



LSHTM Academic Manual 2021-22

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

Contents

3.1 Programme and Module Documentation.....	1
3.2 Programme Approval, Amendments, Suspension and Discontinuation	4
3.4 Programme & Module Amendment Procedure	18
3.5 Suspension & Discontinuation of Programmes or Modules	23
3.6 Annual Programme and Module Monitoring	27
3.7 Periodic Programme Review and Evaluation (Revalidation).....	29

Annual Review of the Academic Manual

The LSHTM Academic Manual was introduced in 2019-20 bringing together all the academic regulations and procedures which constitute LSHTM’s framework for quality and standards for credit-bearing taught provision, research degrees and special programmes. The Academic Manual consists of 11 Chapters all of which are reviewed annually and published as separate documents on LSHTM website together with a summary of amendments. With the exception of most minor editorial changes (e.g. typos, formatting and spelling or grammatical corrections), all revisions and amendments are noted and approved by Senate before the start of each academic year.

3.1 Programme and Module Documentation

- 3.1.1 Programme and module documentation will inform students on their journey from application through to graduation. It is therefore important that these documents reflect accurate information, which has been approved by means of validation, review and amendment procedures.
- 3.1.2 To satisfy the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM)’s obligations to its prospective and current students, amendments to

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

programme and module documentation must be made in an appropriate and timely manner. Programme and module documentation that is published on the LSHTM website forms a contractual obligation, concerning current students and applicants, under the jurisdiction of the [Competition and Markets Authority](#) (CMA).

3.1.3 The quality assurance process outlined in this Chapter are applied to the following academic provision offered by LSHTM.

- **Award-bearing programmes (credit-bearing and research degrees)**
 - LSHTM offers award-bearing programmes at Level 7 and 8 as described by the UK FHEQ. These are credit-bearing taught masters, a professional doctorate and research degrees.
- **Professional Diplomas (non-credit-bearing)**
 - Professional Diplomas at LSHTM are non-credit-bearing courses that hold a recognised status in the Health Care sector. They are aimed at students who hold higher education qualifications and want to develop knowledge and skill in a specialised field. *For example, Professional Diploma in Tropical Nursing.*
- **Credit-Bearing Short Courses**
 - A credit-bearing short course at LSHTM it is defined as a course at level 7 being equivalent in size to no more than 30 credits of learning.
- **Modules**
 - Award-bearing programmes are comprised of multiple credit-bearing modules. The aims and intended learning outcomes (ILOs) attached to each module are linked to the award aims and ILOs. The module assessment will be designed to measure achievement of the module ILOs.

Programme Specification

3.1.4 A programme specification is a concise description of the programme of study that is published externally on LSHTM's webpages as part of the programme information. The programme specification will include, programme aims, objectives and intended learning outcomes; intended audience and entrance

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

requirements; structure and curriculum; mode(s) of study, learning time and how teaching operates; assessment requirements; and credit

- 3.1.5 The document differs from marketing material in that it must also meet external benchmarks and internal expectation and is thus subject to formal approval. LSHTM's standard format takes into account guidance and exemplars produced by the QAA and is available for download [here](#).
- 3.1.6 The primary users of the programme specification will be applicants, current students, External Examiners, professional bodies, potential employers of graduates and placement students, professional, commercial and industrial advisory groups. Internally the document will also be used to ensure accuracy of information on the Student Record System for external reporting, informing the programme details on the web and prospectuses.
- 3.1.7 A programme specification is required for the purpose of validation and periodic review; as well as any proposed changes to the programme structure (including module title changes) made as part of the programme amendment procedure.

Module Specification

- 3.1.8 The module specification provides a concise description of the module. All modules specifications are published to current students at the start of the academic year to inform them on the module content; they also act as a guide to indicative programme content for prospective students. The module specification must articulate the module accurately as approved by a validation, review or as part of the amendment procedure. Internally the document will also be used to ensure accuracy of information on the Student Record System.
- 3.1.9 A module specification is required for the purpose of validation and review; as well as any proposed changes made as part of the module amendment procedure.

Credit-Bearing Short Course Specification

- 3.1.10 A credit-bearing Short Course specification contains elements of both programme and module specifications to reflect its hybrid nature as a course without sub elements

Programme Handbook

- 3.1.11 The programme handbook is the main reference for students in navigating the overview of their programme and overall experience at LSHTM. It is expected that this document is reviewed annually to ensure that the information remains accurate and up to date. Annual operational updates may be made to the programme handbook, however, changes to programme structures, modules, and academic regulations will be expected to have followed the appropriate procedure for approval. Most programmes handbooks will refer to the LSHTM academic regulations as set out in this handbook. Where there are approved programme-specific academic regulations, it will be clearly indicated within the programme handbook.
- 3.1.12 For groups of awards form a cognate group of programmes, it may be judged more appropriate to produce the programme handbooks collectively in a single document to avoid duplication.

3.2 Programme Approval, Amendments, Suspension and Discontinuation

- 3.2.1 The following procedures have been set out to ensure that programmes and modules are designed and approved through validation in accordance with LSHTM policies and procedures; and that existing programmes and modules retain currency in curriculum through an appropriate amendment procedure. Programme and module validation, review and amendment are under the delegated authority of LSHTM's Senate sub-Committees; however, financial approval of new provision is under the auspices of the Finance & Development Committee.
- 3.2.2 Through programme and module design, development and amendment LSHTM is committed to engaging with external expertise and students as co-creators.
- 3.2.3 The following procedures apply to proposals and approvals of new award-bearing programmes, credit-bearing modules, credit-bearing short courses, credit-bearing Continuing Professional Development, and Special Programmes. Programme proposals, design and development with external collaborative partners will follow a similar procedure for validation but will require additional stages as set out in [Chapter 6, Collaborative Provision of the LSHTM Academic Manual](#).

3.3 Programme development, design and approval

The procedure to develop, design, approve and launch a new [award-bearing programme](#) (e.g. MSc, PGDip or research degree) and [Professional Diploma \(non-credit-bearing\)](#) is divided into five stages with final approval resting with Senate Postgraduate Taught Committee:

- [Stage 1: Strategic, Financial Planning Approval \(Business Case\)](#)
- [Stage 2: Academic Development Proposal](#)
- [Stage 3: Programme and Module Specification and Curriculum Design](#)
- [Stage 4: Validation Panel meeting for Programmes](#)
- [Stage 5: Final Approval for new Programmes](#)

It will take two years prior to the launch date to complete this process, which will include at least one academic year after final approval to market and recruit to the new programme.

3.3.1 Stage 1: Strategic, Financial Planning Approval (Business Case)

- i. Proposals for new programmes and any new modules should be considered at faculty level via the Faculty's Annual Budgetary round.
- ii. To develop a new programme proposal relevant LSHTM stakeholders must be consulted (e.g. faculty leadership, marketing, recruitment, finance, Registry, Quality & Academic Standards, University of London Worldwide).
- iii. A business plan for new programmes with any new modules should be drafted and approved by the Faculty Management Group.
- iv. The proposal and business plan for a new programme must be endorsed by the LSHTM [Senior Leadership Team](#) before proceeding to academic development and approval.
- v. For a proposal to be approved the business case will be expected to include:
 - An outline of the new provision
 - A detailed breakdown of costs, income and resource implications with confirmation of the financial approval;

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- Recruitment expectations and opportunities, including a forecast of student demand;
 - Market comparison to major competitor programmes;
- vi. Once the business case is approved, the Dean of the parent Faculty will appoint a lead academic to coordinate the development, design and approval procedure. The lead academic is expected to gain the support of colleagues to form a Development Team, to ensure there is a rounded approach to the curriculum design.

3.3.2 Stage 2: Academic Development Proposal

- i. Once strategic approval has been granted a comprehensive programme proposal should be considered and approved by the FPGTC.
- ii. For new programmes, the faculty will then need to seek academic approval at LSHTM level from the delegated Senate sub-Committee. For research provision, Senate Research Degrees Committee (SRDC) will approve the proposal for development. For taught provision, the Programme and Module Review Committee (PMRC) will make a recommendation for development approval to the Senate Postgraduate Taught Committee (SPGTC). In addition, distance learning (DL) programme and module proposals must receive approval through the University of London Worldwide (UoLW) governance structures at set out in the member institution [Quality Assurance Schedule](#).
- iii. All proposals will be expected to include:
- An outline of the new provision ((from the business case);
 - A detailed breakdown of costs, income and resource implications with confirmation of the financial approval (from the business case);
 - Recruitment expectations and opportunities, including forecast student demand (from the business case);
 - Market comparison to major competitor programmes (from the business case);
 - Distinctive features of the programme/module;
 - The intended learning outcomes;
 - The programme structure (credit framework and mapping to modules) or;
 - The new module rationale (mapping to existing programmes);
 - A teaching, learning and assessment strategy;

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- A list of staff allocated to deliver the programme/subject specialism.
 - iv. Guidance should be sought from colleagues who have specific expertise or responsibilities in these areas.

N.B. If circumstances change in a way that will substantively affect the Programme, Faculty, or LSHTM's finances it may be necessary to suspend or extend the approval procedure.

3.3.3 Stage 3: Programme and Module Specification and Curriculum Design

- i. Once development approval has been granted the programme and module specifications and content can be designed.
- ii. Within the new programme and new module approval process at least six months is set aside for curriculum design and development. The process requires a new programme specification and/or new module specification(s) to be produced, along with an overview of the curriculum. The programme/module aims, learning outcomes and the assessment strategy and method should be mapped and documented.
- iii. Engagement with external expertise, quality assurance and students as co-creators is a core expectation of the curriculum design process. Feedback, advice and guidance from academic, sector and industry peers must also be documented for review at the Validation Panel. There should be academic engagement and scrutiny from:
 - an independent internal academic peer (member of PMRC);
 - an external academic subject expert, or an external examiner;
 - the Quality and Academic Standards team; and
 - current students, typically through a programme committee in the case of an existing programme, or student-staff fora for new developments.
- iv. Academic Leads and development teams designing MSc and research degree programmes are expected to refer to the [QAA supporting resources on degree characteristics](#) and the [Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-awarding Bodies](#) (FHEQ).

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- v. Where available the national [Subject Benchmark Statements](#) should be referenced.
- vi. Programme and Module Specifications and curriculum design should go through a robust consultation process within the parent faculty. If content or delivery is shared with another faculty the consultation process should be extended across faculties.
- vii. The programme's FPGTC should approve the documentation before submitting to the Validation Panel via the [Quality and Academic Standards office](#).
- viii. It is recommended that Academic Leads seek advice, guidance and support from the Quality and Academic Standards office throughout the process at qualityteams@lshtm.ac.uk

3.3.4 Stage 4: Validation Panel meeting for Programmes

- i. A Validation Panel shall meet to scrutinise the new programme and module documentation and will determine a recommendation for approval. Members are expected to consider the documentation objectively and impartially with respect to the LSHTM [Strategy](#). They will be expected to ensure that:
 - the programme/module aims are addressed through the subject specific content within the curriculum design.
 - the structure, curriculum and content meet the academic standard for the proposed level as set out in FHEQ.
 - the assessment strategy is designed to provide students with the appropriate opportunity to meet the programme/module aims and learning outcomes.
 - contact hours have been appropriately set, taking into account module/programme credit value and assessment type.
 - there are appropriate resources and learning opportunities for students (especially central resources like Library and IT).

The following documents should be presented to the Validation panel:

- New programme business case
- Academic Development proposal (as approved by SRDC/SPGTC)
- Programme Specification

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- Module Specification (new modules and existing core modules for new programmes)
 - Summary of feedback from faculty, student and external expert consultation
 - Any other relevant supporting documentation
- ii. The decision of the Validation Panel may be subject to recommendations and conditions that the Academic Lead must respond to following the meeting. The Chair of the Panel will be responsible for ensuring that the conditions have been met and recommendations have been accepted, or justifiably rejected. The Validation Panel will not recommend approval of a programme/module that has not been the subject of external expertise.
- iii. For full Membership and Terms of Reference of the Periodic Review and Validation Panels please see [Chapter 10, Governance of the LSHTM Academic Manual](#).
- iv. The Quality and Academic Standards office will support Academic Leads in arrangements of Validation Panel meetings. qualityteams@lshtm.ac.uk

3.3.5 Stage 5: Final Approval for new Programmes

- i. The outcome report from the Validation Panel meeting will be reviewed at SRDC (for Research) and PMRC (for taught), who will make a recommendation for final approval to SPGTC. The Faculty Operating Officer, Secretary & Registrar and where appropriate the Finance & Development Committee should also be kept informed. If approval is not recommended SRDC or PMRC, SPGTC will determine whether the proposal should be substantially revised or abandoned. Final approval of new programmes must be noted at the next Senate meeting.
- ii. Once formal approval has been confirmed the following action must be completed:
- Notification of approval must be sent to relevant stakeholders including; Deans of Faculty, TPDs, Programme Directors, Head of Marketing and Communication, Head of Registry and Teaching Support Office.
 - Advertising and promotion of the new programme: The Academic Lead will work with marketing and recruitment to develop a webpage and programme prospectus. Programmes must not be advertised to students before formal approval has been granted.

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- Registry Systems: The Academic Lead must liaise with the Registry (and for DL programmes, UoLW) to ensure the relevant systems are set up for admissions and enrolment.
- Learning and Teaching Materials and schemes of will need to be prepared for programme implementation. For DL programmes, this must be in liaison with Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) department.
- Timetabling: The Academic lead will work with timetabling teams to ensure the programme is included in the schedule.
- Teaching Support Administration: The Academic Lead/Programme Director (PD) must liaise with the Teaching Support Office or Distance Learning Office to ensure that all relevant administrative tasks are in place for the start of the academic year.

N.B although these activities cannot take place until the programme has been approved it is expected that the programme development team has engaged with the relevant support and professional service teams to prepare for a new programme or modules.

3.3.6 Credit-Bearing Short Course development, design and approval

The development, design and launch of a new credit-bearing Short course will be subject to a similar 5 stage procedure as a new award-bearing programme. However, the timeline and approval level will be adjusted to reflect the size of, and institutional risk attached to, the new offer:

- [Stage 1: Strategic, Financial Planning Approval \(Business Case\)](#)
- [Stage 2: Academic Development Proposal](#)
- [Stage 3: new credit-bearing short course Specification and Curriculum Design](#)
- [Stage 4: Validation Panel meeting for new credit-bearing short course](#)
- [Stage 5: Final Approval for new credit-bearing short course](#)

A credit-bearing Short Course will take at least 6 months to design develop and approve. Academic development approval and Final approval is overseen by the Programme and Module Review Committee.

NB: Where credit-bearing short courses are grouped into an award structure as recognised by the Framework for HE Qualifications the process will be the

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

same as for an award-bearing programme. This would either be a PGCert (60 credits), PGDip (120 credits) or a Masters (180 credits).

3.3.6.1 Stage 1: Strategic, Financial Planning Approval (Business Case)

- i. Proposals for new credit-bearing short courses should be considered at faculty level via the Faculty's Annual Budgetary round.
- ii. To develop a new credit-bearing short course proposal relevant LSHTM stakeholders must be consulted (e.g. faculty leadership, marketing, recruitment, finance, Registry, Quality & Academic Standards, University of London Worldwide).
- iii. A business plan for new credit-bearing short course should be drafted and approved by the Faculty Management Group.
- iv. The proposal and business plan for a new credit-bearing short course must be endorsed by the LSHTM [Senior Leadership Team](#) before proceeding to academic development and approval.
- v. For a proposal to be approved the business case will be expected to include:
 - An outline of the new provision
 - A detailed breakdown of costs, income and resource implications with confirmation of the financial approval;
 - Recruitment expectations and opportunities, including a forecast of student demand;
 - Market comparison to major competitor programmes;
- vi. Once the business case is approved, the Taught Programme Director of the parent Faculty will appoint a lead academic to coordinate the development, design and approval procedure. The lead academic is expected to gain the support of colleagues to form a Development Team, to ensure there is a rounded approach to the curriculum design.

3.3.6.2 Stage 2: Academic Development Proposal

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- i. Once strategic approval has been granted a comprehensive new credit-bearing short course proposal should be endorsed by the Taught Programme Director.
- ii. For a new credit-bearing short course the faculty will then need to seek academic development approval at LSHTM level from Programme and Module Review Committee (PMRC).

All proposals will be expected to include:

- An outline of the new provision ((from the business case);
 - A detailed breakdown of costs, income and resource implications with confirmation of the financial approval (from the business case);
 - Recruitment expectations and opportunities, including forecast student demand (from the business case);
 - Market comparison to major competitor programmes (from the business case);
 - Distinctive features of the new credit-bearing short course;
 - The intended learning outcomes;
 - The course structure
 - A teaching, learning and assessment strategy;
 - A list of staff allocated to deliver the programme/subject specialism.
- iii. Guidance should be sought from colleagues who have specific expertise or responsibilities in these areas.

N.B. If circumstances change in a way that will substantively affect the Programme, Faculty, or LSHTM's finances it may be necessary to suspend or extend the approval procedure.

3.3.6.3 Stage 3: new Credit-Bearing Short Course Specification and Curriculum Design

- i. Once development approval has been granted the new credit-bearing short course specification and content can be designed.
- ii. At least two months, is set aside for curriculum design and development. The process requires a course specification to be produced, along with an overview of the curriculum. The aims, learning outcomes and the assessment strategy and method should be mapped and documented.

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- iii. Engagement with external expertise and students as co-creators is a core expectation of the curriculum design process. Feedback, advice and guidance from academic, sector and industry peers must also be documented for review at the Validation Panel.
- iv. The specification and curriculum design should go through a robust consultation process within the parent faculty. If content or delivery is shared with another faculty the consultation process should be extended across faculties.
- v. Where available the national [Subject Benchmark Statements](#) should be referenced.
- vi. The Taught Programme Director should approve the documentation before submitting to the Validation Panel via the [Quality and Academic Standards office](#).
- vii. It is recommended that Academic Leads seek advice, guidance and support from the Quality and Academic Standards office throughout the process at qualityteams@lshtm.ac.uk

3.3.6.4 Stage 4: Validation Panel meeting for new Credit-bearing short course

- i. A Validation Panel shall meet to scrutinise the new credit-bearing short course documentation and will determine a recommendation for approval. Members are expected to consider the documentation objectively and impartially with respect to the LSHTM [Strategy](#). They will be expected to ensure that:
 - the aims are addressed through the subject specific content within the curriculum design.
 - the structure, curriculum and content meets the academic standard for the proposed equivalent level as set out in FHEQ.
 - the assessment strategy is designed to provide students with the appropriate opportunity to meet the aims and learning outcomes.
 - contact hours have been appropriately set, taking into account credit value and assessment type.
 - there are appropriate resources and learning opportunities for students (especially central resources like Library and IT).
- ii. The following documents should be presented to the Validation panel:

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- New credit-bearing short course rationale and business case
 - new credit-bearing short course Specification(s)
 - Summary of feedback from faculty, student and external expert consultation
 - Any other relevant supporting documentation
- iii. The decision of the Validation Panel may be subject to recommendations and conditions that the Academic Lead must respond to following the meeting. The Chair of the Panel will be responsible for ensuring that the conditions have been met and recommendations have been accepted, or justifiably rejected. The Validation Panel will not recommend approval of a new credit-bearing short course that has not been the subject of external expertise.
- iv. For full Membership and Terms of Reference of the Periodic Review and Validation Panels please see [Chapter 10, Governance of the LSHTM Academic Manual](#).
- v. The Quality and Academic Standards office will support Academic Leads in arrangements of Validation Panel meetings. qualityteam@lshtm.ac.uk

3.3.6.5 Stage 5: Final Approval for new Credit-bearing short course

- i. The outcome report from the Validation Panel meeting will be reviewed at PMRC who have authority to make a final approval decision on credit-bearing short courses.
- ii. If approval is not recommended the committee will determine whether the proposal should be substantially revised or abandoned.
- iii. Once formal approval has been confirmed the following action must be completed:
- Notification of approval must be sent to relevant stakeholders including; Deans of Faculty, TPDs, Programme Directors, Head of Marketing and Communication, Head of Registry and Teaching Support Office.
 - Advertising and promotion of the new programme: The Academic Lead will work with marketing and recruitment to develop a webpage and programme prospectus. Programmes must not be advertised to students before formal approval has been granted.

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- Registry Systems: The Academic Lead must liaise with the Registry to ensure the relevant systems are set up for admissions and enrolment.
- Learning and Teaching Materials and schemes of will need to be prepared for programme implementation.
- Timetabling: The Academic lead will work with timetabling teams to ensure the programme is included in the schedule.
- Teaching Support Administration: The Academic Lead/Programme Director (PD) must liaise with the Teaching Support Office or Distance Learning Office to ensure that all relevant administrative tasks are in place for the start of the academic year.

N.B although these activities cannot take place until the course has been approved it is expected that the programme development team has engaged with the relevant support and professional service teams to prepare for a new programme or modules.

3.3.7 Module development, design and approval

- 3.3.7.1 New modules are normally approved through the validation of the new programme which has sponsored them ([as described in point 3.3.4 Programme development, design and approval](#)). New modules may also be proposed and implemented through a programme's Periodic Review (see [section 3.7 of this Chapter](#)).
- 3.3.7.2 At times there may be a need to propose and implement a new module outside of these processes. In this case, the new module must be sponsored by a parent programme and be endorsed by the parent programme's faculty.
- 3.3.7.3 In line with 3.4 Programme & Module Amendment Procedure:

A new core module will be considered a Major Amendment to the parent programme. Major Amendments to the programme will be considered for final approval at the Programme and Module Review Committee (PMRC). If there are multiple new core modules proposed this will result in a revalidation of the programme (see point 3.4.5.3)

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

3.3.7.4 New elective modules will be considered a Minor Amendment to the parent programme, and therefore, final approval resides with the Faculty Taught Programme Committee,

3.3.7.5 New modules are resourced by a faculty and will be subject to a 3 stage faculty-based procedure to allow for speedier implementation:

- [Stage 1: Proposal Approval \(Financial and Academic\)](#)
- [Stage 2: Module Specification and Curriculum Design](#)
- [Stage 3: Final Approval of new modules](#)

3.3.7.6 Stage 1: Proposal Approval (Financial and Academic)

- i. Proposals for new modules should be considered at faculty level via the Faculty's Annual Budgetary round.
- ii. A business case for new modules should be drafted and approved by the Faculty Management Group. The business case will be expected to include:
 - An outline and rationale for the new module;
 - A rationale of how the new module benefits the parent programme;
 - A detailed breakdown of costs and resource implications;
- iii. Once financial approval has been granted an academic module proposal should be considered and approved by the Faculty Postgraduate Taught Committee. The proposals will be expected to include:
 - An outline and rationale for the new module
 - A rationale of how the new module benefits the parent programme;
 - Distinctive features of the module;
 - A list of LSHTM staff with subject specialism to deliver the module.

N.B where the module is owned by more than one faculty it will need approval from each of those faculties.

- iv. Endorsement by the faculty to develop a new core module will require subsequent approval by PMRC before it can proceed to development. If multiple core modules are proposed, or if the proposal demonstrates a significant change to the programme, PMRC may recommend revalidation of the programme.
- v. Elective modules can proceed to development after approval at FPGTC.

3.3.7.2 Stage 2: Module Specification and Curriculum Design

- i. Once development approval has been granted the module specifications and content can be designed.
- ii. At least two months should be set aside for curriculum design and development. The process requires a module specification(s) to be produced, along with an overview of session content. The module aims, learning outcomes and the assessment strategy and method should be mapped and documented.
- iii. Engagement with external expertise and students as co-creators is a core expectation of the curriculum design process. Feedback, advice and guidance from academic, sector and industry peers must also be documented. Approval of the new module will require evidence of academic engagement and scrutiny from:
 - an independent internal academic peer (member of PMRC);
 - an external academic subject expert, or an external examiner if the module is part of a programme;
 - The Quality and Academic Standards team; and
 - Current students, typically through a programme committee in the case of an existing programme, or student-staff fora for new developments.
- iv. Module Specification and curriculum design should go through a robust consultation process within the parent faculty. If content or delivery is shared with another faculty the consultation process should be extended across faculties.
- v. Where available the national [Subject Benchmark Statements](#) should be referenced.
- vi. It is recommended that Academic Leads seek advice, guidance and support from the Quality and Academic Standards office throughout the process at qualityteams@lshtm.ac.uk

3.3.7.3 Stage 3: Final Approval of new modules

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- i. The Programme and Module Review Committee (PMRC) will approve core modules, and the Faculty Postgraduate Taught Committee will approve new elective modules, based on the documents provided:
 - the initial proposal and rationale
 - the new module specification
 - a summary of the feedback from the consultation listed in 3.3.6.2
- ii. The Programme and Module Review Committee (PMRC) will note the approval of elective modules.
- iii. Once formal approval has been confirmed the following action must be completed:
 - Notification of approval must be sent to relevant stakeholders including; Deans of Faculty, TPDs, Programme Directors, Head of Marketing and Communication, Quality and Academic Standards, Head of Registry, Head of Distance Learning, and Teaching Support Office.
 - Student Record Systems: The Academic Lead must liaise with the Registry (and for DL programmes, UoLW) to ensure the relevant systems are set up.
 - Learning and Teaching Materials and schemes of will need to be prepared for module implementation.
 - Teaching Support Administration: The Academic Lead/Programme Director (PD) must liaise with the Teaching Support Office or Distance Learning Office to ensure that all relevant administrative tasks are in place for the start of the academic year.

3.4 Programme & Module Amendment Procedure

- 3.4.1 LSHTM operates an annual and periodic monitoring and review process which enables programmes and modules to identify if there is a need to update and enhance the offering to reflect the latest developments in subject knowledge, pedagogy, student feedback and accrediting body requirements so as to deliver the most effective student experience.

3.4.2 Programme Specification Amendments

- 3.4.2.1 LSHTM publishes face-to-face (F2F) programme specifications an academic year prior to a cohort enrolling. For example, September 2018 for the academic year 2019/2020. Therefore, 'Major' programme amendments

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

must be approved by the last Programme and Module Review Committee (PMRC) 15 months prior to implementation (June/July meeting).

- 3.4.2.2 Distance learning (DL) programme specifications are under the jurisdiction of the University of London's marketing and recruitment. They are published in January for recruitment to the next academic year. To meet the January publication date, the University of London require amendments to programme specifications and the accompanying programme regulations to be submitted by 1 September. DL -programme and module amendments require approval at LSHTM prior to submission to the University of London, therefore 'Major' DL programme amendments must be approved at PMRC in the summer term (June/July).
- 3.4.2.3 Amended Programme Specifications for Distance Learning provision will apply to the student cohort registering for the first time in the following academic year. Changes that are advantageous to registered Distance Learning students may be applied retroactively.
- 3.4.2.4 For F2F, only typographical error corrections and staffing amendments to programme specifications may be made after the 15-month deadline ahead of a F2F cohort enrolling. Such amendments do not require Committee approval but the updated forms and track-changed documentation should be submitted via the Taught Programme Director (TPD) to the Quality & Academic Standards office (QAS) no later than 3 months prior to a cohort enrolling (July 2019 for 2019/2020), to ensure that the definitive record is accurate. DL programme specifications are overseen by University of London and may not be amended after they are published in January.
- 3.4.2.5 In exceptional circumstances, it may be necessary to amend a programme/module after publication of the Specification. If this occurs, applicants and/or current students must be informed about the changes in writing.

3.4.3 Module Specification Amendments

- 3.4.3.1 Module specifications provide students with details of the programme's associated compulsory and recommended option modules. They provide the student with an overview of the module aims and learning outcomes as well as indicative content and the assessment methods. Module

specifications are published in the summer (May to August) prior to the start of the academic year.¹

- 3.4.3.2 Minor module amendments can be made during the academic year prior to a cohort enrolling. Minor module amendments are approved at the FPGTC and should be received and noted by PMRC.
- 3.4.3.3 Minor block E module amendments may be approved by FPGTC via Chair's Action and submitted to PMRC for noting.
- 3.4.3.4 Amendments to modules that have an impact on Programme Specifications (and/or Programme Regulations for Distance Learning) are deemed major amendments. They must be approved by the last Programme and Module Review Committee (PMRC) 15 months prior to implementation (June/July meeting).
- 3.4.3.5 Editorial amendments to module specifications do not require Committee approval and must be submitted via the TPD to QAS during the summer (May to August) prior to the start of the academic year.
- 3.4.3.6 Major and minor amendments to programmes or modules will be informed by a variety of factors as suggested in paragraph 3.4.1 above. These factors should be evidenced in the amendment proposal procedure (for example, PTES results, and attainment figures or in response to student feedback). It is expected that there has been suitable consultation prior to proposals being made with, but not limited to, Programme Committee and FPGTC, the External Examiner, and current students and/or alumni.
- 3.4.3.7 It is recommended that guidance is sought from QAS and the TPD at the start of the process.

3.4.4 Definitions

3.4.4.1 Editorial Amendments

Editorial amendments are defined as editorial updates to programme and module specifications that are routine measures of housekeeping and that do not affect the substantive outcomes of a programme or module. *Editorial amendments* include, but are not limited to:

¹ DL Modules are published in May to align with the UoL Recruitment cycle. Ideally Term 1 F2F Module Specifications are published as early as possible to coincide with Short Course recruitment.

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- Correcting typographical errors;
- Updating staffing information;
- Augmenting reading lists
- Revising the wording of Module Intended Learning Outcomes in a way that has no bearing on the meaning, as agreed by the Taught Programme Director; and
- Providing additional factual information without implication to the aims and outcomes of the programme or module.

3.4.4.2 Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are made to single elements of the learning experience that go further than simple *editorial amendments*. These might include, but are not limited to:

- Changes to module description that steers the module content away from the current module aims and learning outcomes;
- Changes to the aims or learning outcomes of a module, that bear no implication to the overall aims and learning outcomes of the programme;
- Changes to module assessment that do not require changes to Programme Specifications (and/or Programme Regulations for Distance Learning);
- Changes to delivery of a Recommended module, such as term or teaching slot allocation
- Changes to the distribution of teaching methods, such as contact hours; and
- The addition of Recommended modules to the suite within a programme.

3.4.4.3 Major Amendments

Generally occurring at programme-level, *major amendments* are changes that have a bearing on the overall structure, aims and/or outcomes of a programme, and present a material change to the learning experience and associated information provided to students and applicants. Module amendments may fall within the *major* category if the changes have a bearing on a programme's structure. *Major amendments* include, but are not limited to:

- Programme title change;
- Introduction of, or change to, entry and/or exit awards;
- Introduction of a new cohort entry point;
- Introduction of a new, or change to the existing, mode of study;
- Change to the mode of delivery;
- Addition, removal or restructuring of routes within a programme;
- Change to admissions requirements;

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- Changes to the programme description that steers the content away from the current programme aims and learning outcomes;
- Changes to delivery of a compulsory module, such as term or teaching slot allocation;
- Amendments to the title of the module;
- Changes to Distance Learning module assessment that is specified in the Programme Specification and/or Programme
- Change to the credit value of a module;
- Change(s) to the diet of compulsory modules; and
- The removal of recommended modules.

3.4.5 Points of Note

- 3.4.5.1 Consultation throughout the process should serve to support the Module Organiser (MO) and/or PD looking to update content. Editorial and minor amendments should be brought to the attention of the PD and the TPD, whilst major amendments should be designed in consultation with the TPD and QAS. It is important to note that the approval of amendments is beyond the remit of this consultative stage, sitting with FPGTC and PMRC for minor and major amendments respectively.
- 3.4.5.2 Multiple minor amendments to a module that have a material effect on the parent programme may be considered a major amendment and therefore will need to be submitted to PMRC for approval.
- 3.4.5.3 If significant change is made to a programme or module that presents a combination of amendments as categorised and defined above, this may result in revalidation. If the change culminates in a new programme offer then the validation procedure would need to be followed.
- 3.4.5.4 Changes that relate only to the MSc Award Scheme or programme-specific Award Scheme will be submitted directly to the Senate Postgraduate Taught Committee for approval.
- 3.4.5.5 FPGTC and PMRC secretaries will send notification of approval for minor and major amendments, respectively, as detailed in [the template emails for approvals for Programme and Module Amendments](#). Following the last PMRC of the academic year, the Secretary to PMRC will provide a summary and accompanying documentation of all approved amendments to Registry,

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

the Teaching Support Office, the Distance Learning Office, and Communications and Engagement.

- 3.4.5.6 In all instances of minor and major amendment, the MO or PD (as appropriate) will ensure that the Committee-approved amendment form and track-changed specification are then submitted to QAS for publication.
- 3.4.5.7 A summary of changes to modules and the parent programme is to be delivered at the corresponding Exam Board, ensuring External Examiners are fully abreast of developments.
- 3.4.5.8 Amendments to provision within the remit of the Doctoral College will follow the same categorisation, with approvals handled by the appropriate Programme Committee and Senate Research Degrees Committee for minor and major amendments, respectively.

3.5 Suspension & Discontinuation of Programmes or Modules

- 3.5.1 In exceptional circumstances, it may be necessary to suspend recruitment (hereafter suspension) to or discontinue a programme of study and/or an individual module. The decision will be made for operational viability and/or student experience, for example where low numbers of students have applied/registered, or there are constraints due to staffing and/or resources, or there has been a loss of external funding, or substantial restructuring is needed. Generally, suspension will be the first consideration, as a temporary solution; however, this may lead to discontinuation if deemed necessary. This document sets out LSHTM's procedures for suspending or discontinuing programmes and modules, in order to protect the interests of students, applicants, and LSHTM.
- **Suspension** is the temporary closure of a programme or module for recruitment. The decisions may be repealed on the authority of those who made them. This will involve consultation with all relevant stakeholders. It may be appropriate to undertake a review or re-validation prior to repealing any suspension, depending on the reasons for the original decision and whether circumstances have changed.
 - **Discontinuation** is where a programme of study or a module is formally closed.
- 3.5.2 The proposal to discontinue or suspend a programme or module must come from the Faculty responsible for that programme or module and after

consultation with key stakeholders. Throughout the process, students currently registered on the programme or module must be consulted. Consultation must occur with and agreement be obtained from stakeholders in all faculties. For collaborative provision, LSHTM must obtain the agreement of the partner institution to the discontinuation or suspension. In all cases the proposal must cover the following areas:

- The rationale for suspension or discontinuation;
- The impact of suspension or discontinuation on applicants and current students;
- The proposed arrangements for all students currently registered on the programme or module (paying particular consideration to those students on deferrals, interruptions or part-time/flexible modes of study);
- The proposed arrangements for students on any other impacted programmes (particularly where a module crosses programmes);
- The proposed arrangements for applicants and recruitment;
- Evidence that students registered on the programme or module have been consulted (e.g. dates of meetings or correspondence details);
- Proposed arrangements for official communication with applicants and students currently registered on the programme or module once the suspension or discontinuation has been approved by the relevant committee;
- The impact on staffing and evidence that staff have been consulted;
- The level of risk in terms of student experience and the student/LSHTM contractual liabilities (e.g. is the module part of the selling point of a programme or is the module part of another programme).

3.5.3 Programme² Suspension or Discontinuation

3.5.3.1 Suspension or discontinuation of a programme will be a case of closing a programme to new registrations, and LSHTM will endeavour to limit the impact on students currently registered on the programme with a 'teach-out' plan. A recommendation to suspend or discontinue a programme is made by the relevant Faculty to Senate Postgraduate Taught Committee (SPGTC) or Senate Research Degrees Committee (SRDC)³; however, the overriding authority to approve proposals to suspend or discontinue a programme rests

² All award-bearing LSHTM programmes, credit-bearing Continuing Professional Development, 'special' non-degree-awarding programmes defined by Senate as needing more scrutiny e.g., Executive Programme for Global Health Leadership and Professional Diplomas.

³ SRDC oversee this stage of the process for Professionals Doctorates programmes with a taught element.

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

with Senate. Through Senate, LSHTM will take account of the contractual liabilities it has with applicants and students and where applicable agree an appropriate 'teach-out' to complete within their maximum period of registration (3-year FT or 5-year PT).

3.5.3.2 Where a programme is taught by distance learning (DL), confirmation of suspension or discontinuation should be sent (via email) from the Chair of Senate to Pro-Vice Chancellor and Chief Executive and/or the Director of Operations & Deputy Chief Executive of University of London Worldwide (UoLW). This email should be copied to the Academic Services Manager and Contracts and Central Services Manager. The notice must include:

- Date for last initial student registration
- Date for final examination
- Date for final awards and programme closure

3.5.3.3 LSHTM is required by the UoL to continue the programme for a period of 5 years to enable students to complete within their maximum period of registration.

3.5.4 Module Suspension or Discontinuation

3.5.4.1 The **suspension** of modules may be proposed by the relevant Faculty and will be approved by the Programme and Module Review Committee on behalf of SPGTC. The overriding authority to approve proposals to **discontinue** a module rests with SPGTC.

3.5.5 Short Course Suspension or Discontinuation

3.5.5.1 Suspension of non-award-bearing short courses that are not classified under 'Special Programmes' may be approved by the Dean of Faculty for the Faculty responsible for that short course, and the Secretary & Registrar on behalf of the Planning & Finance Committee.

3.5.6 Student Consultation

3.5.6.1 Student consultation is a key component in the process of programme and module suspension and discontinuation. The Faculty is responsible for communicating the impact of suspension and discontinuation to applicants and students currently registered on the programme or module at the earliest opportunity. It is encouraged that they have open discussions with students

on the rationale to suspend or discontinue, the impact it may have on them and the proposed arrangements for those currently registered.

3.5.6.2 Evidence of student consultation must be included in the proposal to suspend or discontinue the programme or module.

3.5.6.3 Students and applicants must also receive in writing confirmation of the suspension and discontinuation once approved by Senate that covers the rationale as well as the impact and arrangements agreed.

3.5.7 Timeline

3.5.7.1 The proposal to suspend or discontinue a programme or module should be made in advance of the next recruitment cycle to limit risk of contractual liabilities.

3.5.7.2 For **DL programmes**, LSHTM is required by the UoL to give a notice of at least one year if a module is permanently withdrawn and five years' notice if a programme is to be discontinued. Once the proposal for discontinuation is approved, applications and registrations for the programme may continue to be processed for one final session.

3.5.7.3 In rare, unforeseeable and unavoidable circumstances, it may be necessary to suspend or discontinue a face-to-face (F2F) programme or module after recruitment has begun and applications have been submitted.

3.5.7.4 Once students are enrolled at LSHTM suspension and discontinuation of F2F programmes and modules will, where possible, be avoided; however, in the event that an optional module is undersubscribed it may be necessary to suspend it for an academic year.

3.5.7.5 In the case of the circumstances outlined above the rationale to suspend or discontinue a F2F programme or module must be sufficiently strong to justify the disruption, and arrangements should be made to ensure that the applicants and students receive an alternative, comparable experience. Students may be given the opportunity to change programme; where this is not suitable or possible, applicants will receive a full refund of any deposit paid and students currently registered should refer to section 6 'Refunds' in the [Student Tuition Fees Policy](#).

3.6 Annual Programme and Module Monitoring

3.6.1 Taught Annual Programme Monitoring Procedures

- 3.6.1.1 LSHTM monitors the quality of its academic provision on an annual basis through a mixture of reviews at module, programme and faculty level. Academic staff responsible for the delivery of modules or programmes are asked to reflect on their teaching practice, to respond to student feedback and to ensure that no major difficulties have arisen and identify areas for enhancement. During the process they will draw upon key datasets from student surveys and student achievement as well as the annual External Examiner Report.
- 3.6.1.2 Annual programme and module reviews feed into the wider cycle of quality assurance at both faculty and LSHTM level, with the overall aim to enhance the student experience at LSHTM.
- 3.6.1.3 Annual monitoring is undertaken by module and Programme Directors (PDs) and Module Organisers (MOs). It is the faculties' collective responsibility to ensure that the module or programme review is completed by the end of the academic session. It is a requirement of annual monitoring that detailed action plans are produced, monitored with actions addressed. This should happen through Programme Committees, FPGTC, PMRC and SPGTC on behalf of Senate. There should be a clear audit trail through the committee structure with a series of separate written reports for each module or programme, summary reports and records of discussions noted in the minutes.
- 3.6.1.4 The main divisions are between programme, module, faculty level. The major elements that feed into the LSHTM's annual monitoring procedure are mapped as follows:
- External Examining process and reporting
 - Annual Programme Director Review (APDR)
 - University of London Worldwide (UoLW) - Annual Programme Planning and Review (APPR)
 - Annual Module Reports and Action Plans (AMRAP)
 - Faculty and School summaries of External Examining, APDR and AMRAP
 - Internal Moderators' reports
 - Student Feedback Surveys (Module and PTES, PRES and UoLW)

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- Key data sets from Exam Boards and Registry relating to student admissions, retention, attrition, attainment and student destinations

3.6.2 Annual Module Reports and Action Plans (AMRAP)

- 3.6.2.1 The [AMRAP](#) is drafted by MOs at the end of the module. MOs gather key data sets from Registry, Exam Boards, Alumni and Student Surveys to support Module Review. The AMRAP is discussed with relevant Programme Committees and a revised version if necessary will be sent to the Taught Programme Directors (TPDs) for scrutiny and approval through FPGTC.
- 3.6.2.2 The TPD produces a Module Review Summary for their faculty which will be scrutinised at FPGTC.
- 3.6.2.3 The AMRAP should be used to inform the Annual Programme Director Review report.

3.6.3 Annual Programme Director Review (APDR)

- 3.6.3.1 The [Annual Programme Director's Review report](#) will be drafted by the PD using key data sets including AMRAPs; student feedback (PTES surveys); admissions, retention, attrition, attainment and student destinations data gathered from Registry and Exam Boards; External Examiner reports; and input as appropriate from partners and /or professional bodies.
- 3.6.3.2 ADPRs are discussed at Programme Committee before submission to the TPD for scrutiny and approval through the Faculty PG Taught Committee. Following faculty level discussions, a final version will be submitted to the Quality & Academic Standards office (QAS) for submission to PMRC for noting. TPDs will produce a Faculty Programme Review Summary, which will be scrutinised at PMRC.
- 3.6.3.3 Programmes will be exempt from annual monitoring (APDR) in the year of their periodic review.

3.6.4 Research Annual Programme Monitoring Procedures

- 3.6.4.1 Research degrees monitoring procedures operate differently, because of the individual nature of students' work. The key elements are progress

monitoring of individual students (primarily in departments, with potential involvement of Faculty-level staff); consideration of examiners' reports relating to individual students; and consideration of data and management information (primarily at LSHTM and Faculty level, with departmental involvement where appropriate).

3.7 Periodic Programme Review and Evaluation (Revalidation)

3.7.1 Purpose, Scope and Frequency of Periodic (Five-yearly) Reviews

- 3.7.1.1 All LSHTM programmes are required to undertake a periodic review every five years. This is a more substantial process than annual monitoring which will require scrutiny from external peers as well as internal stakeholders. In the year of Periodic Review programme will be exempt from annual monitoring (APDR)
- 3.7.1.2 The University of London Worldwide (UoLW) Quality Assurance Framework recommends distance learning (DL) programme periodic review follow the lead school procedures, with a dual monitoring and reporting procedure through the governance structures of both the lead college and UoLW. It is LSHTM's responsibility to keep the UoLW informed of the periodic review timetable and to consult with the UoLW Quality, Standards and Governance Directorate when a review date is being finalised. Depending on the size of the provision and review method, the UoLW requires a **three- to six-month notification period** from LSHTM.
- 3.7.1.3 Periodic review is an in-depth evidence-based evaluation of the quality and standards of a programme or related programmes. The reviews will consider a programme's aims and intended outcomes, and identify where further improvements need to be made. An internal panel, which will incorporate significant external input via an External Reviewer, will undertake the review. All reviews should have flexible parameters to ensure relevance to the programme(s) involved. Beyond simply confirming the sufficiency of current provision, review reports should provide constructive recommendations on the future enhancement of this provision.
- At minimum, the review should function as a revalidation exercise to monitor and assure the quality of the existing programme model;

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- The outcome from the review panel may include commendations on good practice that can be disseminated across LSHTM, and recommendations or conditions for reapproval;
- A review may also serve as an opportunity to consider comprehensive updates to the programme, curriculum or delivery;
- Collaborative or joint programmes may wish to cover specific topics relevant to their individual arrangements.

3.7.1.4 It should be noted that the Review Panel is within its jurisdiction not to recommend revalidation, and that the programme be suspended or discontinued. The committee responsible for quality assurance, Senate Postgraduate Taught Committee (SPGTC), will be responsible for final approval of all revalidations and confirming to Senate that a programme should be suspended or discontinued, or working with the Chair of the review panel to revisit the concern(s) over the programme, and whether conditions can be set for revalidation.

3.7.1.5 **Scope:** For a successful and constructive review, it is important to establish key objectives at an early stage. Programme Directors (PDs), with the support from the Quality & Academic Standards office (QAS), will identify areas of concern or specific themes to address. These topics may arise from consultation with the Programme Committee and through annual monitoring.

3.7.1.6 Through Periodic Review, Programme Directors are expected to undertake critical analysis to measure the health of the programme. This should include:

- Mapping individual modules of study and progression pathways to the programme's overall aims and learning outcomes;
- Review of the assessment model ensuring an appropriate variety of assessment methods are utilised for the level of award.
- Trend analysis of the student profile and outcomes for the period under review.
- Assessing the currency of the curriculum and learning strategy against developments in the discipline as well as pedagogical innovations.

3.7.1.7 In addition to the standard LSHTM purpose and scope for review, DL reviews are expected to meet the following UoLW criteria:

- Assess the currency and overall effectiveness of the learning materials, resources and guidance in relation to the programme specification, in the light of:

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- current research and practice in the relevant discipline;
- developments in pedagogical methods for effective distance-learning; technological developments for enhancing the distance-learning experience;
- Evaluate the extent to which minimum expectations for the academic guidance and personal support of students learning at a distance are met;
- Ensure that the UoL's Academic Regulations and quality assurance mechanisms of the UoLW and Lead College are implemented effectively, and that any variations in practice are addressed;
- Review the interface between the UoLW and the Lead College in the management and enhancement of the quality of the programme.

3.7.1.8 **Schedule:** LSHTM academic programmes will go through a process of Periodic Review on a five-year cycle. QAS maintain the schedule on behalf of Programme and Module Review Committee (PMRC). The Committee will confirm the schedule and approve any amendments at the summer term meeting. Where there is some concern, the next periodic review date will be set in accordance with the revalidation of the programme; this will be between 1 – 3 years of the last re-approval date.

3.7.1.9 On occasion, it may be appropriate to request a change to a programme's scheduled periodic review. PMRC requires requests to be submitted to the committee along with the justifiable reasons. Deferral of a review to more than six years since the last re-approval date will not be granted.

3.7.1.10 **Types of programme involved:** All award-bearing LSHTM programmes, credit-bearing Continuing Professional Development, and special programmes⁴ undertake periodic review. The procedures set out in this document have been written with a focus on Master's degree programmes; diploma or certificate programmes are normally expected to be reviewed alongside relevant Master's degree(s) as part of a single exercise. Where a diploma or certificate programme functions independently and does not have significant academic overlap with any LSHTM MSc programme, then a standalone review may be undertaken.

⁴ Special Programmes are those non-degree-awarding programmes defined by Senate as needing more scrutiny e.g., Executive Programme for Global Health Leadership and Professional Diplomas.

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

3.7.1.11 **Collaborative links:** Collaborative programmes are reviewed according to the relevant Memorandum of Agreement. A list of LSHTM's collaborative programmes can be found on the [Collaborative Provision Register](#).

3.7.1.12 LSHTM DL programmes are reviewed under LSHTM procedures, but reviews should take account of additional UoLW requirements and will also be reported on through the UoLW governance structure.

3.7.2 Periodic Review Procedure Timeline:

- **End of autumn term prior to review year** – QAS notify the Programme Team including the PD, Exam Board Chair, Taught Programme Director (TPD), Teaching Support Office (TSO)/Distance Learning Office (DLO) and Registry that the Periodic Review will take place the following academic year;
- **Spring/summer term prior to review year** – The Programme Team to identify any concerns, issues or amendments they want to raise in the review and start to develop a self-evaluation document (SED);
- **Autumn term of the review year** - the Programme Team:
 - consults with Programme Committee, Exam Board Chair and Dean of Faculty to identify and nominate External, Internal and Student Reviewers for the Review Panel;
 - gathers preparatory work and information in the autumn term, in order to finalise a SED and supply further information to the Review Panel;
 - Any changes to the programme that will be proposed in the review should undertake programme and faculty consultation;
- **Autumn term of the review year** – QAS liaise with Programme Team and proposed panel to finalise the Review Panel meeting date;
- **Autumn term of the review year** – PMRC confirms the review schedule and the panel nominations
- **Early spring term of the review year** – the Programme Team submits the SED and supporting documentation to the Review Panel via QAS;
- **Spring term of the review year (March-April)** – Review Panel meeting takes place between March and April;
- **2 weeks after the Review meeting** – Secretary returns minutes including conditions, recommended actions and commendations to the Chair
- **Early summer term of the review year** - The External Reviewer returns the independent report 4 weeks after the review meeting;

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- **Summer term of Review year** – The PD with support from the Programme Committee considers the **conditions** and **recommendations** as well as the External Reviewer Report and drafts response/action plan;
- **Summer term of Review year** – Programme Team submits their [Review Response Report](#) to FPGTC (this can be conducted via Chair's action where the TPD deems it appropriate)
 - *Programme Team should undertake any additional consultation in relation to the actions taken in response to the recommendations and conditions;*
- **Late summer term of the review year** – The Programme Team submits their final response/action plan to the final PMRC of the academic year. This ensures that any improvements to programmes and modules will be enacted promptly;
 - *If the final review report is submitted after the end of the academic year it will be submitted to the **first PMRC of the next academic year**, however, this may delay the implementation of any amendments to programmes or module Specifications;*
- **Summer term following review year** – the Programme Team submits the one-year follow-up report to PMRC (the review outcomes should be monitored at Programme Committee and FPGTC level prior to submission).

3.7.3 Programme Team

- **Programme Director** – must be a member of the Programme Team, taking responsibility for co-ordinating major activities. Where there are multiple PDs for a programme, only one need be nominated to lead on the review, however, the others must take part. The specific work this will entail during the review year should not necessarily represent a major extra commitment, but may create pressures of time and work intensity at key stages (depending on the size of the programme and the scope chosen for the review). It will be important to consider this when planning for the academic year.
- **Exam Board Chair** – must be a member of the Programme Team, as the senior academic responsible for assuring the academic standards of the programme. However, they may delegate this responsibility to the Deputy Exam Board Chair if necessary, e.g. due to work commitments.
- **Wider Faculty input:** PDs may seek support from their faculty team, including Module Organisers (MOs) that are linked to the programme. The TPD should be kept informed of any significant issues or proposals

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

emerging during review work, so that they have visibility at an early stage and can provide appropriate guidance.

- **Professional Services:** PDs will need to engage the support of Professional Services to gather supporting documentation. It's important to ensure that relevant teams and departments are given advance notice of expected requirements as soon as notice is received of the periodic review taking place.

3.7.3.1 Programme Teams are expected to act in a collegiate way, and may divide responsibilities between themselves as they see fit especially to help reduce the burden on the PD.

3.7.3.2 QAS can provide guidance and advice on the procedure and will be in liaison with the PD at an early stage.

3.7.4 Review Panel

3.7.4.1 No member of the Review Panel should be associated or have a conflict of interest with the programme under review (for example, no MOs who have modules attached to the programme, a tutor or supervisor from the programme). Any potential conflicts of interest should be raised with QAS. The PD will identify and nominate individuals to be on the Review Panel, with support and endorsement from the TPD and Programme Committee. PDs should approach colleagues and the External Reviewer informally before they are nominated to the Panel to ensure that they are able to participate. The nominations for the Review Panel are submitted to QAS who will seek final approval at PMRC in the autumn term of the year of the review.

3.7.4.2 PDs should seek guidance from QAS if they are unsure of a nominee's suitability and/or need support seeking panel members.

3.7.4.3 Panel members should be identified as early as possible to ensure a suitable meeting date can be found and confirmed (see paragraph 3.7.4.5).

3.7.4.4 For full Membership and Terms of Reference for the of the Periodic Review and Validation Panels please see [Chapter 10 of the LSHTM Academic Manual](#).

Review Panel meeting:

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- 3.7.4.5 **Date:** The Review Panel meeting takes place in the spring term between March to April. The PD must liaise with QAS when selecting the meeting date, specifically noting:
- The External Reviewer's availability (they should be contacted at an early stage, to help identify a suitable meeting date);
 - The availability of the Internal Reviewer and Student Reviewer;
 - **For face-to- programmes**, the visit should take place when current students will be available to meet the Review Panel;
 - **For DL programmes**, the Review Panel will not necessarily be expected to meet current students. However, the Programme Team should aim to set up channels for student input or liaison—such as a live online discussion via Moodle, or a survey run in advance of the visit—so that feedback is available to the Review Panel;
 - Colleagues who are required to meet the panel will be available (TPD, MOs, Teaching staff, Supervisors)
- 3.7.4.6 **Schedule:** The Panel meeting will normally take place over only one day. The standard agenda template below can be adapted to include more sessions at the Panel's discretion.
- 3.7.4.7 **Final Feedback Session:** During the final session, the Panel will provide their feedback to the Programme Team (PD, Exam Board Chair, and TPD). The Panel will provide commendations, recommended actions and conditions for reapproval. The minutes and shared with the Programme Team to formulate an action plan in response.

3.7.5 Self-evaluation and Further Supporting Information

- 3.7.5.1 The review should be evidence-based, with relevant information about the programme made available to the Review Panel.
- 3.7.5.2 **Responsibilities:** The PD will take the lead in preparing information for the review—particularly the SED. The PD is responsible for gathering all supporting documentation. It is advisable to involve Professional Service departments, including the TSO/DLO and the Alumni Relations and Annual Giving team, from as early as possible in the process, so they can start to collate information.
- The SED and material about the programme must be made available to the Review Panel (including the External Reviewer) at least one month before the Review Panel meetings;

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- A SharePoint and/or Moodle page will be set up for the Review Panel so that the sharing of documents is effective and efficient;
- QAS will set a deadline for the relevant documents, and/or links to pages must be made available to the Review Panel.
- Review records are kept by QAS for archiving after completion of the review.

3.7.5.3 The following standard documentation should be collated for an MSc review. Fewer or different documents may be relevant or required for Diploma or Certificate reviews.

3.7.5.4 Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

- **Purpose:** All programmes undertaking a periodic review produce a SED. This should provide information and a critical analysis of the health of the programme for the Review Panel, as a starting point for their enquiries.
- **Key content:** The SED should indicate the key priorities, challenges, strengths and weaknesses of the programme, and summarise the key issues around delivery of the Programme. It should be evidence-based and provide a balanced and open critical reflection on the quality of curriculum and learning opportunities, and the supporting systems and mechanisms in place. It should highlight areas of concern or for improvement, as well as identifying features of good practice or areas for enhancement. It should include within the document or as appendices:
 - A mapping exercise of individual modules of study and progression pathways to the programme's overall aims and learning outcomes;
 - A review of the assessment model ensuring an appropriate variety of assessment methods are utilised for the level of award.
 - Trend analysis of the student profile and outcomes for the period under review.
 - Assessment of the currency of the curriculum and learning strategy against developments in the discipline as well as pedagogical innovations.

3.7.5.5 Programme Documents:

- **Programme specification** – links to the latest version online and a tracked changed version if the Programme Team has identified areas for improvement in the programme. Proposed amendments to programmes should have had faculty consultation and finally be considered at the first PMRC after the review is completed, as per

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

LSHTM's procedure for programme and module amendments contained in [section 3.4 of this document](#);

- **Programme handbook** – latest version of handbook for students on the programme;
- **Programme Readers** – where relevant. [Note that Programme Administrators will need to keep these on file; they may be in hardcopy only due to licensing restrictions on electronic distribution, and it can be hard to track previous versions down once the Library reference copy gets updated];
- **Project guidance** – including handbook and related forms (e.g. approval form, feedback questionnaire) for programmes where this is relevant.

3.7.5.6 Module information:

The Review Panel should be given information about all core Term 1 modules and all compulsory and recommended Term 2 and 3 modules (at least the same core spectrum of modules as allocated to the Exam Board for moderation, and possibly a wider spread beyond those), including:

- **Module Specifications** - links to the latest versions online
- **Annual Module Report and Action Plan (AMRAP) forms** for most recent two years, as completed annually by MOs, plus any related cross-module summary/overview (whether for the specific programme, or prepared by TPDs at Faculty level)
- **Module handbooks** – including any practical handbooks.
- **Assessment details.**
- Any **teaching materials** (from Moodle), lecture outlines etc. as requested by the Panel.

Periodic reviews of individual programmes should confirm that the modules relevant to the programme remain fit for purpose (compulsory and recommended modules). This is expected to entail scrutiny of how the key elements highlighted in Module Specifications (key areas of content, intended learning outcomes etc.) support intended learning outcomes for the larger programme. In some cases, it may be appropriate to look at particular modules in more depth, but this is not a general requirement; and while not every optional module in LSHTM's portfolio is covered in a programme review, the currency of the curriculum is maintained through standard annual monitoring. However, it is helpful to note how programme staff monitor the appropriateness of student choices.

3.7.5.7 Programme quality and academic standards information:

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- **Programme Committee meeting minutes** – for current year and previous year
- **Annual Programme Director’s Review (APDR)** – for most recent two years.
- **External Examiner reports plus responses**– for most recent two years.
- Any **prior review reports**, working group reports or other documents of relevance – from within the last five years.
- **Reports to and from accrediting or other bodies** – from within the last five years.
- **Information from LSHTM-wide student surveys** (e.g. PTES) – for most recent two years, and showing both programme-level and LSHTM-level results. This can be supplied by QAS.
- Further **specific feedback** about the programme should normally be sought for the purpose of the review, from both current students and alumni
- Any other relevant Programme level student evaluations if carried out

For DL the following additional information is required:

- The current **programme agreement between LSHTM and UoLW:** comprising Schedule A (distribution of activities); Schedule B (academic decision-making and quality assurance pathways)
- The original **report from External Assessor** dating from when the programme was formally approved or last substantially revised.
- The UoLW **form for adding new award(s) to an existing programme** dating from when any last substantive programme revisions were made.
- **DL Annual Programme Review reports** for the most recent two years (supplementing standard LSHTM Annual Programme Director Reviews).
- Specific **DL Programme Regulations**.

3.7.5.8 **Student statistics** (PD to request information from Registry/UoLW)

- **Applications and admissions** information (numbers, origin, support) – for most recent four years, including current student numbers.
- **Pass rates data** – for most recent four years.
- **First career destinations** data for face-to-face (F2F) alumni, collected by Registry for the HESA “Destination of Leavers from Higher Education” survey.

3.7.5.9 **Student assessed work** (PD to request information from the TSO/DLO)

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- An appropriate **sample from the most recent year of projects and module assessments/assignments** should normally be provided. The Review Panel may ask to see further information.
- A list of **project report titles** for the most recent four years should be provided, as appropriate.
- **Exam papers** for the previous two years should normally be provided, as appropriate.
- **Exam Board spreadsheets** may potentially be provided at the request of the Review Panel, i.e. to show module, exam and project grade data (esp. mean Programme GPA) – for the previous year, or possibly up to the last four years.

3.7.5.10 Other information which may be gathered specifically for the review

- **Feedback from employers and/or professional organisations** should be sought where appropriate – e.g. for Programmes which have strong links with particular organisations.
- **Information on competitor programmes** – this can be a challenge for PDs to research, but potentially a worthwhile exercise. The Pro-Director of Education and the Registry may have relevant information collected at LSHTM level. It can also be helpful to check which members of staff (or whether any) have acted in similar External Review or external examining roles on programmes elsewhere.
- **Emerging research areas** in the subject which are yet to be incorporated into the curriculum but may be of (future) relevance – may be worth considering or detailing where appropriate.

3.7.5.11 **Sources of information:** Registry, the Alumni Relations and Annual Giving team and QAS can also assist with provision of centrally-held information.

3.7.6 Student and alumni voice

3.7.6.1 Gathering views from past and current students is an important part of the review process. The aim should be to give the Review Panel, and particularly the External Reviewer, an understanding of typical views and opinions about the programme, as well as student destinations after graduating. Potentially useful channels or sources of information include:

- **Direct meetings:** The Review Panel must receive direct feedback from a selection of students and programme reps as part of the Review Panel meeting. It may be desirable, particularly for smaller programmes taught F2F, to arrange an open meeting with all current students. It is also recommended to arrange for the Review Panel to meet some F2F alumni. For DL programmes, VLE discussion channels (e.g. Moodle) may be a helpful channel to obtain feedback from students – e.g. through a protected online discussion forum, primed with questions from the Review Panel and open for a set period; or via a live online 'chat' between the Review Panel and students who have agreed to participate at a set time.
- **Past surveys:** Feedback recorded from LSHTM, programme and module surveys will provide useful primary data. Centrally held data from PTES and PRES can be requested from QAS. Module and other programme surveys from the TSO, and the Alumni Relations and Annual Giving team and/or the Registry will hold graduate destination surveys.
- **Specific surveys for the review:** It is recommended that a survey of alumni be undertaken for each periodic review. This allows scope to ask any questions that the Programme Team are particularly keen to have answered. The current student body may also be specifically surveyed. If necessary, survey exercises can be administered centrally by the Alumni Relations and Annual Giving team. [Further guidance is available.](#)

3.7.7 Review Outcome and Reporting

3.7.7.1 **Revalidation:** The Panel will make a recommendation to reapprove (revalidate) the programme for another five (5) years which will be considered by **PMRC**, formally approved by SPGTC and noted at Senate. **PMRC** will receive the External Reviewer report, the Review minutes/actions and the Programme Team's response. The reapproval may be subject to conditions set by the Review Panel and PMRC will consider whether these conditions have been met before reporting to SPGTC.

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

- 3.7.7.2 In exceptional circumstances it may be appropriate to recommend that a programme is suspended or discontinued. The decision to discontinue a programme will ultimately reside with Senate.
- 3.7.7.3 For DL Programmes, a copy of the final review report should be sent to the UoLW Quality Manager.
- 3.7.7.4 [Minutes and Actions from the Review Panel meeting](#): The secretary will return the recommended actions, conditions and commendation as recorded in the minutes to the Chair within 2 weeks of the Review Panel meeting. Once approved they should be shared with the Programme Team (Programme Director) so that they can respond in a timely manner.
- 3.7.7.5 [External Reviewer's report](#): The External Reviewer should return a written report within 4 weeks after the Review Panel meeting, via QAS. Approximately one-day's work is estimated for post-visit follow-up and report preparation. The External Reviewer report should reflect their own views; but may refer to material from the SED, or as recorded by the note-taker during the review visit, as they see fit.
- **Overview of main Programme characteristics:** A summary of programme content, approach and notable strengths and weakness.
 - **Conclusions on innovation and good practice:** Identifying any current aspects of the programme which are particularly innovative or which represent good practice.
 - **Conclusions on quality and standards:** Confirming whether the programme specification for the programme is appropriate and supports achievement of the programme objectives; the quality of learning opportunities available to students; and whether intended learning outcomes are being obtained by students.
 - **Conclusions on currency of the curriculum:** Confirming whether the programme remains current and valid in the light of developing knowledge in the discipline, practice in its application, and developments in teaching and learning.
 - The External Reviewer should use the [template report provided](#).
- 3.7.7.6 [Programme Team response report](#):
- **Conditions:** The Programme Team will be required to respond to any conditions raised within the periodic review by the determined deadline;
 - **Recommendations:** The Programme Team will be expected to consider and respond to any recommendations made by the Review Panel. The

Chapter 3: Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

Programme Team will be required to provide justification where recommendations are being rejected;

- **Programme Amendments and Improvements:** Proposed improvements to programmes, which have been identified, raised and discussed as part of the review, should be included in the response. If amendments to programme or module specifications are submitted to the final PMRC of the academic year the module improvements can be implemented for the next academic year, whereas programme specification amendments will be implemented for the next academic year (plus 1) in line with LSHTM's Programme and Module Amendment procedure (as outlined in [section 3.4 of this document](#)).⁵ Other programme improvements should be implemented and monitored through the Programme Committee, FPGTC and annual monitoring procedures;
- The Programme Team should use [template report provided](#).

3.7.7.7 **Publication:** Once approved and reviewed at PMRC, final review reports will be made available on the [Academic Quality & Standards pages of LSHTM website](#) – being publicly available, so that prospective students would be able to read them, as per HEFCE recommendations on placing review reports in the public domain. Personal information (as per the GDPR) will be redacted prior to publication.

3.7.7.8 **Programme Committee:** The Programme Committee is expected to take on responsibility for monitoring the recommendations and associated actions raised in the review. Where these are not items under the direct control of the Programme Committee, e.g. LSHTM-wide requirements, they should be referred on as appropriate. The PD is responsible for their review action plans and it is recommended that this be incorporated into their general annual monitoring.

3.7.7.9 **Experience-sharing:** The Associate Dean of Education (Quality, Academic Standards & Collaborative Provision) will hold an informal meeting for PDs who have undertaken reviews in the previous year to share feedback on their experience with the PDs due for review in the current academic year, who will be starting the preparatory stages.

⁵ Any programme or module amendments proposed through the Periodic Review Procedure must have undergone consultation with relevant stakeholders before being submitted to PMRC for approval.

- 3.7.7.10 **One-year-on reporting:** A brief update is added to the response report on progress of implementing actions. This should be monitored by the Programme Committee and submitted to FPGTC for comment prior to being submitted to PMRC approximately one year after the review. Relevant PDs should complete the follow up report, and may wish to discuss with their TPD.
- 3.7.7.11 **Ongoing work:** Any major recommendations, which have not been implemented by a year after the review should be specifically flagged to PMRC by the Faculty. PDs will be expected to take forward and imbed any outstanding/ongoing action points in their Annual Programme Director Review (APDR).