(Policy & Procedure for Validation of all Programmes at Level 6-10 NFQ)

NEW TAUGHT PROGRAMME EVALUATION PANEL REPORT

1.   GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1   Provider:

1.2   Provider Locations:

1.3   Date of Visit:

1.4   Overview:
1.
2.
3.
4.

1.5   Principal Programme:

Type of Award	Level	Proposed Programme Title Evaluated	Total Credits	Proposed Embedded Exit Award Evaluated	Exit Credits

Number of Annual Intakes:	
Duration:	
Target Learner Groups:	
Enrolment Date:	
Expected Number of Learners per Intake:	
Approved Countries for Provision:	
ISCED:	
Akari Programme ID:	

1.5.1 Associated Programme(s):

Type of Award	Level	Proposed Programme Title Evaluated	Total Credits	Proposed Embedded Exit Award Evaluated	Exit Credits

Number of Annual Intakes:	
Duration:	
Target Learner Groups:	
Enrolment Date:	
Expected Number of Learners per Intake:	
Approved Location(s) for Provision:	
ISCED:	
Akari Programme ID:	

1.6 Evaluation Panel Membership:

Name	Role	Affiliation
	Chairperson	
	Academic Representative	
	Academic Representative	
	Industry Representative	
	Industry Representative	
	Learner Representative	
	Secretary to Panel	
	Admin Support	

1.7 Attendance Register:

Name	Role	

1.8 Apologies:

Name	Role	

1.9   Agenda:

……………………..

2. EVALUATION AGAINST THE VALIDATION CRITERIA

2.1 Examination of the Programmes:

As a result of Covid-19, this is now a 2-stage remote evaluation process:

2.1 STAGE 1: Preliminary Evaluation of the Programmes by the Evaluation Panel (*via* email) before Panel Meeting including Response by Programme Development Team to Panel Comments

2.2 STAGE 2: Evaluation of Programmes at Virtual Evaluation Panel *via* MS Teams on _____ *insert date*.

2.1   STAGE 1: Preliminary Evaluation of the Programmes by the Evaluation Panel (*via* email) before Panel Meeting including Response by Programme Development Team to Panel Comments

	Examining Criteria	Panel Member Comment	Response by Programme Development Team
2.1.1	Are the proposed programmes in line with the University's *Policy and Procedures for the Design, Development, Validation and Withdrawal of all Programmes at Award Levels 6-10 in the NFQ?*		
2.1.2	Has the programme team provided evidence to demonstrate interaction with relevant prospective employers in the development of these programmes?		
2.1.3	Has the programme team provided evidence to demonstrate demand from prospective learners to study on these programmes?		
2.1.4	Is the programme(s) concept, implementation strategy well informed and soundly based – considering social, cultural, educational, professional and employment objectives?		
2.1.5	Are the proposed programme titles fit for purpose? Do they reflect the intended programme learning outcomes and award level?		

2.1.6	Do the programmes meet the requirements set out in the relevant SETU Carlow *Awards Standards*?		
2.1.7	Are programme objectives and outcomes clear, transparent and appropriate with the awards being sought and detailed in the submission document?		
2.1.8	Are the rationale and requirements for the programmes, including the graduate attributes associated with the programmes, clear, transparent and appropriate and detailed in the submission document?		
2.1.9	Are the access, transfer and progression arrangements clear, transparent and appropriate? Are they detailed in the submission document?		
2.1.10	Are the criteria and procedures for recognition of prior learning (RPL) clear, transparent and appropriate in the submission document?		
2.1.11	Is the curriculum content outlined in the submission document structured and fit for purpose?		
2.1.12	Comments on individual modules?		
2.1.13	Where it exists, are the practice placement / work based elements clear, transparent and appropriate for both the learner and the employer?		

	Are they outlined in the submission document?		
2.1.14	Are the assessment strategies robust, reliable and valid and are they clearly documented in the submission?		
2.1.15	Are the teaching and learning strategies sound and programme specific?		
2.1.16	Are all ethical perspectives covered within all programme syllabi and is it clearly evidenced in the submission document?		
2.1.17	Is the teacher-learner dialogue process clear, transparent and appropriate in the submission document to ensure that learners will be well informed, guided and cared for?		
2.1.18	Where relevant, are special arrangements for joint/collaborative provision articulated in the submission document?		
2.1.19	Has the management of the programme being clearly detailed in the submission document to ensure it will be well managed and resourced and that any joint/collaborative provision has been taken into account?		
2.1.20	Any other comments?		

2.2 STAGE 2: Evaluation of Programmes at Virtual Evaluation Panel *via* MS Teams on _____ *insert date*:

2.2.1 <u>Strategic:</u>

2.2.2 <u>Rationale, structure, aims & objectives, entry requirements, access, transfer & progression:</u>

2.2.3 <u>Programme Curriculum, Teaching & Learning and Assessment:</u>

3.   DECISIONS   *(For the attention of South East Technological University Carlow Academic Council)*

3.1   Determination

The evaluation panel recommend the validation of the following programmes, subject to the following listed under 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 below:

Type of Award	Level	Approved Programme Title	ISCED	Akari Prog ID	Total Credits	Duration		Parent Programme
						FT	PT	

3.2   Commendations & Comments

The Panel …………………

3.3   Conditions

The evaluation panel require that the Programme Development Team should take note of the following conditions and that a satisfactory response to address those conditions shall be received before the validation is considered by Academic Council of the South East Technological University Carlow.

1.
2.
3.
4.

3.4   Recommendations

Recommendations are suggestions made by the Programme Evaluation Panel in the spirit of improving the proposed programme. While these are not binding, the reasons for not incorporating a recommendation have to be clearly stated by the Programme Development Team in its response to the Evaluation Report.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

3.5   Response to Evaluation Panel Report By Programme Development Team

The following documents must be submitted as part of the response by the Programme Development Team to the Evaluation Panel Report; all response documents must incorporate comments, conditions and recommendations outlined in Sections 2.1, 2.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of this report:

1. Response to Evaluation Panel Report Section 3.3 and 3.4.
2. Programme Schedules for each programme to be approved
3. Programme Abstract for each programme to be approved
4. Revised Submission Documentation

3.6   Approval

Programme Evaluation Report Approved by:

XXXXXX
Chairperson to Panel
(XXXXXXXXX)

Date: _____

XXXXX
Secretary to Panel
(XXXXXXXXXX)

Date: _____