The Institute of Ismaili Studies

Programme Design, Development and Approval Policy

1. Introduction

The policy outlined by the present documents details The Institute of Ismaili Studies (IIS) principles, guidelines and procedures for the development, approval, amendment and alteration of taught provisions delivered by the IIS, including programmes of study; new taught modules to be included within existing programmes; and taught modules already included in existing programmes. This policy has been devised following the indicators of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education outlined in Chapter B1 'Programme design, development and approval'; B3 'Learning and teaching'; B6 'Assessment of students and recognition or prior learning'; and Part A 'Setting and maintaining

Current and past reports from external examiners on existing programmes are explicitly acknowledged and addressed in the preliminary/development phase of any taught provision.

Programme Validation Panels include external senior academic staff of internationally recognised expertise.

Integrity and Feasibility	The new provision(s) shall comply with national academic regulations.
	The new provision(s) shall comply with internal academic regulations.
	Appropriate teaching staff is available, or can be made available, within reasonable time, cost and circumstances.
	Appropriate learning resources are accessible, or can be made available within reasonable costs and circumstances, by both staff and students.

7. Approval of new taught provisions

With the exception of minor amendments to existing taught provisions (see point 4), new provisions will be approved through a two phases process.

1. Phase One: Approval in Principle by the Academic Steering Committee

   Holding a plenary session, the ASC will peruse appropriate preliminary documentation provided by programme/module leaders, advisers, faculty and any other developer and examine the proposed new or amended taught provisions in the light of the principle[DOT90s][pro gra

shall not have been involved in any aspect of the e;33880TDthe)Tj73221Tf3.444TD.0015Tf.4590TD(

Appendix I: Appointment criteria and duties of Programme Validation Panel

	• fluency in English Staff members who are directly involved in the writing and/or teaching of any of the provisions under evaluation cannot serve as internal members.	
Student Member	A current or former student at the IIS or ISMC, not currently enrolled in any taught programme run by the DGS, selected by the DGS Head of Department and the Special Projects Manager from a pool approved by the Academic Management Committee comprising alumni, current PhD Students, current ISMC students and meeting the following criteria: • expertise in one or more disciplines (or cognate disciplines) related to the taught provision(s) under consideration; • Not acting as representative of a current student body; • recent experience as student representative or other analogous function is desirable; • fluency in English; • Residing in the UK with availability to attend the required meetings.	• to review the proposed taught provision(s) from the point of view of prospective students; • to comment on the clarity of Learning Objectives and Outcomes; • to comment on the appropriateness and weighting of the proposed assessments; • to comment on theto Students, comment on the

Appendix II: Validation Directions

The Institute of Ismaili Studies
Department of Graduate Studies

Validation Directions for Validation Panel Members

Academic year 2015-16

1. The Approval Process

The approval process is

A **Reading List** (if not included in the **Outline**)

detailed response explaining how the proposed conditions are going to be fulfilled. The teaching of a specific module <u>cannot start</u> until all conditions have been fully addressed to the

Is there, across the Programme, a sufficient variety of teaching methods and approaches?

Are the proposed modes of delivery appropriate for the current student learning stage?

c. Assessment (please also see the attached assessment charts and assessment brief)

Is assessment appropriate to verify the proposed learning outcomes?

Is each learning outcome explicitly or implicitly assessed?

Are individual assessments appropriately weighted?

Are the proposed assessment methods sufficiently varied?

Are the proposed assessment methods including significant formative elements?

Do the proposed assessments allow students to develop transferable skills?

d. Learning Resources

Are the necessary learning resources available and accessible by students?

e. Student Support

Are students provided with academic support appropriate for this stage?

Are tutorial/seminars or analogous activities explicitly or implicitly included in the

The Institute of Ismaili Studies **Approval Feedback Form for New or Significantly Revised Provisions**	
1. Title	
2. Academic adviser/lecturer name	
3. Panel chair name	
4. Date	

5. General feedback

6. Proposed outcome

       Approved with no recommendations or conditions
       Approved with recommendations
       Approved with conditions
       Approved with conditions and recommendations
       Delayed approval, pending submission of further material
       Not approved

7. Details of suggestions, recommendations and/or conditions

Appendix: Duties of Programme Validation Panel members

Member	Intended duties
Panel Chair	• to oversee operations at the Panel meeting, ensuring that the Panel reaches a firm agreement on whether the proposed taught provision(s) meet national FHEQ thresholds and internal requirements and criteria; • to evaluate the operational aspects of the new taught provision(s) delivery, in compliance with national and internal regulation, and in respect to the IIS's capacity for delivery; • to collect and collate feedback, evaluations and outcomes from the panel, and to compile the Approval Feedback Form(s) to be transmitted to the Head of Graduate studied for final ratification by the IIS Director.
External Member	• to evaluate whether the proposed taught provision(s) contents and delivery are appropriate to meet the intended Learning Objectives and Outcomes; • to evaluate whether the proposed taught provision(s) are set at the correct FHEQ level in terms of content, integrity and assessment; • to evaluate whether the proposed taught provision(s) are comparable to existing provision at the national level in terms of quality and topical relevance; • to evaluate whether the proposed assessment(s) strategy and approach is appropriate to verify the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, and in regard to student experience in general.
Internal Member	• to evaluate whether the proposed taught provision(s) contents and delivery are appropriate to meet the intended Learning Objectives and Outcomes; • to evaluate whether the proposed taught provision(s) are set at the correct FHEQ level in terms of content, integrity and assessment; • to evaluate how the proposed taught provision(s) will broaden/enhance/supplement the current academic offer by IIS, and how they will be integrated within the existing offer; • to evaluate whether the proposed taught provision(s) are comparable with existing provision at the national level in terms of quality and topical relevance; • to evaluate whether the proposed assessment(s) strategy and approach is appropriate to verify the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, and in regard to student experience in general.
Student Member	• to review the proposed taught provision(s) from the point of view of prospective students; • to comment on the clarity of Learning Objectives and Outcomes; • to comment on the appropriateness and weighting of the proposed assessments; • to comment on the overall workload; • to comment on the level and variety of transferrable skills developed by the proposed provisions; • to evaluate whether the amount and quality of student support offered or planned alongside the proposed provision(s) will enable students to achieve the intended Learning Objectives and Outcomes.