



Quality Assurance Code of Practice

Approval of New Courses of Study

This document is primarily intended for:

Developers of new courses

Assistant Registrars (Faculty/School or equivalents)

Members of Committees involved in the approval of new courses

Queries:

First point of contact: Assistant Registrars (Faculty/School or equivalents)

Further advice: Academic Registry

Contents

Legal and Regulatory Compliance	2
Purpose	2
Scope.....	2
Principles	3
Monitoring and Review	4
Course Approvals Overview.....	5
Course Approvals Timelines	6
Initial Course Development.....	7
1. Strategic Approval – Boards of Studies.....	8
2. Strategic Approval – Academic Programmes Committee.....	9
3. External Review of New Courses.....	12
4. Academic Approval – Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees	14
5. Academic Approval – Faculty/School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees.....	15
6. Academic Approval – Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee.....	17
7. Approval of Doctoral Programmes	19
8. Fast-track approval for course variants – study abroad/placement.....	20
9. Fast-track approval for new exit awards	22

Legal and Regulatory Compliance

QA3 supports the University to comply with OfS Ongoing Condition of Registration B1: *Academic Experience* in respect of ensuring courses are up to date, coherent and effectively delivered.

QA3 supports the University to comply with OfS Ongoing Condition of Registration B5: *Sector-recognised standards* in respect of ensuring standards are set with reference to the relevant Sector-recognised Standards.

QA3 supports the University to comply with OfS Ongoing Condition of registration C1: *Guidance on consumer protection law* in respect of taking account of relevant guidance from the Competition and Markets Authority and to comply more broadly with consumer protection law.

Purpose

QA3 outlines the University's principles and assigns responsibilities in respect of approving new courses.

Scope

QA3 applies to approval of new courses leading to undergraduate and postgraduate taught awards of the University.

QA3 applies to approval of new integrated and professional doctorate programmes.

QA3 applies to approval of exit awards.

Principles

1. New courses are approved to support the University Strategy.
2. New courses are approved where they pose an acceptable level of financial risk to the University.
3. New courses are approved where they pose an acceptable level of reputational risk to the University.
4. New courses are approved where they represent an appropriate use of University resources.
5. New courses are approved where the University has the resources to deliver a high-quality student experience.
6. New courses are approved where they pose an acceptable level of risk to academic quality and standards.
7. Decisions about approving new courses are appropriately informed by expert external input.
8. Decisions about approving new courses are appropriately informed by student voice.
9. Courses are marketed in compliance with relevant consumer protection law.

Responsibilities

The **Vice-Chancellor** gives financial approval-in-principle to resource requests associated with new courses. This is indicated through sign-off by the Director of Finance.

Senate approves:

- new integrated and professional doctorate programmes.
- new courses leading to a new type of award

Academic Programmes Committee (APC):

- gives Stage 1 Strategic Approval to new courses
- approves marketing of new courses prior to obtaining Stage 2 Academic Approval
- sets success criteria for new courses.

Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee (CPAC):

- gives Stage 2 Academic Approval to new courses
- recommends new integrated and professional doctorate programmes and new courses leading to a new type of award to Senate for approval
- approves exemptions to Academic Frameworks
- reports annually to Senate on new courses which have been approved.

Chair of CPAC gives Stage 2 Academic Approval to new course variants with a study abroad/placement.

University Doctoral Studies Committee (UDSC) comments on proposals for new integrated and professional doctorate programmes prior to consideration by APC.

Boards of Studies recommend new courses to APC for Stage 1 Strategic Approval.

Chairs of Boards of Studies give Stage 1 Strategic Approval to new course variants with a study abroad/placement

Faculty/School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees (FLTQCs) recommend courses to CPAC for Stage 2 Academic Approval.

Faculty Doctoral Studies Committees (FDSC) comment on proposals for new integrated and professional doctorate programmes prior to consideration by CPAC.

Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees (DLTQCs) recommend new courses to F/SLTQCs for Stage 2 Academic Approval. For the School of Management, Directors of Teaching exercise this responsibility.

Course Proposers submit the required documents to Committees.

Faculty/School Assistant Registrars advise on QA3.

Academic Registry advises and publishes guidance on QA3.

Faculty/School accountants advise Course Proposers on completing Form QA3.1 Resource Implications.

Faculty/School marketing teams support Course Proposers to complete:

- the course description text in Course Specifications
- Form QA3.6 Stage 1 Unit Summaries.

Monitoring and Review

Mechanisms for monitoring and reviewing new courses are as outlined in [QA13: Degree Scheme Review](#) and [QA51: Education Annual Review and Enhancement](#).

Course Approvals Overview

New courses require Stage 1 Strategic Approval and Stage 2 Academic Approval.

Stage 1 Strategic Approval focuses on assuring a new course supports the University Strategy and is financially viable. Course Proposers need to provide a rationale for the course, financial, resource, market and recruitment information, and very high-level academic information about the course.

Stage 2 Academic Approval focuses on assuring the academic quality & standards of a course and that the University can deliver a quality student experience. Course Proposers need to provide detailed academic information about the course.

New courses can be marketed after Stage 1 Strategic Approval. This requires approval of academic information about the course, i.e. the course specification, at Stage 1.

Offers to students cannot be made until a course has secured Stage 2 Academic Approval.

Course Approvals Timelines

Marketing deadlines

The deadline to commence marketing of undergraduate courses is the December which falls 21 months prior to the start date of the first cohort.

For example, for a start date of October 2027, undergraduate courses should commence marketing in December 2025.

The deadlines for marketing postgraduate courses are not set centrally. Course Proposers should consult with Faculty/School, Doctoral College and central marketing teams as appropriate.

It is normally advised to commence marketing 18 months prior to the start date of the first cohort to ensure viable recruitment.

For example, for a start date of October 2027, postgraduate courses normally commence marketing in March/April 2026.

Final approval/recruitment deadlines

Offers to students cannot be made until a course has received Stage 2 Academic Approval.

The last opportunity to obtain Stage 2 Academic Approval is normally the last meeting of Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee (usually in June) one academic year prior to the start date of the first cohort.

For example, for a start date in October 2027, a course should receive Stage 2 Academic Approval by June 2026.

Timelines for completion

It is possible for courses to complete both stages of the formal approval process within one academic year.

However, committees may reject proposals or ask for proposals to be resubmitted at any stage, and Course Proposers should bear this in mind when planning approval and recruitment timelines.

Initial Course Development

Initial development of new courses is led by academic staff within departments.

Where a new course is being developed, the academic staff involved nominate a Course Proposer(s) to act as a contact point with professional services and committees.

Course Proposers notify the Faculty/School Assistant Registrar as early as possible that they plan to develop a new course so that they can provide appropriate advice and coordinate timelines for approvals.

Academic Quality & Standards publishes:

- [QA3, including relevant annexes](#) such as
 - the Curriculum Design Principles
 - the Assessment Taxonomy
 - the Teaching Taxonomy
 - approval forms and templates
- [QA44 including the course specification template](#)
- [the Assessment for Learning Principles](#)
- [the Academic Frameworks](#)

Course Proposers may seek advice from Academic Quality & Standards on assessment regulations, academic frameworks and the QA Code of Practice which set parameters for course design. academic-standards@bath.ac.uk

The Centre for Learning & Teaching publishes [guidance on best practice in course, assessment and learning and teaching design](#). Course Proposers engage with this guidance when developing new courses.

Course Proposers may seek advice from the Centre for Learning & Teaching on best practice in learning and teaching, including technology enhanced learning and artificial intelligence. clt@bath.ac.uk

1. Strategic Approval – Boards of Studies

- 1.1 Boards of Studies recommend new courses to Academic Programmes Committee (APC) for Stage 1 Strategic Approval.
- 1.2 In recommending courses for Stage 1 Strategic Approval to APC, Boards of Studies assure that:
 - the proposal supports the Faculty/School strategy
 - the proposal represents an appropriate use of Faculty/School resource
 - the Faculty/School has the necessary resources to support a high-quality student experience.
 - in-principle support has been obtained from all academic departments which would be involved in supporting the new course
 - the proposal is likely to obtain Stage 1 Strategic Approval from APC (see Section 2).
- 1.3 Boards of Studies decide which documents which Course Proposers must submit to them. These will likely include the documents to be submitted to APC (See Section 2).

2. Strategic Approval – Academic Programmes Committee

- 2.1 Academic Programmes Committee gives Stage 1 Strategic Approval to new courses.
- 2.2 Academic Programmes Committee additionally approves the marketing of courses prior to obtaining Stage 2 Academic Approval.

Responsibilities of APC

- 2.3 In giving Stage 1 Strategic Approval to a new course, APC assures that:
 - the course supports the University Strategy
 - the course is financially viable
 - the course represents an appropriate use of University resources
 - the University has the resources to deliver a high-quality student experience
 - the course does not require exemptions to the Governing Documents of the University, Assessment Regulations, Academic Frameworks or the QA Code of Practice, or that such exemptions will be sought by the Course Proposers.
 - the course title is appropriate.
 - the entry criteria are appropriate
- 2.4 APC also sets success criteria for new courses against which they will be reviewed.

Documents submitted to APC for Strategic Approval

- 2.5 Course Proposers provide a rationale for the course:
 - the rationale references the University Strategy, the Faculty Strategy and the University's Curriculum Design Principles
 - the rationale confirms support from all relevant Heads of Department
 - the rationale includes proposing entry requirements for the course
 - there is no template for the rationale, and it can be provided as a cover paper for the approving committee. QA3.1 includes a section on links to University strategy. Information provided in QA3.1 can be signposted rather than duplicated in the rationale.
- 2.6 Course Proposers submit Form QA3.1 Resource Implications
 - Form QA3.1 sets out the business case for the course
 - The course costing spreadsheet must be appended to Form QA3.1
 - Course Proposers can seek advice on the business case from Faculty accountants
 - Form QA3.1 must have been signed off by the Faculty Accountant prior to submission to APC

- The business case must have been signed off by the Director of Finance prior to submission to APC
- Form QA3.1 includes proposing success criteria for the course

2.7 Course Proposers submit Form QA3.3 Market Information

- Form QA3.3 sets out the marketing and recruitment case for the course
- Form QA3.3 must have been signed off by the Director of Recruitment & Admissions prior to submission to APC.
- Form QA3.3 must have been signed off by the Director of Marketing & Brand prior to submission to APC.
- Course Proposers can seek advice on the marketing and recruitment case from Faculty marketing teams, central Marketing, UG/PGT Admissions, the Student Recruitment team and the International Relations Office

2.8 Course Proposers submit a draft Course Specification

- The course specification provides outline academic information about the course
- Course Proposers complete the course description section with input from faculty marketing team
- Course Proposers can seek advice on the Course Specification from Faculty Assistant Registrars and Academic Quality & Standards.

2.9 Course Proposers submit minutes from Boards of Studies (and where applicable University Doctoral Studies Committee).

2.10 Where a course is likely to require exemption from the Academic Frameworks or Assessment Regulations, Course Proposers highlight this to APC. Advice can be sought from Faculty Assistant Registrars and Academic Quality & Standards.

2.11 Course Proposers submit Form QA3.6 Stage 1 Unit Summaries.

- the requirements are different for UG and PGT courses, as explained in the form
- Course Proposers complete Form QA3.6 with input from faculty marketing teams
- when marketing a course, the University must provide complete and accurate *material information* to potential applicants. This is a legal requirement. Failure to do so carries severe financial, legal and reputational risks for the University.

APC outcomes

2.12 APC makes one of the following decisions about new course proposals:

- To give Stage 1 Strategic Approval
- To give Stage 1 Strategic Approval subject to conditions

- To not give Stage 1 Strategic Approval
- 2.13 Courses which have been given Stage 1 Strategic Approval may proceed to Stage 2 Academic Approval processes.
- 2.14 Courses which have been given Strategic Approval subject to conditions may proceed to Stage 2 Academic Approval processes once the committee has confirmed that any conditions have been met.
- 2.15 Where a course is marketed prior to obtaining Stage 2 Full Academic Approval, it must only be marketed using the information APC has approved. It must also be marketed as 'subject to approval'.

3. External Review of New Courses

Appointment of External Reviewers

- 3.1 Chairs of Boards of Studies appoint External Reviewers on nomination of Course Proposers.
- 3.2 Chairs of Boards of Studies appoint External Reviewers on nomination of Course Proposers.
- 3.3 Two External Reviewers are appointed for each new course proposal.
- 3.4 Where a proposals is for a new course variant, and much of the course content already exist, only one External Reviewer is required.
- 3.5 The Chair of the Courses and Partnership Approval Committee (CPAC) may waive the requirement for External Reviewer appointments for certain types of proposal.
- 3.6 At minimum one External Reviewer for each course must be familiar with UK academic standards and must:
 - have knowledge and understanding of the UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality
 - have competence and experience in the field covered by the course
 - have academic qualifications/professional qualifications to at least the level of the qualification being externally examined
 - have experience of setting assessment and running assessment procedures (either externally or internally)
 - have sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the discipline to be able to command the respect of peers
 - have familiarity with the standard to be expected of students in the course to be examined
 - have fluency in English
 - have met the criteria set out by relevant professional and accrediting bodies
 - have awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of the flexible curriculum
 - have expertise in the enhancement of the student learning experience.
- 3.7 One External Reviewer may be e.g., a professional/industry expert.
- 3.8 Current External Examiners are not appointed as External Reviewers.
- 3.9 Where a course includes more than one subject, the team of External Reviewers must be able to provide expert commentary on the whole course.

Role of External Reviewers

- 3.10 External Reviewers provide expert commentary on all documentation submitted as part of Stage 2 Academic Approval and the new course proposal more broadly.
- 3.11 External Reviewers provide a report for consideration by CPAC. FLTQCs may also require the report.

4. Academic Approval – Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees

- 4.1 Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees (DLTQCs) recommend new courses to Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees (FLTQCs) for Stage 2 Academic Approval.
- 4.2 For the School of Management, the responsibilities of the DLTQC in relation to Course approval outlined in this section will be carried out by the Directors of Teaching. For this purpose and as required, Directors of Teaching will form a Course Review Panel and advise the School Learning and Teaching Quality Committee about new courses as detailed below.
- 4.3 Course Proposers submit the following documentation to DLTQCs:
- Course Specification
 - all Unit Descriptions
 - the relevant QAA Subject benchmark Statement
 - where relevant, the requirements of accrediting bodies
- 4.4 In recommending a new course for Stage 2 Academic Approval, DLTQCs assure that:
- the course is appropriately informed by the latest research in the field
 - the course is appropriately informed by the latest developments in relevant professions
 - the course is appropriately informed by the latest developments in teaching and learning relevant to the discipline
- 4.5 If a new course is to be accredited, DLTQCs assure that the course meets the requirement of the accrediting bodies.
- 4.6 Academic Quality & Standards provides [guidance](#) for secretaries to DLTQCs on recording these assurances for the purpose of audit trail.
- 4.7 DLTQCs make one of the following decisions about new course proposals:
- recommend for Stage 2 Academic Approval
 - recommend for Stage 2 Academic Approval subject to conditions
 - not recommend for approval
- 4.8 Courses which have been recommended to FLTQC subject to conditions may proceed for consideration by FLTQC once committee has confirmed that any conditions have been met.

5. Academic Approval – Faculty/School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees

- 5.1 FLTQCs recommend new courses to Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee (CPAC) for Stage 2 Academic Approval.
- 5.2 Where a course is interdisciplinary and includes units from more than one Faculty/School, one Faculty must be identified as the owning Faculty/School for the purpose of the proposal. The owning Faculty/School must ensure to seek relevant input from other Faculties/School on the proposal (via formal committee meetings or an ad-hoc forum) and provide evidence of this consultation to CPAC.
- 5.3 The Course Proposal Teams submit the following documentation to FLTQCs:
- Course Specification
 - all Unit Descriptions
 - a link to the relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statement
 - where relevant, the requirements of accrediting bodies
 - intended learning outcomes map
 - assessment strategy and map
 - relevant extracts from DLTQC minutes
 - confirmation that any conditions attached to recommendation have been met
 - (optional) External Reviewers' reports
- 5.4 In recommending new courses for Stage 2 Academic Approval, FLTQCs assure that:
- the DLTQC has appropriately exercised its responsibilities in scrutinising new course proposals.
 - all students will have the opportunity to demonstrate achievement of the Course Intended Learning Outcomes
 - the course is coherent, meaning knowledge and skills are taught in an appropriate order
 - the course offers an appropriate amount of contact time
 - the course includes an appropriate balance between teaching methods
 - the amount and balance of assessment across the course and stages of the course is appropriate
 - for each unit:
 - the UILOS are appropriate for the subject and level of the unit, and are meet in part the statement of outcomes in the relevant Qualification Descriptor
 - the content support students to achieve the UILOs
 - the breadth and depth of content is appropriate to the size of the unit
 - the amount of contact time supports students to achieve the UILOs
 - the teaching methods support students to achieve the UILOs
 - the methods of assessment are capable of testing the UILOs

- the volume of assessment is appropriate to the size of the unit
- 5.5 Academic Quality & Standards provides guidance for secretaries to FLTQCs on recording these assurances for the purpose of audit trail.
- 5.6 FLTQCs make the following decisions about new courses:
- recommend for approval to CPAC
 - recommend for approval to CPAC subject to conditions
 - refer back to DLTQC
 - not recommend for approval
- 5.7 Courses which have been recommended to CPAC subject to conditions may proceed for consideration by CPAC once the committee has confirmed that any conditions have been met.

6. Academic Approval – Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee

- 6.1 CPAC gives Academic Approval to new courses.
- 6.2 The Course Proposal Teams submit the following documentation to CPAC:
- rationale for the course
 - Course Specification
 - all Unit Descriptions
 - intended learning outcomes map
 - assessment strategy and map
 - any request for exemption from the Academic Frameworks
 - confirmation of intention to submit requests to EQSC for exemption from Assessment Regulations
 - relevant extracts from APC minutes
 - relevant extracts from F/SLTQC minutes
 - evidence of consultation with other Faculties/School contributing to the course
 - relevant extracts from UDSC/FDSC minutes or equivalent feedback
 - confirmation that any conditions attached to recommendation have been met, including, where relevant, relating to export controls
 - External Reviewer reports, and responses to the reports from the Course Proposal Team.
- 6.3 Where a Course Proposal Team is required or intending to seek external accreditation for a new course proposal, confirmation must be provided to CPAC with the course proposal regarding the exact requirements of the accrediting body regarding any accreditation, as well as relevant timescales for submission. Any submission to accrediting bodies must be submitted separately to CPAC for approval prior to sending to the accrediting bodies, in accordance with QA8 Professional Accreditation.
- 6.4 In giving Stage 2 Academic Approval to new courses, CPAC assures that:
- the FLTQC has appropriately exercised its responsibilities in scrutinising new course proposals
 - the course is expected to comply with UKVI regulations, including the maximum use of online delivery across the course
 - the course has been designed to align with the Curriculum Design Principles and Assessment for Learning Principles
 - Course Intended Learning Outcomes meet the Sector-recognised Standards Qualification Descriptor in full
 - the course complies with the relevant Academic Framework, or approves relevant exemptions
 - the course complies with the relevant Assessment Regulations, or that the Course Proposers will seek relevant exemptions from Education, Quality & Standards Committee

- the proposal has not changed substantially in relation to strategic considerations following approval by APC, such that the proposal must be referred back to that committee
- proposers have confirmed that, where applicable, relevant checks related to export controls have been completed and if required, that an application for export control license is underway
- the Course Specification and unit summaries are suitable for publication.

6.5 CPAC make the following decisions about new courses:

- Give Stage 2 Academic Approval
- Give Stage 2 Academic Approval subject to conditions
- Refer back to FLTQC
- Refer back to APC
- Not approve
- Recommend to Senate for final approval (where applicable)

6.6 Courses which have been given Stage 2 Academic Approval subject to conditions are not approved until the committee confirmed that any conditions have been met.

6.7 CPAC notifies Senate on an annual basis of the courses which have been approved in the previous academic year.

6.8 The Secretary to CPAC notifies the following of decisions about proposed new courses:

- Course Proposal Team
- Dean of Faculty/School
- Associate Dean Education
- Faculty/School Director of Operations
- Faculty/School Assistant Registrar(s)
- Head of Department/Division
- Education Manager
- Faculty/School Business Manager
- Faculty/School Head of Marketing
- Head of Admissions (UG/PGT)
- Student Fees Manager
- Programmes & Projects manager (DVC & Provost)
- Academic Registry Course Records
- Academic Registry Student Data
- Academic Registry Student Records
- Academic Registry Timetabling

7. Approval of Doctoral Programmes

Approval processes for integrated and professional doctorate programmes are the same as those for taught courses except that:

- UDSC comments on proposals prior to consideration by APC
- FDSCs comment on proposals prior to submission to CPAC (in addition to FLTQC)
- New programmes must be approved by Senate

8. Fast-track approval for course variants – study abroad/placement

New courses which are variants of existing courses with the only difference being the addition of a study abroad/placement year may be fast-tracked through course approvals.

New courses must meet the following conditions to be fast-tracked:

- the study abroad/placement year must be an additional year and not substitute for a year of study
- there must be no differences from the existing course other than those associated with the study abroad/placement year
- there must be no request for new resource associated with the new course.

If proposals meet these conditions, they may be fast tracked and there is no requirement for External Review.

Stage 1 Strategic Approval by the Chair of the Board of Studies

Chairs of Boards of Studies give Stage 1 Strategic Approval to new courses which are variants of existing courses with the only difference being the addition of a study abroad/placement year.

In giving Strategic Approval, Chairs of Boards of Studies assure that:

- the course supports the University Strategy and any Faculty strategy
- the course is financially viable
- the proposal represents an appropriate use of Faculty/School and Department resources.

It is for Chairs of Boards of Studies to determine what documentation Course Proposers must submit to obtain Stage 1 Strategic Approval.

Where Stage 1 Strategic Approval is fast-tracked, **courses may not be marketed prior to obtaining Stage 2 Academic Approval.**

Stage 2 Academic Approval by the Chair of CPAC

The Chair of CPAC gives Stage 2 Academic Approval to new courses which are variants of existing courses, with the only difference being the addition of a study abroad/placement year.

The Course Proposal Teams submit the following documentation to CPAC:

- Course Specification
- Placement Unit Description
- Intended Learning Outcomes mapping (Form QA3.4)

In giving Stage 2 Academic Approval, the Chair of CPAC assures that:

- the course complies with the relevant Academic Framework
- the course complies with the relevant Assessment Regulations
- the Course Specification and unit summaries are suitable for publication.

9. Fast-track approval for new exit awards

New exit awards for existing courses do not require Stage 1 Strategic Approval.

New exit awards for existing courses may be fast-tracked through Stage 2 Academic Approval.

Stage 2 Academic Approval

FLTQCs recommend approval of new exit awards for existing courses to CPAC.

CPAC approves new exit awards for existing courses.

Course Proposers submit the following documentation to CPAC:

- Rationale for new exit award(s)
- Requirements for award of the exit award(s)
- Evidence of relevant stakeholder feedback (e.g. students, external examiner, accrediting body)
- Course Specification

In giving Stage 2 Academic Approval, the Chair of CPAC assures that:

- the proposal complies with the relevant Academic Framework
- the proposal complies with the relevant Assessment Regulations
- the updated course documentation is suitable for marketing (if applicable).

Statement Details

Issue Version:	8.0
Date:	August 2026
Antecedents:	<i>Education, Quality and Standards Committee</i> 14 May 2025 2 July 2024 19 October 2023 Minute 296 29 June 2022 Chairs Action (to revise annex H) 14 October 2025 25 June 2026 30 July 2026 25/26 CA-17
	<i>Quality Assurance Committee</i> Minutes 289, 335, 491, 638, 742, 794 1 July 2008 Minute 857(7) & (8) 3 July 2009 Minute 976(7) 1 Dec 2009 (Chair's Action: rev to Annex B) 13 July 2010 Minute 1098(1)
	<i>University Learning Teaching and Quality Committee</i> 13 July 2011 – 16 July 2019: Minutes 120, 212, 279, 428, 552, 671, 722, 671, 807, 940, 1002, 1070, 1150, 1197
	<i>Academic Programmes Committee</i> 7 March 2012 Minute 55
	<i>Senate</i> New Framework for Assessment: Assessment Regulations (NFAAR) 9 April 2008 (Minute 12740) and 11 June 2008 (Minute 12782). NFAAR revisions for PGT: 14 April 2010 (Minute 13110) NFAAR revisions for FD/HY/CPD: 8 June 2011, Minute Review of Programme Processes and Committee Structures: 14 April 2010, S09/10-138, Minute 13112 Year Long Units: 13 February 2008, Minute 12704. 24 October 2007, Minute 12593. 10Oct2001 Minutes 11284, 11940, 11993, 12144, 12593, Effectiveness Review of Senate, 2006. Report of the Working Party on Faculty Structure, S01/02-4 Streamlining NFA documentation, October 2015 (Minute 13992) 8 June 2022 (Minute 15155)
	QA17 V1.1

	QA34 V2.0
Related Documentation:	<u>External</u> Office for Students: Securing student success: Regulatory framework for higher education in England Sector-recognised standards (including Qualification Descriptors) Competition and Markets Authority: Higher education: consumer law advice for providers QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education QAA Subject Benchmark Statements Advice and Guidance: Course Design and Development Information for Students: A guide to providing information to prospective undergraduate students <u>Internal</u> University Ordinances Regulations for Students University Assessment Regulations QA44 Course Handbooks and Course Specifications
Author	Academic Registry