Programme Validation and Revalidation Policy

Version Number 4

Effective from 1 October 2026

Author: Academic Quality Manager

Updated September 2026

Quality Management Office

Table of Contents

1. Purpose 4
2. Scope 4
3. Policy Statements 4
Strategic Oversight and Evaluation 4
Externality 5
Student Involvement 5
Programme Development and Design 5
Programme suitability for Students with visas 6
4. Programme Approval Process 6
Business Implications and Decisions 8
Academic Decisions. 8
Approval of Standalone Modules 10
5. Programme/Module Amendment 10
6. Revalidation 11
7. Programme Withdrawal and Temporary Suspension to Recruitment 13
8. Policy Enforcement: Role of the University's Quality and Standards Committee (QSC) ... 14
9. Related Documentation 15

Abbreviations and acronyms

APC – Academic Portfolio Committee

CPVP – Collaborative Programme Validation Panel

AA – Apprenticeship Assessment (formerly known as EPA – End-Point Assessment (applies to Apprenticeship Programmes))

HOCAG – Home Office Compliance Assurance Group

OfS – Office for Students

PC - Partnership Committee

PASC – Portfolio Approval Subcommittee PVP – Programme Validation Panel

PMEP – Programme Monitoring and Enhancement Procedure

PSRB – Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies

QAA – Quality Assurance Agency

QMO – Quality Management Office

QSC – Quality and Standards Committee

UAOG – University Apprenticeships Operations Group

1. Purpose

1.1. This document outlines the principles and regulations governing the design, validation, amendment, revalidation suspension and withdrawal of taught programmes leading to University of Salford credit or awards, including collaborative programmes delivered wholly or in part by other institutions under formal agreements.

1.2. In defining its own programme design, validation, amendment, revalidation and withdrawal policy and procedures, the University takes account of best practice in the UK Higher Education sector, Office for Students' (OfS) conditions of registration and the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

1.3. When considering and revalidating programmes, the University ensures that all relevant business issues (e.g., strategic, financial, resource, legal and reputational) are given due consideration and that any identified risks are appropriately managed.

1.4. The University is responsible for the academic standards of its awards and the quality of its programmes. This policy and related procedures are mechanisms to assure academic standards and quality of provision for the University, external stakeholders, and students.

2. Scope

2.1. This policy applies to all credit bearing provision approved by the University of Salford wherever delivered and includes:

- Programme development and design.
- Programme and module validation (including stand-alone modules).
- Programme and module amendment.
- Revalidation
- Withdrawal of programmes and temporary suspension of recruitment to programmes.

3. Policy Statements

Strategic Oversight and Evaluation

3.1. Academic authority rests with the University's Senate which has the primary duty to oversee the academic quality and standards of the University. On behalf of Senate, the University's Quality and Standards Committee (QSC) is responsible for ensuring that this policy and related procedures are applied systematically and evaluated, implementing changes where necessary.

3.2. Senate has delegated responsibility for decisions about programme business matters including approving proposals for new programmes, and decisions about programme withdrawal and suspension to recruitment to the Academic Portfolio Committee (APC), approval of new partnerships for both UK and Overseas provision to the Partnership Committee and responsibility for academic decisions to the Programme Validation Panel (PVP). See Scheme of Academic Governance.

Externality

3.3. The University makes use of external participation in its programme-related procedures to ensure independence and objectivity. It uses External Advisors and External Examiners with appropriate academic knowledge and experience and, where applicable, representatives of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) when considering new programmes or revalidating existing programmes. The function of the External Advisor and External Examiner is to comment independently, objectively and with authority on the academic quality of the programme under consideration. Criteria and the process for appointment of External Advisors are available on the Quality Management Office Hub Pages. Information regarding the role and functions of the External Examiner is available on the University main webpages.

3.4. The Chair of PVP escalates to QSC any conditions or recommendations from PVPs that have a wider University implication.

3.5. Internal peer review is demonstrated through the PVP membership, which includes an independent Chair.

Student Involvement

3.6. The University embeds student involvement at all stages of programme design, validation, amendment and revalidation. This is described in the detailed guidance on the QMO Hub pages supporting this policy.

3.7. Student involvement is continued through the PVP membership, which includes Students' Union representation on the Revalidation Panels.

Programme Development and Design

3.8. All programmes must align with the University's Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes (see Related Documentation) (unless an approved exception is in place) and the Curriculum Design Principles. Programme Teams should collaborate with industry professionals, ensuring that their insight and feedback is embedded within the development of a new programme.

3.9. All programmes must align with requirements of the OfS Quality and Standards Condition of Registration, UK Quality Code for Higher Education, including Subject Benchmark Statements and, where applicable, other external references such as those of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) and the Skills England Apprenticeship Standards.

3.10. All collaborative programmes shall satisfy the requirements for partnerships and collaboration as set out in the University's Collaborative Provision Policy and Procedure (see Related Documentation section).

3.11. When Faculties are preparing a new programme proposal, they must consult with other Faculties which have, or may have, an interest in the subject area, via their relevant Associate Dean Academic.

3.12. Guidance on programme design and pedagogy is available from Salford Academy

3.13. Advice and guidance on the operation of this policy is available from the Quality Management Office.

Programme suitability for Students with visas

3.14. This section (3.14 to 3.19) only applies to programmes where international students are required to study in the UK. Therefore, it does not apply to programmes (collaborative or otherwise) delivered wholly overseas or wholly online, as these students do not require a visa other than if they wish to come to the UK for graduation.

3.15. The University of Salford holds a Sponsor Licence issued by the Home Office that allows it to recruit and teach Student Visa holders. In order to maintain our licence, the University's Home Office Compliance Programme Approval Checklist is completed for all new programmes, programme re-approvals and programme amendments. 7 This Checklist is maintained by the Head of Home Office Compliance and overseen by the University's Home Office Compliance Assurance Group (HOCAG). It identifies the suitability of programmes for admission for the two most frequently used visas: the Student Visa and standard Visitor Visa.

3.16. The Home Office Compliance Programme Approval Checklist is completed at the Business Case Approval stage and reviewed at the Academic Case Approval stage to ensure that any changes in the details of a programme have not affected the suitability for a Student Visa.

3.17. *Other visas (i.e. not Student Visas or a standard Visitor Visa)* – The University recognises that there are several other visa types, including for example employees on the Skilled Worker Visa that have specific Home Office Compliance requirements. The University Admissions team consider, on a case-by-case basis, the suitability of programmes for applicants intending to use these less common visa types. Programme teams should seek the advice of the Head of Home Office Compliance prior to marketing programmes to applicants using the less frequently used visa types and whether they have a right to study which will be verified as part of Registration.

3.18. *Communicating visa requirements* – Restrictions to visa types are clearly communicated when the programme for admission is marketed or advertised, and before any offers are made to applicants. Similarly, if a programme is not suitable for international students on a Student Visa or a standard Visitor Visa, this is communicated when the course is marketed or advertised.

3.19. *Requirements for programmes offered to students on a Student Visa (Level 3 only)* – The programmes must:

- Be full-time programmes as defined in the Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes and primarily taught through face-to-face delivery.
- Have a minimum of fifteen hours a week face-to-face contact time over 23 weeks a year in line with Home Office Visa and Immigration rules.

3.20. *Requirements for Programmes Offered to Students on a Student Visa (Level 4 and Above)* – The programmes must:

- Be full-time programmes as defined in the Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes and primarily taught through face-to-face delivery.
- Have at least two 'contact points' per teaching week on separate days facilitated face-to-face by staff where this is a lecturer, researcher, technician, member of support staff, graduate teaching assistant of the institution, or a visiting or external specialist. See the

Engagement Policy for Student Route and Tier 4 Visa Holders at the University of Salford for further information about contact points. It is recognised that during periods of assessment, the Level 6 final project or dissertation stage and during the final 60 credits of a Level 7 PGT programme, there may be fewer contact points (as defined in the *Engagement Policy for Student Route and Tier 4 Visa Holders*).

- Be delivered predominantly face-to-face on campus, with remote delivery (including any hybrid elements) making up no more than 20**%** of the taught elements of the programme. This includes any reassessments that require attendance.

3.21. UKVI have confirmed that activities including writing dissertations, conducting research, undertaking fieldwork, carrying out work placements, and sitting or re-sitting examinations are not considered "taught elements" and are therefore not in scope of the remote delivery requirements.

3.22. Programmes intended to recruit Student Visa holders should normally be designed so that remote delivery does not exceed 20% of taught elements. Where a programme proposes remote delivery between 21% and 40%, the programme team must provide and evidence a robust, transparent and evidence-based academic and pedagogic rationale for the proposed delivery model.

3.23. For the University to offer any programme to Student Visa holders with remote delivery (including hybrid delivery) between 21% and 40%, approval must be obtained from UKVI in advance. Programmes within this range must be identified as part of the validation or revalidation process.

3.24. Programme teams proposing remote delivery between 21% and 40% must engage with the Home Office Compliance Team at the earliest opportunity and ensure that sufficient time is built into programme approval and implementation timelines to enable any required UKVI approval to be obtained. International students requiring a Student Visa cannot be recruited to a programme within this range until the relevant approval has been granted.

3.25. Programmes with between 21% and 40% remote delivery are normally considered by UKVI through established institutional approval processes. Programme teams should be aware that the timing of these processes may affect recruitment opportunities, and it is unlikely that Student Visa holders could be recruited to the first intake of a newly approved programme in this category.

3.26. Once approval has been obtained, further approval will not normally be required unless substantial changes are made to the programme or its delivery. Where significant amendments are proposed, consideration must be given to whether a further UKVI submission is required, and advice must be sought from the Home Office Compliance Team.

4. Programme Approval Process

4.1. The programme approval process has three stages, Strategic Case Approval, Business Case Assurance and Academic Approval. For detailed information and guidance about the programme approval procedure see the QMO Hub Pages.

Business Implications and Decisions

4.2. Strategic Case Approval considers the Strategic Case for the development of new programmes(s) and approved at the Academic Portfolio Committee (APC)

4.3. Business Case Assurance considers the business case for the development of a new programme(s) at the Portfolio Approval Subcommittee (PASC) and assures APC that the programme is able to proceed to stage 3, Academic Case Approval

4.4. At Strategic Case stage, Faculties are responsible for ensuring that the programme design, including aims, are in line with earlier sections 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9.

4.5. The Business Case Approval stage of the process aims to ensure that:

- There is a sound business case supported by market insight.
- Engagement with industry has taken place and this feedback has informed the programme design.
- The programme is aligned with the University's strategic direction.
- Potential risks have been identified and plans are in place to manage them. The Programme reflects the needs of industry and equips graduates with the skills required for future employment.

4.6. Strategic case approval which impacts on recruitment to programmes must normally be completed no later than 20 December, 19 months before the first intake (September starts) in the academic year preceding delivery of the programme. Programme teams must consult Published Programme Approval Dates and Deadlines to ensure timely programme development and approval. Exceptions to the December deadline may apply to programmes that are not aligned to standard September starts and to programmes that have a demonstrable market, strong business case and align with University strategy.

4.7. Criteria for approval outside of this timescale would require: evidence of a targeted and existent future cohort; a clear marketing plan and budget of how this would be realised; and evidence that the proposal could be delivered without impacting on current provision, for example timetabling, outside UCAS timescales.

4.8. New programmes are not advertised until the Strategic Case approval is granted.

4.9. In addition to 4.8, programmes delivered through collaborative provision agreements are not advertised until approval for the partnership has been granted through the Partnership Committee (PC).

Academic Decisions

4.10. Faculties have responsibility for developing academic proposals for new programmes and for confirming, through their relevant Associate Dean that a case for Academic Approval can be submitted for consideration to the PVP.

4.11. Academic Approval is granted by the PVP. PVPs normally comprise of four Panel members (a Chair, 2 University panel members, an external member and, for Revalidation, a student member).

4.12. The external member is an External Advisor who is also appointed to the Panel for new programme approvals and revalidations.

4.13. Due to the small numbers involved, to be quorate a PVP must comprise at least two University members (including the Chair or Deputy Chair) and an External Advisor should be present for new programme approvals and revalidations. A representative from the University Apprenticeship Operations Group (from a different Faculty to that proposing the new/amended apprenticeship programme) normally also attends as a full panel member where apprenticeship provision is being considered.

4.14. The University acknowledges that the panel members on each PVP are a small number of colleagues representing the wider University. As such the University seeks to recruit colleagues to PVP with diverse backgrounds and expertise. PVP members receive initial training and annual briefing sessions which explain their role and key considerations.

4.15. The Academic Approval process aims to ensure that a new programme:

- Is aligned with University's design principles (3.7) and with institutional regulations, policies and procedures.
- Is aligned with appropriate external references (see sections 3.8 and 3.9).
- Has appropriate content.
- Will be taught by staff with the appropriate skills and knowledge.
- Will offer appropriate learning opportunities and support for students.
- Has robust access and participation plans in place.

4.16. Academic Approval shall normally be granted no later than 31 January in the academic year preceding delivery of the programme to ensure that any timetabling implications can be accommodated. Programme teams must consult Published Programme Approval Dates and Deadlines to ensure timely academic case approval. Exceptions to this deadline may apply to programmes that are not aligned to standard September starts and to programmes that have a demonstrable market, strong business case and align with University strategy.

4.17. Documentation for Academic Approval shall normally be presented within six months of Strategic Case Approval. For cases that are within six -twelve months approval from APC Chair must be sought. After 12 months APC approval must be re-applied for.

4.18. New programmes are monitored and assessed against their original business case through the Programme Monitoring and Enhancement Procedure and Revalidation Procedure.

4.19. Programmes are normally validated for five years, starting from the academic year when the approval took effect from. This period can be reduced if there are appropriate internal or external requirements.

4.20. Programmes with additional requirements:

i. For apprenticeship provision undergoing validation, additional documentation will be required to ensure alignment with the Ofsted Inspection Framework and Department for Education funding rules. A representative from the University Apprenticeship Operations Group (from a different Faculty to that undergoing validation) will also attend as a full panel member where apprenticeship provision is being considered.

ii. For programmes with a Higher Technical Qualification (HTQ) Kitemark undergoing approval, additional documentation will be required to ensure mapping to the HTQ occupational standards remains current.

iii. For programmes with a higher national qualification, additional documentation will be required to ensure that mapping is done to Pearson core curriculum content.
iv. For programmes which map to Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements, additional mapping documentation will be required to assure the Panel that programmes are mapped to the most current standards.
v. For academic partnerships, additional documentation is required depending on the typology of the partnership.

Approval of Standalone Modules

4.21. All modules within a programme shall be approved as stand-alone modules.
4.22. A stand-alone module outside of a programme can be approved through the Programme and Module Amendment Procedure. Reviews of standalone modules are included within the revalidation process.

5. Programme/Module Amendment

5.1. For detailed information and guidance about the programme/module amendment procedure see the QMO Hub pages
5.2. The University's programme/module amendment process is intended to provide a framework for the modification and enhancement of programmes and modules so that they continue to accord with institutional regulations, policies and external expectations and are of a standard appropriate to the qualifications to which they lead.
5.3. External Examiners are asked to comment independently, objectively and with authority on the academic quality of any proposed amendments that may substantially affect the programme content and learning opportunities for students (see External Examining for all Taught Programmes Policy).
5.4. Programme changes that affect more than one third of programme credits are considered and approved by the PVP. The PVP should ensure that the factors listed in section 4.15 and, if applicable, the views of External Examiners are taken into consideration., even if APC approval is required for the business case.
5.5. Minor programme and module amendments are defined as changes that affect less than one third of programme credits and are approved by the Faculties' Associate Dean.
5.6. Changes to programmes may not be advertised or implemented until the programme amendment process is successfully completed.
5.7. The deadline for approval of programme and module amendments depends on the type of amendment and when it is due to be implemented. Amendments should be approved for the next entering cohort before course/module information is issued to them. Changes which affect information already provided to applicants and/or existing students, such as course/module-related material information upon which they have made an informed decision, will normally only be approved for the next admissions cycle, unless these are clearly in the best interests of all students (see sections 5.9 to 5.11). Proposers of amendments should seek advice from the QMO regarding deadlines that apply to their

proposed amendment. Exceptions to the deadlines may apply to programmes that are not aligned to standard September starts.

5.8. Where amendments proposed for an existing programme have the potential to impact on the programme resources and/or marketing, a Business Case shall be required. This ensures that the revised programme continues to meet business requirements.

5.9. The University is required to comply with the Consumer Rights Act (2015) and to work with prospective and existing students when amendments are made to programmes or programmes are withdrawn, offering them alternative programmes or arranging transfers where appropriate.

5.10. Where existing students are, or may potentially be, affected by an amendment to a programme, a consultation should take place (normally via email) that clearly identifies the proposed changes. The process for consultation is available on the QMO hub.

5.11. Where prospective students are, or may potentially be, affected by an amendment to a programme, they are informed of the change following the process set out in the QMO hub pages.

6. Revalidation

6.1 The Revalidation approach complements the Programme Monitoring and Enhancement Procedure and, for collaborative programmes only, the Collaborative Provision Policy and Procedures (see Related Documentation section). The University's continuous approach to programme monitoring provides an overview of the institutional portfolio and its performance against internal and external benchmarks. Based on this data, and working with Faculties, the QMO identifies a revalidation schedule. The Academic Portfolio Committee has oversight of the agreed five-year schedule and monitors its delivery. Normally, each Revalidation Panel considers a group of cognate programmes (including standalone modules where relevant), the outcome of which assures the University that the provision continues to meet the Office for Students' B Conditions of Registration. Each programme group will normally undergo revalidation every five years.

6.2 Faculties have responsibility for reviewing documentation required for revalidation and confirming, via their relevant Associate Dean, that the request for revalidation may be submitted for consideration via a Programme Validation Panel. Revalidation of the provision presented is granted by the Panel. Membership of the Panel includes an independent Chair and an independent External Advisor.

6.3 Given that the Panels normally revalidate a suite of programmes, any amendments identified and decided to be a condition of re-approval, by the Panel are approved as part of this process. Any amendments with the potential to substantially impact on the programme resources and/or marketing, will be required to complete a Business Case which will go through the normal APC approval process. This ensures that the revised programme continues to meet business requirements. Any new provision that Programme Teams wish to introduce within their directorates follows the programme approval process as detailed in this policy as normal.

6.4 The University complies with the Consumer Rights Act (2015) and liaises with applicants and consults existing students when amendments are made to programmes or programmes are withdrawn, offering them alternative programmes or arranging transfers where appropriate. Amendments should be approved for the next entering cohort before course/module information is issued to them. Changes which affect information already provided to applicants and/or existing students, such as course/module-related material information upon which they have made an informed decision, will normally only be approved for the next admissions cycle, unless these are clearly in the best interests of all students.

6.5 Where existing students are, or may potentially be, affected by an amendment to a programme as a result of revalidation a consultation takes place. The process for consultation is available on the QMO hub pages. Where prospective students are, or may potentially be, affected by an amendment to a programme as a result of Revalidation, they are informed of the change following the process set out on the QMO hub page.

6.6 The revalidation process aims to ensure that the programme presented for re-approval:

- Has systematically reviewed the external (both in HE and more widely) and internal factors that may impact on the programme within the next five years and that any potential risks have been identified and plans are in place to manage them.
- Has sought and considered the views of relevant stakeholders including students, partners, employers, External Advisors and (if applicable) PSRBs.
- Has identified and considered, any intractable or recurring issues in the Programme Action Logs prepared as part of PMEP.
- Has a continued business case and sufficient resources.
- Is aligned with University's design principles (3.7) and with Institutional regulations, policies and procedures.
- Is aligned with appropriate external references (see sections 3.8 and 3.9).
- Has appropriate content.
- Will be taught by staff with the appropriate skills and knowledge.
- Will offer appropriate learning opportunities and support for students.

6.7 Additionally, the process aims to contribute to the identification and sharing of good practice at both local and institutional levels and propose actions to enhance programmes at a local and an institutional level.

6.8 Programmes are normally re-approved for five years, starting from the academic year when re-approval took effect from. This period can be reduced if there are appropriate internal or external requirements or concerns, or an Interim Review could be instigated.

6.9 Normally, programmes will be presented for consideration as a cognate group, the group of programmes should normally correspond to the grouping used for the purposes of PMEP as applicable. In exceptional circumstances a single programme can be presented for Revalidation, for example programmes subject to accreditation by an external body e.g. a PSRB may seek to combine the consideration of the Revalidation with the external revalidation or re-accreditation meeting.

6.10 Programmes involving collaborative provision may bring forward a Revalidation to align with the review of the collaboration required under the University's Collaborative Provision Policy and Procedures (See Related Documentation section). The collaborative partners must be included in the Revalidation process.

6.11 Programmes with additional requirements:

i. For apprenticeship provision undergoing Revalidation, additional documentation will be required to satisfy Ofsted and Department for Education funding requirements. A representative from the University Apprenticeship Operations Group (from a different Faculty to that undergoing Revalidation) will also attend as a full panel member where apprenticeship provision is being considered.

ii. For programmes with a Higher Technical Qualification (HTQ) Kitemark undergoing Revalidation, additional documentation will be required to ensure mapping to the HTQ occupational standards remains current.

iii. For programmes with a higher national qualification, additional documentation will be required to ensure that mapping is done to Pearson core curriculum content.

iv. For programmes which map to Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements, additional mapping documentation will be required to assure the Panel that programmes remain mapped to the most current standards.

6.12 Programme Teams should ensure they are engaging fully with all programme stakeholders. Existing performance data is presented as evidence to the panel. The relevant Industry Advisory Boards should be consulted on the programmes undergoing review at the appropriate board meeting. Feedback from the boards should explore whether the programmes remain current and appropriate and that graduates from the programmes will have the relevant knowledge and skills to meet the needs of future employers. Partners should also be fully consulted on the programmes undergoing revalidation and feedback gathered to inform the Self-Evaluation Document to ensure the provision remains appropriate for them and that it enables the partnership to continue to run effectively. Other Faculties involved in the delivery of the programmes undergoing revalidation should also be consulted on this and have the opportunity to feed into the Self-Evaluation Document.

6.13 If a decision is made to withdraw a programme and not replace it with a similar programme, it is not required to undergo revalidation.

6.14 An Interim Review of a programme/programme suite may be instigated at any time due to concerns around standards or student experience, for example data from PMEP or concerns raised by an External Examiner or PSRB. This follows the paperwork and timeline requirements as for a normal revalidation with an additional a drill down into a sample of student work, and student feedback, across identified key modules.

7. Programme Withdrawal and Temporary Suspension to Recruitment

7.1. For detailed information and guidance about the programme withdrawal and temporary suspension to recruitment procedure see the QMO hub pages.

7.2. When considering the withdrawal of a programme or temporary suspension to recruitment, the following factors, as applicable, should be taken into account:

- Academic standards and quality of the programme.
- Viability of and market demand for the programme (e.g. failure to attract sufficient students to allow the programme to run; impact of external funding changes).
- Changes in PSRB requirements.
- Availability of resources to support the programme at Faculty level.
- The impact on other programmes that share resources and/or modules.

7.3. The programme withdrawal and temporary suspension procedure on the QMO hub pages includes proposals for teaching and managing students yet to complete the programme. These proposals must be completed in all situations i.e. including where the initial intention is to resume recruitment after a one-year suspension. The plans for teaching and managing students yet to complete withdrawn programme or programmes where recruitment has been suspended, must be reviewed annually by the Faculty Education and Standards Committee, with escalations to QSC as required.

7.4. A programme that has been withdrawn, or where recruitment has been suspended, should not be advertised or offered in any way. A withdrawn programme may be re-activated only by the approval of a new programme proposal.

7.5. Faculties should normally avoid withdrawal of programmes or suspension to recruitment within an existing admissions cycle. PVC Deans of Faculty recommend decisions to withdraw or suspend the recruitment of programmes to APC for approval.

7.6. Faculty proposals to resume recruitment to a suspended programme are considered for approval by APC. The Faculty provides APC with a business rationale as to why the Faculty considers the issues that caused the initial suspension resolved and why recruitment should be resumed.

7.7. Where appropriate, the programme suspension and withdrawal process aims to contribute to the identification and sharing of lessons learned across the University.

8. Policy Enforcement: Role of the University's Quality and Standards Committee (QSC)

8.1. QSC oversees the effectiveness of and compliance with the programme design, approval, monitoring, revalidation and withdrawal processes through audit and overview reports.

8.2. All decisions regarding programme approvals, re-approvals withdrawals and temporary suspension to recruitment must be reported to QSC to enable QSC to maintain a strategic overview of the University's academic portfolio, whilst ensuring local discretion for the currency and development of the academic portfolio.

9. Related Documentation

9.1. **University Policy**

See also the following related policies and documents in the Academic Handbook.

- Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes
- Collaborative Provision Policy and Procedure
- External Examining for Taught Programmes Policy
- Programme Monitoring & Enhancement Procedure
- Engagement Policy for Student Route and Tier 4 visa holders at the University of Salford
- Timetable Policy

9.2. **External Guidance**

The following external webpages are maintained by the Home Office UK Visas and Immigration

Visas and immigration

Student visas

Visit to Study

Document Control Information			
Revision History incl. Authorisation: (most recent first)			
Author	**Summary of changes**	**Version**	**Authorised & Date**
Emily Armstong/Jayne Langlands	Updated to reflect changes to APC/Withdrawal and Suspension/ Remote Delivery Changes/ Updates to Programme Validation Processes/ Faculty changes	V4	Emma French Chair of Quality and Standards Committee (Chair's action) Approved 19/09/2026
Helen Sharman and Helen Duell	New paragraphs 4.22 to 4.24 - include information about length of programme validation, collaborative provision and additional documentation requirement for apprenticeships and other non-standard programmes (to match that included in Programme Revie Section). Information added following July 2024 external review of the University's readiness for an OfS external review of its integrated End-Point Assessments (EPAs) and to ensure alignment of documentation requirements at validation and review.	V3.1	Emma French Chair of Quality and Standards Committee (Chair's action) Approved 19/09/2024
Helen Duell	A*s well as normal annual editorial updates, the key updates to the policy are as follows: revision to name of the policy from Programme Design, Approval Amendment, Review and Withdrawal Policy to Programme Validation and Review Policy; and insertion of section detailing new approach to Periodic Review (already approved by Quality & Standards Committee), update to include the Home Office Requirement Checklist within the RSI2 form.*	V3	Quality and Standards Committee 03/07/2024
Helen Duell	*Editorial update to clarify requirements for programmes offered to students on a Student visa (3.19).*	V2.9	No approval required.
Helen Duell/Jayne Langlands	*As well as normal annual editorial updates, the key updates to the policy are as follows: removal of the low-risk approvals route; addition of timelines regarding PARP approval; clarification of requirement of industry involvement in programme development; programme and module amendment timelines; the removal of some operational process details, such as storing module specifications on PaMIS; updates to the PPRR section of the policy to describe how it complements PMEP; additional clarification about the ADNPC role in PPRR and in Programme Withdrawal and Suspension; the strengthening of exception criteria for programmes whose development and approval are outside standard timelines; update of information regarding Student Visas; clarification of expectation of industry involvement in programme development; and the*	V2.9	ULTC Approval 05/07/2023

	addition of reference to UAOG's advisory role at PARPs considering apprenticeship provision.		
Helen Duell/Jayne Langlands	*Considering greater OfS scrutiny and compliance to CMA, the locus of responsibility for sign-off for Programme Withdrawal and Suspensions has changed to ADNPC.* *Updated references to Quality Enhancement Office to the new Quality Management Office name, references to ADPC with ADNPC and information regarding the Student Visa which has replaced the Tier 4 (General) student visa.* *Removed Appendix 2 with revised EIA guidance and form, replaced with a link to the LTEC webpage.* *Final editorial updates for the new year.*	V2.8	ULTC Approval 09/11/2022
Helen Duell	*Following an E-consultation with PARP members a revised paragraph 4.16 was approved via ULTC Chair's Action:* *"To minimise the potential for conflicts of interest, PARP members are normally drawn from directorates which are not responsible for leading on the delivery of the programme. PARP members who are from any other directorates that are contributing to, but not leading a proposal, may take part in the discussion about the item but must not act as Chair and should withdraw for the decision. The Chair or a resolution of the Panel can ask them to stay for the decision, but they cannot vote."*	V2.7	ULTC Chair's Action 18/08/2022
Helen Sharman	*Changes to policy in relation to programme suitability for students on a Tier 4 visa (Level 4 and above). The change is to focus on contact points rather than contact hours.*	V2.6	ASQAC 6/5/2020
Helen Sharman	*Information about PARP that was in the Scheme of Academic Governance has been transferred to this policy. Also, additional information added about PARP operation and conflicts of interest following school mergers.*	V2.5	ASQAC Chair Sam Grogan 20/6/2019
Helen Sharman	*Changes to policy in relation to business case approval to introduce a light-touch business case approval process for low-risk proposals. See section 4 and cross-references to the new process throughout the document.* *Changes to reflect introduction of the Programme and Module Information System (PaMIS) (section 3.14) including the introduction of Appendices 1a and 1b describing definitive course documentation.*	V2.4	ASQAC 8/5/2019

Helen Sharman	*Changes to policy in relation to responsibility for who approves suspensions and withdrawals (section 7) including:* • *Dean of School to approve all suspensions and withdrawals* • *New requirement for Schools to normally seek Academic Development and Partnerships Committee approval to restart recruitment to a programme that has been suspended.*	V2.3	ASQAC 6/2/2019
Helen Sharman	*Committee changes* • *Removal of reference to SELTEC (replaced with Associate Dean Academic)* • *Name of committee approving business case changed from ADSG to new committee: Academic Development and Partnerships Committee (ADPC).* • *Removal of reference to the Collaborative Partnerships and Programmes sub-committee (this work is now included in ADPC)* *Revisions to programme withdrawal and suspension including:* • *Approval (within recruitment cycle) by Chair of Academic Development and Partnerships Committee (ADPC). The Chair will consult with both Admissions and Strategy* • *Requirement for teach-out plans* *Quality Code links updated to reflect new code* *Added reference to ICZ ready curriculum* *External reference points to include Higher/Degree Apprenticeship Standards*	V2.2	Sam Grogan, Chair of ASQAC (27/7/18) (following e-consultation of ASQAC members)
Helen Sharman	*Revisions to sections regarding programmes offered to Tier 4 Students including to extend period in which teaching can take place to 9pm.*	V2.1	Sam Grogan, Chair of ASQAC: 26/09/16
Helen Sharman	*Addition of sections 3.19 to 3.24 (international Students), Table 2 (section C) and sections 5.9, 5.11, 6.6 and 6.7(CMA);4.7 and 4.12 (approval deadlines); Equality Assessment; minor changes to update website links.*	V2.0	Sam Grogan, Chair of ASQAC: 8/09/16
Helen Sharman	*URLs added to Programme Development and Review: Procedures and Guidance Document.*	V1.2	No approval required
Helen Sharman	*Committee names updated.*	V1.1	No approval required

Helen Sharman	*Complete revision of previous documentation round Programme Approval therefore new policy*	V1.0	Senate 10/07/2015

Policy Management and Responsibilities:	
Owner:	*The Head of Academic Quality and Partnerships has the authority to issue and communicate policy on programme approval and has delegated day to day management and communication of the policy to the Quality Standards Manager.*
Others with responsibilities (please specify):	*Members of Academic Portfolio Committee (decide on programme business matters)* *Members of Programme Validation Panel (decide on programme academic matters)* *Associate Deans (approve minor amendments and sign off programme documentation on behalf of the Dean of Faculty)* *Deans of Faculty (sign off programme documentation, can approve low-risk proposals)* *Chair of APC (decide on programme withdrawals and programme suspension).*

Author to complete formal assessment with the following advisory teams:	
Equality Analysis (E&D, HR) *Equality Assessment form*	1. *Completed June 2023attached as appendix*
Legal implications (LPG)	2. *The Chair of Home Office Compliance Assurance Group (HOCAG) is the University's Solicitor who proposed the sections 3.19-3.24 regarding international students.*
Information Governance (LPG)	3. *N/A*
Student facing procedures (QMO)	4. *N/A*
UKVI Compliance (Student Admin)	5. *Head of Home Office Compliance commented on the draft of the section on suitability for international students (September 2026)*

Consultation:	
Staff Trades Unions via HR Students via USSU Relevant external bodies (specify)	1. *N/A*

Review:	
Review due:	*July 2027*
Document location:	*University Academic Handbook page: https://www.salford.ac.uk/governance-and-management/academic-handbook*