**Stage 3**

**Reading Group Report (HE05H)**

**Part 1: Panel Members**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| HEQA Representative 1 |  |
| HEQA Representative 2 |  |
| HEQA Representative 3 |  |
| Academic Member |  |

**Part 2: Key Dates**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date of Reading Group report |  |
| Date for resubmission of Full Approval document |  |
| Full Approvals Panel event |  |

**Part 3: Overarching Programme Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme title |  |
| Approved location of delivery |  |
| Faculty/ School |  |
| Programme Leader |  |
| Academic Consultant |  |
| Employer Consultant |  |

The following questions whilst not definitive guide the panel in considering appropriateness of the programme specification:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | YES | **NO** | **Comment:** |
| Is the correct template used? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Are appropriate footers used (eg version control) | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Are the programme title and award type clearly stated? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Are the entry requirements clearly specified and appropriate?  (eg for standard and non standard entry; APL; DBS or PSRB requirements, IELTS) | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Is the mode of attendance clearly stated and appropriate? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Is the minimum number of students required within the first cohort appropriate for the programme to be able to start? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Do the overall programme aims and distinctive features fit with TEC Partnership’s HE strategy and existing provision? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Are the programme aims and distinctive features appropriate and transparent?  (e.g. are links to industry and/or employability clear; in cases of WBL- are the demands and expectations transparent? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Are CVs of module tutors attached? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Have resource requirements been taken into consideration and planned for the first intake? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Has the programme specification been designed against appropriate, valid and current external reference points?  (e.g. QAA Benchmarks Statements, FDQB, NOS, PSRB) | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Is the mapping of external reference points to the programme learning outcomes accurate, rigorous and transparent? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Do the programme learning outcomes reflect appropriate content and balance of   * Knowledge and understanding * Intellectual skills * Professional/practical skills * Transferable skills? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Is the structure clear and appropriate?  (e.g. full/ part time, credits, short fat, long thin, core and optional modules) | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |
| Are all relevant sections complete and is the programme specification presented to a publishable standard? | 🗸 | 🗸 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **General Comments** |
|  |

If the panel answer in the shaded areas for any of the above, further development of the programme specification is needed before approval by Reading Group to proceed to full approval can be granted.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendations of reading group: | | | | | |
| Approved (progress to FAP): | | ✓ | Not Approved (return to draft): | ✓ |  |
| Panel recommendations: |  | | | | |