Protocols for dealing with under-prepared or weak validation submissions

Very occasionally the outcome of a validation event is to refer the proposal back to the faculty for further work. Whilst there must be a provision for this outcome at a validation event, it should be an exceptional course of action. The university expects that faculty Heads of Quality and PVC/Deans shall only sign off o Deficiencies in information which will leave the validation par
- reliable conclusion
  - o Non-compliance with expected internal or external requirements/protocols, such a the university procedures for validation and the relevant sections of the QAA Qua Code.
  - o Presentation of information which is significantly unclear or contradictory
  - o The academic challenge of the programme is not set at the correct level and is defined without engagement with national reference points

Record reasons and alert relevant parties with a recommendation for action
The Head of Academic Quality should be immediately advised of the reasons why the proposal is not yet ready with a recommendation of what action should be taken.

Where a proposal is not yet ready, if time allows the recommended action would normall to make arrangements for supplementary information to be circulated to the validation pa All supplementary papers must be received by panel members at least 5 working days p to the validation event.

If there is no time for a late circulation of papers it should be recommended that the even postponed and a new date set.

Decide the appropriate course of action
A decision is then made whether to postpone the event or make a late circulation of supplementary papers. The PVC/Dean should be formally alerted by the Head of Academ Quality, stating the reasons, with a copy of the email to the Panel Chair, faculty Head of Quality and the programme leader/proposer.

The decision on the appropriate course of action should be arrived at swiftly and by consensus through discussion between the Chair, faculty Head of Quality and PVC/Dean mediated by the Head of Academic Quality. The Pro Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Lear will arbitrate where the decision is contentious.

Review of processes
To learn lessons from the situation all parties should reflect on what might be done differently to avoid similar cases in the future. More formally, it is within the remit of the Academic Quality Committee to monitor trends and make recommendation to changes in practice.

Protocols for situations where significant issues are identified during the validation event and the panel is unable to proceed

Very exceptionally cases arise where it is evident to the panel that the validation should be terminated before the panel draws together conditions and recommendations. This is distinct from cases where the outcome is that the proposal is referred back with an invitation to resubmit.

The validation panel chair should seek agreement of the panel not to proceed with the validation

The panel should record its reasons for not proceeding with the event
This will be an issue which is so fundamentally wrong that the panel is not confident that quality and standards of the award can be assured, for example
- o Fundamental mismatch between programme outcomes and module outcomes
- o No confidence that resources are in pla6(ha)10- be asi th between p `eThe v27TT0 1 Tf 35.12`