

Part 6

Module and Course Modifications

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Modification of modules / courses is allowed where it has been identified as necessary to enhance the delivery of a course. Modifications may or may not trigger the full re-approval of a course.
- 1.2 Reasons for a modification may be, for instance; a condition of Academic Review (Part 8) or Collaborative Review (Part 11); feedback from students; feedback from a professional, statutory or regulatory body; or feedback from an External Examiner.
- 1.3 The formal process for approving modifications ensures the integrity of modules / courses and ensures adherence to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Principles (Part 1).

2 Principles Governing the Approval of Modifications

- 2.1 Modifications will not be applied retrospectively and should only be implemented at the start of the Term or academic session following their approval.
- 2.2 Where new curriculum material is being introduced in existing modules, (other than the normal up-dating of existing modules), external input will always be sought.
- 2.3 Where modifications being proposed will affect students currently enrolled on, or applying to, the course, such students must be consulted and notified of any modifications once they have been approved.
- 2.4 Once a modification has been approved, student facing documentation must be updated by the Course Leader and the revised version of the course specification lodged with Quality Assurance and Enhancement. Delta amendments via Courses and Systems must only be processed after formal approval by the School Quality Committee.
- 2.5 Modifications should be considered within the parameters of any professional, statutory or regulatory body requirements.

2.6 Where modules are offered cross-institutionally, the School owning the module is responsible for ensuring that proposed modifications do not impact negatively on courses from other Schools.

2 Types of Modification

2.1 Course modifications can be categorised in three ways:

- Changes that constitute a modification of more than 25% of the core modules of the course.
- Changes that constitute a modification of less than or equal to 25% of the core modules on the course.
- Normal and regular updating of core and optional modules that do not count towards the 25% rule.

2.2 Changes that constitute a modification that counts toward the 25% rule are as follows:

- A. any replacement of a core module;
- B. any addition, removal or allocation to a different level of a core module;
- C. any change in the credit weighting of a core module;
- D. any change to the learning outcomes of a core module (with or without a change in the title of a module);
- E. any change to the curriculum content of a core module other than routine updating (with or without a change in the title of a module);
- F. any change in the mode of delivery of a core module (eg from face-to-face to distance learning mode).

2.3 The following table defines the number of core modules that can be modified before the 25% limit is exceeded:

<i>Number of core modules on the course</i>	<i>Number of core modules that can be modified before the 25% limit is exceeded</i>
18-16	4
15-12	3
11-8	2
7-4	1

The 25% rule relates to all Core Modules irrespective of their Credit weighting (15, 20, 30, 40, 45, 60 credit modules all count as one module).

For courses outside the Academic Framework, assessment of modifications that constitute 25% of the course will be made on a case by case basis but will be based on the principles outlined here.

- 2.4 A running log of all course modifications should be kept by the School Quality Committee and submitted to Quality Assurance and Enhancement Officer for monitoring.

3 Changes that constitute a modification of more than 25% of the core modules of the course

- 3.1 Modifications that constitute more than 25% of the total course require full re-approval of the course/provision.

The procedure to be followed for the re-approval of existing courses is the same as for the approval of new courses (see Part 5 of this manual) except that: (a) all current enrolled students must be consulted, usually, but not exclusively, via the Course Committee; (b) transitional arrangements are specified (if applicable); and (c) where the reapproved course replaces a current course or courses, Student Recruitment and Marketing (SRM) will be notified in order to provide clear information on the university website and contact applicants to provide notification of course revalidation, where applicable.

- 3.2 Re-approval of on campus courses should be completed and approved by the Peer Review by March of the academic year preceding the first intake on to the new course, in order that applicants can make an informed acceptance of their offer.

4 Changes that constitute a modification of less than or equal to 25% of the core modules on the course.

- 4.1 The School Quality Leader shall set a deadline, internal to the School, for early notification of all planned modifications to existing courses and modules. Based on this information, the School Quality Leader determines whether the amount of proposed amendments constitutes a modification or requires full re-approval. In order to aid this process, Schools should put in place a system to log and monitor changes considered cumulatively since the last (re)approval or Academic Review of the course. The Course Modification Log will be continuously reviewed and updated by the School Quality Committee and submitted to Quality Assurance and Enhancement for monitoring.
- 4.2 The process is not intended to be used to introduce significant amendments that should properly be dealt with by a full re-approval process. For this reason the School Quality Leader may refuse to deal with proposed changes as modifications if it appears that the process is not being used in the spirit for which it is intended (for example, presentation of new options to consecutive meetings of a School Quality Committee).

4.3 Subject to the provisions of the 25% rule, School Quality Committee may approve the creation of a distance learning version of an existing module. The following will be required:

- Learning materials for the modules;
- Via the external expert's report, confirmation that assessment design, materials and support meet the quality assurance requirements for distance learning.

4.4 In the following circumstances the Department Head is responsible for ensuring that a suitable external expert is nominated.

- proposal of a new module;
- changes to curriculum content in an existing module;
- addition or subtraction of learning outcomes in an existing module;
- changes to the objective of learning outcomes in an existing module;
- creation of a distance learning version of an existing module

The suitability of the external expert will be determined by the Chair of the School Quality Committee subject to the following criteria:

4.4.1 The depth and relevance of subject knowledge.

4.4.2 Prior experience of teaching on courses at the same level or above.

4.4.3 Impartiality (the nominee should not normally have any formal links with the School offering the course during the last five years as a former member of staff.

4.4.4 It is possible to use a current External Examiner with the required subject knowledge.

4.5 The external expert is asked to comment, in writing, on the following issues:

4.5.1 Whether the module is an academically coherent package.

4.5.2 Whether the learning outcomes for the module are of an appropriate standard.

4.5.3 Whether the indicative reading list for the module are appropriate and up-to-date.

4.5.4 Whether the teaching and learning methods listed for the module are appropriate.

4.5.5 Whether the assessment methods and weightings listed for the module are appropriate.

4.5.6 Whether the module is an appropriate addition to the overall course and whether its place in the structure is appropriate.

- 4.5.7 For distance learning modules, that assessment design, materials and support meet the quality assurance requirements for distance learning.
- 4.6 The Course Leader or Department Head, as appropriate, is responsible for providing the following documentation to the School Quality Committee for the consideration of modifications. All documentation should be circulated to members in advance of the meeting:
- 4.6.1 Rationale for modification including details of how the modification affects the structure of the course(s) on which it is offered, how it affects the stated aims and objectives of the course, transitional arrangements (if applicable), communication with partner institution(s) (if applicable), communication with other School(s) where offered (if applicable) and, for new modules, examples of evidence of demand etc.
 - 4.6.2 Evidence of student consultation (usually via the minutes of the Course Committee).
 - 4.6.3 Where changes to existing modules are being proposed, a copy of the existing module specification(s) and a copy of the amended module specification(s).
 - 4.6.4 Where changes to curriculum content are being proposed, the written comments of an external expert.
 - 4.6.5 Where a new module is being proposed, the curriculum vitae of the module leader involved, and the written comments of an external expert.
 - 4.6.6 A revised version of the course specification.
- 4.7 The School Quality Committee will evaluate the proposal against elements of the Quality Criteria (see part 4 of this manual) and other appropriate external reference points, as appropriate (see section 5.2 in Part 5 of this manual).
- 4.8 The School Education and Experience Committee can either (a) approve the proposal or; (b) reject the proposal and require that it be revised and re-submitted for further consideration at a future meeting. The School Quality Committee may not impose conditions of approval.
- 4.9 The minutes of the School Quality Committee will record details of the discussion with regard to the proposal, comments of external expert where appropriate, and the outcome agreed by the committee. The School Quality Committee Servicing Officer is responsible for forwarding the relevant paperwork to the internal departments affected.
- 4.10 Once a modification has been approved by the School Quality Committee, it can be delivered at the next point of delivery of that module.
- 4.11 The Module Leader should consult Library and Learning Services to ensure availability of funding to purchase learning resources.

- 4.12 When approving modifications to modules or re-approving a module/replacing a module with an alternative, Schools should ensure that modifications are applied to all courses on which the module is offered. It is important that Department Head also consider whether such modules are offered on courses in other Schools or on collaborative courses.
- 4.13 Where modifications have been made to courses franchised to partner institution(s), the School Quality Committee will formally note the need to arrange for rolling out modifications to the partner. The School Collaborative Lead and Link Tutor will initiate discussions with the partner as to implementation and the partner will notify students of the changes usually but not exclusively through Course Committees. Once agreement has been reached on the date from which the modifications be implemented by the partner, the School Quality Committee will approve the timescale and arrangements for implementation. Where new core modules, or changes to curriculum content are involved, the School Quality Committee will need to satisfy itself that the partner is able to deliver the new content prior to commencement of delivery.

5 Normal and regular updating of core and optional modules that do not count towards the 25% rule

- 5.1 Changes to optional modules, require the approval of the School Quality Committee but do not constitute a modification counting towards the 25% modifications rule.
- 5.2 Changes to core modules that do not involve changes to curriculum content or learning outcomes, as for example the addition or removal of pre- or co-requisites; a change in the form, length or nature of assessment; the main aims or main topics of study; or module title changes, require the approval of the School Quality Committee, but do not constitute a modification counting towards the 25% modifications rule.
- 5.3 School Quality Committee may approve non 25% rule modifications, on receipt of an appropriate rationale, evidence of student consultation, and where appropriate, a revised module specification.
- 5.4 Normal and regular updating of indicative reading lists does not require approval by the School Quality Committee, any normal or regular updates to module specifications should be sent to Quality Assurance and Enhancement so that an up to date version of the module specification is accessible at all times.

6 Modifications to Course Titles

6.1 Modifications to course titles can only be considered after permission is obtained from the Chief Marketing Officer or their nominee and the Dean of School.

6.2 Proposed modifications to course titles are considered and approved by the School Quality Committee, using the standard proforma (available from the UEL website at: <https://uelac.sharepoint.com/LearningandTeaching/Pages/forms-and-guidance-notes.aspx>)

Such proposals must include a rationale for the title change. Evidence of consultation of all students and applicants affected must be provided, both through Course Committee and individual notifications, and detailed transitional arrangements supplied. The comments of an external expert are required to confirm the validity of the proposed change. A revised course specification should be presented to the School Quality Committee.

6.3 All course title changes are reported, by the School, to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Officer responsible for approval and withdrawal, in order that Peer Review can be completed and final approval obtained. The Quality Assurance and Enhancement Officer is responsible for informing the relevant departments to ensure that all records are updated.

7. Intermediate and Named Awards

7.1. Where an approved course exists, it may have named or un-named intermediate awards. If it is proposed that an intermediate award should be open for recruitment as a course in its own right (e.g., a PGDip version of an MSc course) approval can only be considered after permission is obtained from the Chief Marketing Officer or their nominee and the Dean of School.

7.2. School Quality Committee can create a course in its own right from an intermediate award after considering a rationale and the course specification.

7.3. Where the intermediate award was previously un-named, the comments of an external expert are required to confirm the validity of the proposed change.

7.4. The process described in section 7.2. and 7.3 of this section can also be adapted to add intermediate awards to existing courses, or to name/re-name previously un-named intermediate awards of existing courses.

8. Course Withdrawal

8.1. Course Withdrawal Principles

8.2. Course withdrawals are considered and noted by the School Quality Committee using the standard proforma, available from the UEL intranet at:

<https://uelac.sharepoint.com/LearningandTeaching/Pages/forms-and-guidance-notes.aspx>

- 8.3. Withdrawal consists of two stages. No action to halt recruitment is taken until Student Recruitment and Marketing (SRM) receive the details from stage 1 of the form.
- 8.4. School Management Team (SMT) consider this form; if the decision is to withdraw, the servicing officer for SMT will circulate the form to SRM.
- 8.5. SRM will take action to halt recruitment, and will inform QAE to add the course to the withdrawal schedule. QAE service School Quality Committees who monitor stage 2 of the process.
- 8.6. This process is not for halting recruitment for a brief period.
- 8.7. **Course Withdrawal Process - Stage 1: Cease Recruitment**
- 8.8. Dean of School confirmation is needed to provide some basic details about what is being withdrawn and when. Confirmation is also needed to assure stakeholders that the decision to withdraw has been made with due consideration to all surrounding circumstances.
- 8.9. Considerations include:
- Recruitment considerations including obligations relating to recruitment targets
 - Obligations to foundation year students or students for whom this course is a progression route
 - Impact on collaborative partner arrangements, including consideration of in-country regulatory requirements
 - Impact on other Schools (if modules are shared)
 - Impact on staff
 - Impact on students
 - Impact on offer holders including international students who may have been issued a CAS
- 8.10. **Course Withdrawal Process - Stage 2: Student Protection**
- 8.11. The quality assurance process ensures those affected, particularly students and offer holders have been appropriately involved with the withdrawal, and agreed transitional arrangements are in place.
- 8.12. Arrangements for withdrawal are approved at the School Quality Committee, forwarded to QAE for due process audit and thereafter noted at the Education and Experience Committee. System and Courses Team are notified of the withdrawal when the due process check is complete.
- 8.13. Where students currently enrolled on or intermitting from the course will not be affected by the withdrawal, i.e., the course will continue as normal until all students are complete. Students should be notified both at the Course Committee and via individual notifications.
- 8.14. Where students currently enrolled on, or intermitting from, the course will be affected by the proposed changes, evidence of consultation of all students

affected must be provided, both through the course committee and individual notifications, and detailed transitional arrangements supplied.

- 8.15. The processes described in 7.13 and 7.14 also apply to students at collaborative partners.
- 8.16. Note courses are not suspended (this process was removed in 2016/17). A course is withdrawn and then if a decision is made to bring the course back, a rationale is made to the Education and Experience Committee. The committee will decide whether the course needs to go through the initial approval process and/or be re-validated before teaching resumes. Where a course has been withdrawn for more than two years, it will normally require revalidation.

Study abroad

School Quality Committee will wish to consider proposals for study abroad modules for UEL students. This is to ensure that the modules that the student plans to study map against the level, aims and learning outcomes of the student's course of study, and that appropriate arrangements are made for credit achieved via study abroad to be counted in degree classifications. Prior to the student taking modules abroad, the module content and way in which marks or grades awarded would be mapped to UEL marks needs to be agreed. This needs to take account of the mapping and grading system being used in country and its relation to the UK system, to ensure that we have accurately taken account of the different approaches to marking and grading and its relationship to the equivalent UEL mark. The study abroad module will be shown on the student's transcript of study.

Involvement of External Examiners

Modifications may be the result, either directly or indirectly, of external examiners' comments and/or annual reports. Schools are advised to keep their external examiners informed of any proposed modifications.

Manuals, Forms and Guidance notes relevant to Part 6

<https://uelac.sharepoint.com/LearningandTeaching/Pages/forms-and-guidance-notes.aspx>

- Module Specification Template
- Nomination of an External Adviser for a validation/review event
- Course Withdrawal Form
- Change of Course Title Form
- Course Modification Log Template