings

5.5   Programmatic Review Report
Following the issue of oral findings on the day of the evaluation, the panel will work with the evaluation secretary on the production of a Programmatic Review Report. The Report should explicitly address the validation criteria, cite evidence to support judgements made, identify strengths and weaknesses of the proposed programme and take due regard to the relevant ESG standards.

5.6   Responding to the Panel Findings
The Programme Review Team will compile a response to the Recommendations/Conditions.   The response will outline how any conditions stipulated by the panel will be addressed, to include a timeframe within which the condition(s) will be met. The response will also include a rationale for how the recommendations of the panel may or may not be incorporated into the programme structure.

On completion of this work, the full programme response will be submitted by the Head of Faculty/Department to the Registrar for verification that the recommendations as laid down by the external validation panel have been satisfactorily addressed. The Registrar's Office ensures that the revised full programme document is subsequently circulated for

approval to all members of the external validation panel, confirming that the stipulated conditions have been addressed.

6. Decision-Making and Revalidating the Programme

Revalidation is a function of Academic Council.

1) Following the conduct of the panel site visit and the evaluation of the revised programme and the review process, the panel prepares a report and makes a recommendation to IADT on the re-approval of the programme

2) (Assuming a positive recommendation) The Registrar submits to Academic Council a recommendation that the programme be revalidated presenting the Panel Report and the Response of the Institute to same, including any changes to the revised programme.

3) Academic Council considers the recommendation and typically revalidates the programme.

Note that Academic Council does not have to accept the recommendation of the panel, or the Registrar, and may also require an amendment to the programme. Such a course of action should only be undertaken in grave circumstances, which should clearly be documented in any associated minutes.

7. Ongoing Monitoring and Periodic Review

The Programme Board is established and a Programme Co-ordinator is designated. The programme is evaluated and improved.

- The programme is subject to annual review by the Programme Board
- A report from the Programme Board is presented annually at Academic Council

8. Feedback from Evaluators

a) Within eight weeks of the conclusion of the Programmatic Review all external participants, stakeholders, evaluators, etc. are invited by the Office of the Registrar to complete a survey to seek their feedback on their views of the process and its effectiveness.

b) Six weeks after the conclusion of the Programmatic Review the Office of the Registrar seeks feedback from the Programmatic Review Team members and other internal stakeholders on their views of the process and its effectiveness.

Appendix One

Self-Evaluation Check List

1. **Institutional Mission & Strategy**
   a) Does the Programme align to the **mission & strategy**?
   b) Does the programme map to the relevant Faculty/Department **mission**?
   c) Does the programme fit into national and European priorities?

2. **Genuine Need & Stakeholders**
   a) What **research** has been conducted for the provision of this programme in the area in which it is to be provided?
   b) Since the programme will be publicly funded, can it be demonstrated that in developing the programme due regard has been given to relevant public policy?
   c) Is the programme as a process and the intended programme learning outcomes adequately informed by the views of appropriate stakeholders such as learners, graduates, lecturers, employers, relevant advisory bodies, social and community representatives?
   d) Does the programme meet genuine education and training **needs**?

3. **Comparative Benchmarking**
   a) Does the programme compare well against benchmarks (where appropriate)?
   b) What specific programmes has it been benchmarked against?

4. **Viability/Sustainability**
   a) Is the programme **viable**?
   b) Is IADT adequately resourced to undertake and complete the programme proposed?
   c) Does IADT have a specific viable delivery/business-plan for the programme?
      a. Is the physical and electronic infrastructure provided on a stable basis?
      b. Are the financial plans based on realistic projections of student numbers and other variables?
   d) Are there satisfactory contingency arrangements for adapting to changing circumstances or coping with failure of the programme (having due regard for the interests of learners)?

5. **Programme Standard – Intended Learning Outcomes**

a)   Have minimum intended programme learning outcomes been established which is consistent with any relevant subject/field/qualification standards and all National Qualifications Frameworks?

b) Has an entry standard been established? Is the prerequisite learning for participation in the programme and any other relevant assumptions relating to the programme's prospective learners made explicit?

c) Is there clear guidance on the recognition of prior learning – both certified and uncertified (**RPL**)?

d) Is it reasonable to expect that all learners who are judged qualified to access this particular programme should be able to graduate from it subject to their making a reasonable effort and complying with the programme's conditions?

e) Since standards are cumulative (i.e. one must have level x outcomes in order to progress to level x = 1 outcome), can it be clearly demonstrated that the programme's prerequisite learning specification includes the knowledge, skill and competence specified at lower Framework levels?

f) Do the intended learning outcomes emphasise *profound learning* outcomes much more than *transient learning* outcomes? (*Transient learning outcomes are those which are relatively easily acquired and date more quickly. An example of this kind of learning might be skill in the use of a particular software package—one learns how to operate the software without much concern about why the user interface is the way it is or about the underpinning algorithms or data structures. Profound learning takes longer to acquire and dates more slowly if at all—it changes a person significantly. Examples of this include learning to speak a modern language, to play a musical instrument or to be proficient in mathematical methods. This perspective is only an approximation but can be a useful alternative way of thinking about kinds of learning and approaches to learning.*) Do the intended learning outcomes correspond with all national legislation and
international recommendations?

g) Have the programme learning outcomes been specified describing what a student **will know** and **be able to do** at the end of the programme? Is this language and verb use precise and concise? Have the programme learning outcomes been limited to as few as reasonably possible, ideally no more than 8, and are they articulated in broad terms? Just to clarify the learning outcomes, should the language be precise and concise or articulated in broad terms? Am I reading this wrong?

h) Has careful attention been paid to curriculum and programme design and content?

i) Are the learning outcomes at programme level underpinned by learning outcomes at Module level? Is this visibly mapped?

j) Have the programme's Module learning outcomes been specified describing what a student **will know** and **be able to do** at the end of the

Module? Is this language and verb use precise and concise?

k) Are the intended learning outcomes (at both programme and Module level) appropriate to the intended professional field (work field) of a graduate of this programme?

l) Do the programme learning outcomes correspond appropriately to the type (academic, vocational, professional) of qualification and the demands specific for the domain?

m) Do the learning outcomes of the programme correspond with the requirements set by professional colleagues, both nationally and internationally, and by members of the relevant domain's community of practice, i.e. do they correspond with the needs of a beginning professional in the particular discipline?

6. Programme Learning Outcomes - Assessment

a) Has a *programme assessment strategy* been provided for the programme as a whole and *module assessment strategies* for each of its constituent modules?

b) Are the programme **and** module assessment strategies (**for both formative and summative assessment[3]**) both clear and appropriate? Do they provide for the verification of the attainment of the intended learning outcomes?

c) Are all the programme and modules intended learning outcomes capable of being assessed?

d) Has it been verified that there are no assessments being administered which do not map to a learning outcome?

e) Where possible has it been determined that 'marks' are not allocated for attendance, or for the completion of units which do not align to the programme learning outcomes?

f) Has it been verified that the module learning outcomes map directly to the programme learning outcomes?

g) Has it been verified that all programme learning outcomes are assessed and has it been identified where (in which module(s)) they are assessed?

h) Is there awareness of the spectrum of assessment methodologies and are they utilised as relevant to the programme?

i) Are all assessments fair, valid, reliable and transparent? Does the assessment design process ensure valid assessment of the intended learning outcomes?

---

[3] "Summative assessment is the type with which most people are familiar. It is usually conducted in the last few weeks of term to see how well students have learned what they were supposed to have learned. … Formative assessment does not form part of the student's final grade or mark. It is used to provide constructive feedback to improve learning and understanding. The product of formative assessment may never be quantifiably recorded on a grade sheet."
Surgenor, P. (2010) Teaching Toolkit: Summative & Formative Assessment http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/UCDTLT0029.pdf

j) Are assessment decisions in relation to design, development and variety made within a programme context and focused on programme learning outcomes[4]?

k) Is assessment for learning given emphasis in relation to assessment of learning[5]?

l) Can the assessment satisfactorily verify whether the students have realised the learning outcomes of the components of the curriculum in a way that is insightful for students?

m) In respect of a master's programme, is there a thesis/substantial project in which the student shows analytical capacity or an independent problem-solving capacity at academic level?

n) Are the programme's procedures for assessment of learners consistent with institutional and national assessment regulations?

o) What arrangements are in place for External Examiners and what other mechanism is in place to monitor and review the maintenance of programme standards?

p) Are you confident that assessment tasks demand high standards of learning?

q) Is assessment and feedback planned within and across programmes to ensure appropriate student preparation and practice before summative assessment takes place?

r) Is there an emphasis on assessment for learning over systems focused on marks, grades and reliability?

Assessment methods and descriptions

Assessment types for learning, as learning, and of learning

[4] _____ Higher Education Academy

[5] "Balancing assessment for and assessment of learning is concerned with striking a better balance between assessment of and assessment for learning. Assessment of learning is 'summative', i.e. its main purpose is to grade and certify students' achievement, while assessment for learning is 'formative', aiming to support and advance students in their learning." _Integrative Assessment Managing assessment practices and procedures Guide no 4_ QAA (2007) http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/docs/publications/managing-assessment-practices-and-procedures.pdf

s) Is it evident in the programme design that there understanding of the limitations of explicit assessment standards[6]?

t) Are students encouraged to participate in disciplinary communities – communities of practice?

u) Is there an emphasis on building students' assessment literacy through a learning process in which they internalise, apply and reflect on assessment standards?

v) Do local communities of practice play a role in facilitating collaboration about assessment standards?

7. **Programme is a process**

a) Is there adequate understanding that a **programme is a process** which enables prospective learners to attain specified minimum intended programme learning outcomes reliably and efficiently in terms of learner effort via:

The environment
The mode of learning
Staff support provided
Intended workload
Resources provided

And

Assessment of intended learning outcomes

Therefore:

b) Is the programme's content and learning environment appropriate to the programme's intended learning outcomes? Specifically

i. What evidence is there that the prospective learners may achieve the intended programme learning outcomes?

ii. Is the programme's strategy for enabling learners to move from the minimum access standard to the minimum intended programme learning outcome explicit, realistic and viable?

iii. Does the programme *involve* authentic learning opportunities to enable the achievement of the intended programme learning outcomes?

iv. Are any and all exceptions to the provision of reasonable accommodations clear?

8. **Staff Capacity**

a) Are the programme's staff (assessors, teachers, etc.) as a group must be competent to enable learners to develop (achieve) the intended programme

---

[6] "Assessment lacks precision. ... [I]t is not always possible to specify or assess important consequences of education." Is it understood that "the role of professional judgement [is] to be part of the assessment process, alongside the use of explicit criteria?" *A Marked Improvement,* Higher Education Academy, pp. 41-43.
https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/A_Marked_Improvement.pdf

learning outcomes and to assess learners' achievements and expert in their respective disciplines?

b) Are the staff members who are to provide both academic and administrative support for the provision of this programme familiar with any national standards?

c) What training/induction has been provided for these staff members?

d) What are their precise roles and responsibilities?

e) Are the nominated persons competent to fulfil their roles?

9. **Student Needs including Physical and Virtual Environment**

a) Is it evident that the diverse student population (such as mature, part-time, employed and international students as well as students with disabilities), as well as the shift towards student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, has been taken into account when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources and student support?

b) Is the programme's learning environment (physical, social, and intellectual and recognising that the environment may be virtual) consistent with the intended programme learning outcomes? Consider

      i. its resources, such as libraries and online databases and physical resources, such as laboratories, equipment, areas and studios;

      ii. human resources, such as tutors, counsellors, advisors and peers where applicable

      iii. other student supports

c) Does the programme make reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities?

d) Are any and all exceptions to the provision of reasonable accommodations clear?

e) Is the programme content including reading lists, lecture notes, and any other material used by the programme appropriate?

10. **Learner Feedback**

a) How are learners represented and how is feedback obtained?

b) Are there appropriate student representation opportunities and student feed-back opportunities?

c) Have learners been explicitly consulted during the development/review of this programme?

11. **Clear information**

a) Has **clear information** been prepared for students on the intended learning outcomes of all modules, content, study and learning methodology, assessment, credits, learning materials, qualification level, etc. presented in a clear **programme handbook**?

a) Are the entry requirements for this programme **clear** and in keeping with national and relevant international norms?

b) In the case of a modular programme the pool of modules and learning pathway constraints should be explicit and appropriate in light of the intended programme learning outcomes. Are there effective guidance services for learners on the selection of appropriate learning pathways?

c) Is the proposed **public information** about the programme as well as its procedures consistent with national policies?

d) Is there **clear information** about career opportunities arising from the programme? (E.g. The presentation of the programme should not lead learners to presume that successful completion of the programme will entitle them to enter a particular profession or progress to another programme unless this is actually the case. If, for example, the programme is designed to meet the educational requirements of a regulated profession or recognised professional body this should be stated explicitly.)

e) Are issues of student support and guidance clear?

f) Have all matters regarding the professional recognition or international recognition of the qualification been stated clearly?

11. Workload and Credit

a) Has student **workload** been considered carefully and realistic credit assigned? (E.g. consider advice in Gonzalez & Wagenaar Tuning documents or ECTS Handbook 2015)

b) Is the programme to be provided in a way that its intended learning outcomes can be reliably and efficiently attained by the learners?

c) Is the programme's use of ECTS or other **Credit** systems according to the ECTS handbook?

d) Are Credit and RPL provisions consistent with any national policy on these areas?

12. Mode of Learning

a) Is there recognition within the programme team that a different mode of provision constitutes a different programme, and each type of provision is unique?

b) Have the specific needs of different modes of provision and types of higher education been considered, e.g. distance, part-time, online, professional, vocational, academic, etc.

c) Has the **mode of learning** – distance, electronic, part-time, full-time, blended, etc. been clearly stated and is it appropriate to the cohort of intended participants and the intended learning outcomes.

    d) Where relevant is there a well-structured placement opportunity?

13. International

    a) Are there opportunities for Erasmus and other international exchange students?

    b) This programme is available to international students. Have appropriate provisions been made in keeping with <u>Provision of Education to International Students: Code of Practice and Guidelines for Irish Higher Education Institutions (IHEQN) 2009</u> and Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of Education and Training to International Learners (QQI, 2015)[7]?

    c) Is there transparency in the documentation and proposed public information on the programme that would be accessible to an international audience?

---

[7] http://www.qqi.ie/Publications/Code%20of%20Practice.pdf

Appendix Two
Administration of the Validation Process

Responsibility for administrative arrangements around the external programme validation process rests within the Registrar's area, and is managed by the Cross Institute Administrator. Duties include:

- Contacting and liaising with prospective panel members
- Arranging any travel and accommodation requirements for panel members
- Collating required information (tax status, bank details, etc.) from panel members in order to ensure payment for site visits, and sending the information to HR and Finance departments for set up and processing
- Ensuring the Faculties deliver the final programme document within an agreed time limit to Registrar's office for final approval, prior to distribution to panel members
- Proof reading the document to ensure it conforms to IADT template guidelines, and checking accuracy of standard information in relation to IADT policies (i.e. admissions, eligibility)
- Distributing the programme document and agenda (e-mail is the preferred 'green' option for distribution) to the external panel members, along with any other relevant information.
- Organising the schedule of events on the day of the validation process (venue, lunch, taxis etc.) and any other duties to ensure the smooth running of the validation process
- Attending the validation process and taking minutes of the procedure
- Writing a report of the process, based on the minutes, and recording the decision of the panel, to include recommendations, conditions and observations of the panel
- Sending the completed draft report initially to the Registrar, and then to the Chair and members of the validation panel for sign off
- Making any amendments or additions to the report proposed by the Chair or panel
- Submitting the final report to the Registrar and Head of Faculty for consideration of the panel's findings