

Quality at

Dun Laoghaire Institute of Art, Design and Technology

Procedure for the Development & Approval of New Programmes

Document Reference & Version No	Procedure for the Development & Approval of New Programmes Draft 2 of V3
Purpose	To guide staff on the process for the development and approval of new programmes
Commencement Date	Version 1 November 2005 Version 2 November 2009 Version 3 October 2015 awaiting approval
Date of Next Review	2017
Who needs to know about this document	Registrar, Heads of Faculty, Heads of Department, Programme Co-ordinators, all academic staff, all students
Revision History	Revision of V.2009
Policy Author	Registrar
Policy Owner	Academic Council and Executive

1. Purpose

The purpose of this procedure is to ensure that new programmes leading to awards, up to and including taught Level 9, but excluding joint awards, developed by the Institute meet the following overarching objectives:

- Compliant with the strategic and academic plan of the Institute
- Fulfil an identifiable need for industry or the local community
- Comply with relevant national policies and procedures
- Are of appropriate academic breadth and depth with assessable learning outcomes that are consistent with the levels of knowledge skill and competence as prescribed by the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ)
- Maximise opportunities for learners to avail of access, transfer and progression routes, including the flexible and innovative use of Recognition of Prior Learning.
- Can be adequately resourced - academic, physical and human resources - and can be provided within a supportive and engaging intellectual and skills-based learning environment.

2. Scope

This procedure applies to all IADT developed programmes, except those leading to joint awards, for which a dedicated procedure is in place¹.

3. Organisational Responsibility

The Registrar has responsibility for Institute-wide academic planning and quality assurance in academic matters and collaborates with the Faculties in the progression and management of such matters.

The Secretary/Financial Controller has responsibility for Institute-wide resource and financial planning and collaborates with Faculties in the preparation and management of pay/non-pay budgets and projects of a capital nature, and in the development of business plans for proposed new programmes.

4. Overview of Steps in Developing a Programme

The process moves through the following phases

- 1) Programme initiator brings outline proposal to Faculty for approval to proceed
- 2) Faculty brings outline proposal to Programme Validation Committee (PVC) for approval to proceed

¹ The procedure for the development of programmes leading to joint awards, is intended to mirror this document, not create any unnecessary additional processes, but rather provide for the differences in governance, management and legality which arise in the context of a joint award.

- 3) Faculty develops a Financial Plan in consultation with the Directorate of the Secretary Financial Controller and brings it to Executive for approval
- 4) Following separate and distinct PVC and Executive approvals to progress, a detailed Programme is developed
- 5) Submission to IADT Programme Validation Committee (PVC) with a formal minute from Executive approving the Financial Plan
- 6) Feedback from PVC
- 7) Revised Programme Document is sent to the Registrar
- 8) Registrar convenes an independent panel of peers and experts to evaluate the proposal and make recommendations to IADT-
- 9) Panel conducts a site visit, prepares a report and makes a recommendation to IADT on the approval of the programme
- 10) The programme development team respond to the findings of the panel, normally within no more than 6 weeks with a specific response to each panel finding and also with an updated programme proposal where relevant.
- 11) The Registrar submits to Academic Council a recommendation that the programme be validated presenting the Panel Report and the Response of the Institute to same, including any changes to the proposed programme
- 12) Academic Council validates the programme
- 13) Governing Body notes the programme approval
- 14) IADT notifies the HEA

5. Outline Proposal for the Development of a New Programme

5.1 Areas to address in the programme proposal outline

Once a Faculty executive has approved the development of a programme proposal the proposer should develop an outline programme proposal which addresses the following:

- How the Programme fits within the strategic/academic plan for the Faculty/Institute
- Rationale for the programme
- Demand for the programme
- Indicative enrolment targets
- Employment opportunities, support from potential employers
- Programme Aims and objectives
- Programme Intended learning outcomes with
 - Indicative structure and content
 - Indicative pedagogical approach
 - Assessment Strategy to include modes of assessment, assessment schedule, mapping of module learning outcomes
- Opportunities for Erasmus and other international exchange students
- How the Programme responds to the needs of life-long learners for flexibility, e.g. blended learning
- Requirements for Library/Learning Resources
- Requirements for ICT resources
- Any other requirements, e.g. specialised resources, dedicated space

- Proposed membership of Programme Development Board

Presentation of this initial outline provides PVC with an opportunity to provide feedback to the proposers against the objectives listed in paragraph one and provides a basis for endorsing the development of the detailed Programme Specification.

It is important that new programme proposals are submitted well in advance of the proposed starting date, to allow time for the validation process to take place, and to ensure timely dissemination of information to potential applicants, CAO etc.. A minimum of 12 months is normally required.

6. Submission of Financial Plan with the Outline Proposal

In addition to seeking the approval of PVC, the Head of Faculty will submit a Financial and Staffing Plan for all new Programmes to the Executive management team, for review of potential costs associated with any new programme of study to be offered by the institute. Examples of such potential costs should include, but not be limited to the following:

6.1 Students

Planned student intake per year

Level of Programme

Classification of Programme (Science, Business, Arts, etc.)

6.2 Pay

Academic staff required to deliver the programme

Part time hours budget

Technician staff required

Attendant posts required

Demonstrator posts required

Visiting Lecturers

6.3 Non Pay

Programme materials

Programme development fees

Advertising/Promotion

Recruitment Costs

Travel and Subsistence

Equipment hire

Learner Support costs

Mode of Provision costs

Staff training costs

Library costs

Insurance

Detailed space and facility needs

Once the Executive approves the Financial Plan, the programme proposer can establish the programme development team.

7. Full Programme Design and Development

With the approval of PVC and Executive of the Financial Plan, the Faculty will undertake the detailed research, development and drafting process required to prepare a detailed Programme Specification document to meet the requirements of the Institute. A Programme Development Board will normally be established, which will include the relevant internal academic experts. External experts may be co-opted to this Board to assist the design process.

Typically research will include

- stakeholder feedback on the demand for and benefits of the proposed programme
- a detailed confrontational swot analysis or similar model
- a benchmarking exercise in respect of similar programmes in Irish and international HEIs

A template for a programme is available. Appendix One, provides a list of questions which a programme development team may find helpful to pose to itself during the development of a programme. A programme development team should expect to respond to questions of this nature at PVC and/or during the evaluation by an independent panel.

It is expected that programme development teams will make use of various pedagogical resources in enhancing a learner-centred approach, for example considering diversity in the type of teaching and assessment strategies to be used. The Teaching and Learning Committee maintains an up to date resource listing that will be of assistance.

7.1 PVC Consideration of the Full Programme Draft

- The final draft of the Programme Document should be submitted by the Faculty to the Registrar for inclusion on the agenda of PVC.
- PVC should formally confirm that Executive has approved the financial plan.
- Appendix One, provides a list of questions which members of the PVC may wish to use to evaluate the programme proposal. Subject to the approval of PVC, the Programme Development Board will finalise the Programme Document, making such revisions as are appropriate having regard to the recommendations of PVC.
- Should PVC indicate that major revision to part or all of the Programme Document is required the revised document should be submitted in full to a subsequent PVC meeting.
- The final copy of the Programme Document, as approved by the Programme Validation Committee will be forwarded by the Head of Faculty to the Registrar, who is then responsible for organising the Programme Validation Process.

8. The Validation Process

8.1 Steps in the Validation process

- Establish a Programme Validation Panel
- Arrange for visit of the panel to the campus to meet with programme team, visit the facilities and evaluate the programme
- Panel makes findings
- Programme Team considers the conditions/recommendations of Panel and modifies the programme accordingly, or withdraws the programme from the validation process
- Office of the Registrar communicates the response of the Institute to the Panel chair
- The panel chair makes final statement
- Registrar brings a recommendation to the Academic Council, attaching the Panel Report and the Institute response
- Academic Council makes a validation decision

8.2 Establishing a Programme Validation Panel

The Registrar is responsible for appointing the Validation Panel. The two criteria for membership of a panel are:

- a) Relevant competence
- b) Independence from IADT and any of the internal parties

The panel typically comprises three to six persons:

- Appropriate senior person from another Higher Education Institute (HEI) to act as Chair
- Academics from a HEI with expertise in the area of the proposed Programme
- Industry/Business expert(s) to reflect employer needs

Panel members are asked to make formal declarations regarding any conflicts of interest. Normally a gender balance will be maintained.

8.3 Programme Validation Criteria

The Validation Panel is asked to evaluate the proposed programme to assess how it meets the following key criteria²:

- *Strategic Mission*: The programme aligns to the strategic plan and objectives of the Institute

² Drawn and adapted from QQI *Validation Policy* 2013

- *Access/Entry Standard*: The *prerequisite learning* for participation in the programme and any other assumptions relating to the programme's *target learners* are explicit.
- *Outcome Standard*: The *minimum intended programme learning outcomes* are consistent with the relevant *awards standards* and the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) *award-type descriptors*.
- *Learning*: The programme can enable its *target learners* to attain the *minimum intended programme learning outcomes* through reliable assessment, efficiency in terms of learner effort and workload, and a stimulating learning environment, cognisant of a diverse cohort of learners.³

8.4 Panel Evaluation

The panel members are asked to come to a consensus view as to whether the proposed programme meets the criteria specified in paragraph 8.3. Typically where a programme does not meet the criteria, the panel will advise that the programme should only progress conditional to certain amendments being made. The panel is also invited to focus on general strengths and weaknesses in the programme, and asked to make recommendations on improvements, or commend features of good practice.

Whilst it is expected that a proposed programme would not be put forward for independent panel evaluation unless it had been through earlier rigorous considerations, and therefore typically a panel's findings will be in some form of affirmation, it is expected that there may be exceptions where a panel may advise that a programme not be validated, or be wholly redesigned.

8.5 Panel Visit

Each panel member will receive a soft and/or hard copy of the documentation.

During the visit to the Institute, the Panel will typically follow a full-day agenda as follows:

- Initial session, private to Panel
- Panel meets with President, Registrar and Head of Faculty and/or other senior staff
- Panel meets with Head of Faculty/ Head(s) of Department and academic staff associated with the proposal
- A tour of Institute facilities follows
- Panel meets in private session to consider its findings
- Panel meets with President, Registrar and Head of Faculty to orally convey a summary of its findings

8.6 Validation Report

Following the issue of oral findings on the day of the evaluation, the panel will work with the evaluation secretary on the production of a validation report. The Report should

³ The concept of minimum intended programme learning outcomes and its relation to teaching, learning and assessment are explained in QQI's *Assessment and Standards 2013*.

explicitly address the validation criteria, cite evidence to support judgements made, identify strengths and weaknesses of the proposed programme and take due regard to the relevant ESG standards.

8.7 Responding to the Panel Findings

The Programme Team will compile a response to the Recommendations/Conditions. The response will outline how any conditions stipulated by the panel will be addressed, to include a timeframe within which the condition(s) will be met. The response will also include a rationale for how the recommendations of the panel may or may not be incorporated into the programme structure.

On completion of this work, the full programme response will be submitted by the Head of Faculty/Department to the Registrar for verification that the recommendations as laid down by the external validation panel have been satisfactorily addressed. The Registrar's Office ensures that the revised full programme document is subsequently circulated for approval to all members of the external validation panel, confirming that the stipulated conditions have been addressed.

9. Decision-Making and Validating the Programme

Validation is a function of Academic Council.

- 1) Following the conduct of the panel site visit and the evaluation of the programme, the panel prepares a report and makes a recommendation to IADT on the approval of the programme
- 2) (Assuming a positive recommendation) The Registrar submits to Academic Council a recommendation that the programme be validated presenting the Panel Report and the Response of the Institute to same, including any changes to the proposed programme
- 3) Academic Council considers the recommendation and typically validates the programme.

Note that Academic Council does not have to accept the recommendation of the panel, or the Registrar, and may also require an amendment to the programme proposed. Such a course of action should only be undertaken in grave circumstances, which should clearly be documented in any associated minutes.

10. Funding Authority Approval to Offer the Programme

Once programme has been validated the Institute must advise the Higher Education Authority (HEA). In this context the Institute must ensure that all conditions relating to staffing and resourcing of the programme are provided for in the context of the programmes and budgets estimates provided to the HEA.

11. Ongoing Monitoring and Periodic Review

The Programme Board is established and a Programme Co-ordinator is designated. The programme is evaluated and improved.

- The programme is subject to annual review by the Programme Board
- A report from the Programme Board is presented annually at Academic Council

Appendix One

Self-Evaluation Check List

1. Institutional Mission & Strategy

- a) Does the Programme align to the **mission & strategy**?
- b) Does the programme map to the relevant Faculty/Department **mission**?
- c) Does the programme fit into national and European priorities?

2. Genuine Need & Stakeholders

- a) What **research** has been conducted for the provision of this programme in the area in which it is to be provided?
- b) Since the programme will be publicly funded, can it be demonstrated that in developing the programme due regard has been given to relevant public policy?
- c) Is the programme as a process and the intended programme learning outcomes adequately informed by the views of appropriate stakeholders such as learners, graduates, lecturers, employers, relevant advisory bodies, social and community representatives?
- d) Does the programme meet genuine education and training **needs**?

3. Comparative Benchmarking

- a) Does the programme compare well against benchmarks (where appropriate)?
- b) What specific programmes has it been benchmarked against?

4. Viability/Sustainability

- a) Is the programme **viable**?
- b) Is IADT adequately resourced to undertake and complete the programme proposed?
- c) Does IADT have a specific viable delivery/business-plan for the programme?
 - a. Is the physical and electronic infrastructure provided on a stable basis?
 - b. Are the financial plans based on realistic projections of student numbers and other variables?
- d) Are there satisfactory contingency arrangements for adapting to changing circumstances or coping with failure of the programme (having due regard for the interests of learners)?

5. Programme Standard – Intended Learning Outcomes

- a) Have minimum intended programme learning outcomes been established which is consistent with any relevant subject/field/qualification standards and all National Qualifications Frameworks?

- b) Has an entry standard been established? Is the prerequisite learning for participation in the programme and any other relevant assumptions relating to the programme's prospective learners made explicit.
- c) Is there clear guidance on the recognition of prior learning – both certified and uncertified (**RPL**)?
- d) Is it reasonable to expect that all learners who are judged qualified to access this particular programme should be able to graduate from it subject to their making a reasonable effort and complying with the programme's conditions?
- e) Since standards are cumulative (i.e. one must have level x outcomes in order to progress to level x + 1 outcome), can it be clearly demonstrated that the programme's prerequisite learning specification includes the knowledge, skill and competence specified at lower Framework levels?
- f) Do the intended learning outcomes emphasise *profound learning* outcomes much more than *transient learning* outcomes? (*Transient learning outcomes are those which are relatively easily acquired and date more quickly. An example of this kind of learning might be skill in the use of a particular software package—one learns how to operate the software without much concern about why the user interface is the way it is or about the underpinning algorithms or data structures. Profound learning takes longer to acquire and dates more slowly if at all—it changes a person significantly. Examples of this include learning to speak a modern language, to play a musical instrument or to be proficient in mathematical methods. This perspective is only an approximation but can be a useful alternative way of thinking about kinds of learning and approaches to learning.*)
- g) Do the intended learning outcomes correspond with all national legislation and international recommendations?
- h) Have the programme learning outcomes been specified describing what a student **will know** and **be able to do** at the end of the programme? Is this language and verb use precise and concise? Have the programme learning outcomes been limited to as few as reasonably possible, ideally no more than 8, and are they articulated in broad terms? Just to clarify the learning outcomes, should the language be precise and concise or articulated in broad terms? Am I reading this wrong?
- i) Has careful attention been paid to curriculum and programme design and content?
- j) Are the learning outcomes at programme level underpinned by learning outcomes at Module level? Is this visibly mapped?
- k) Have the programme's Module learning outcomes been specified describing what a student **will know** and **be able to do** at the end of the Module? Is this language and verb use precise and concise?
- l) Are the intended learning outcomes (at both programme and Module level) appropriate to the intended professional field (work field) of a graduate of this programme?

- m) Do the programme learning outcomes correspond appropriately to the type (academic, vocational, professional) of qualification and the demands specific for the domain?
- n) Do the learning outcomes of the programme correspond with the requirements set by professional colleagues, both nationally and internationally, and by members of the relevant domain's community of practice, i.e. do they correspond with the needs of a beginning professional in the particular discipline?

6. Programme Learning Outcomes - Assessment

- a) Has a *programme assessment strategy* been provided for the programme as a whole and *module assessment strategies* for each of its constituent modules?
- b) Are the programme **and** module assessment strategies (**for both formative and summative assessment**⁴) both clear and appropriate? Do they provide for the verification of the attainment of the intended learning outcomes?
- c) Are all the programme and modules intended learning outcomes capable of being assessed?
- d) Has it been verified that there are no assessments being administered which do not map to a learning outcome?
- e) Where possible has it been determined that 'marks' are not allocated for attendance, or for the completion of units which do not align to the programme learning outcomes?
- f) Has it been verified that the module learning outcomes map directly to the programme learning outcomes?
- g) Has it been verified that all programme learning outcomes are assessed and has it been identified where (in which module(s)) they are assessed?
- h) Is there awareness of the spectrum of assessment methodologies and are they utilised as relevant to the programme?
- i) Are all assessments fair, valid, reliable and transparent? Does the assessment design process ensure valid assessment of the intended learning outcomes?

⁴ "Summative assessment is the type with which most people are familiar. It is usually conducted in the last few weeks of term to see how well students have learned what they were supposed to have learned. ... Formative assessment does not form part of the student's final grade or mark. It is used to provide constructive feedback to improve learning and understanding. The product of formative assessment may never be quantifiably recorded on a grade sheet."
 Surgenor, P. (2010) Teaching Toolkit: Summative & Formative Assessment <http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/UCDTLT0029.pdf>

- j) Are assessment decisions in relation to design, development and variety made within a programme context and focused on programme learning outcomes⁵?
- k) Is assessment for learning given emphasis in relation to assessment of learning⁶?
- l) Can the assessment satisfactorily verify whether the students have realised the learning outcomes of the components of the curriculum in a way that is insightful for students?
- m) In respect of a master's programme, is there a thesis/substantial project in which the student shows analytical capacity or an independent problem-solving capacity at academic level?
- n) Are the programme's procedures for assessment of learners consistent with institutional and national assessment regulations?
- o) What arrangements are in place for External Examiners and what other mechanism is in place to monitor and review the maintenance of programme standards?
- p) Are you confident that assessment tasks demand high standards of learning?
- q) Is assessment and feedback planned within and across programmes to ensure appropriate student preparation and practice before summative assessment takes place?
- r) Is there an emphasis on assessment for learning over systems focused on marks, grades and reliability?

Assessment methods and descriptions

Assessment types for learning, as learning, and of learning



⁵ Higher Education Academy

⁶ "Balancing assessment for and assessment of learning is concerned with striking a better balance between assessment of and assessment for learning. Assessment of learning is 'summative', i.e. its main purpose is to grade and certify students' achievement, while assessment for learning is 'formative', aiming to support and advance students in their learning."

Integrative Assessment Managing assessment practices and procedures Guide no 4 QAA (2007)

<http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/docs/publications/managing-assessment-practices-and-procedures.pdf>

- s) Is it evident in the programme design that there understanding of the limitations of explicit assessment standards⁷?
- t) Are students encouraged to participate in disciplinary communities – communities of practice?
- u) Is there an emphasis on building students' assessment literacy through a learning process in which they internalise, apply and reflect on assessment standards?
- v) Do local communities of practice play a role in facilitating collaboration about assessment standards?

7. Programme is a process

- a) Is there adequate understanding that a **programme is a process** which enables prospective learners to attain specified minimum intended programme learning outcomes reliably and efficiently in terms of learner effort via:

The environment
The mode of learning
Staff support provided
Intended workload
Resources provided

And

Assessment of intended learning outcomes

Therefore:

- b) Is the programme's content and learning environment appropriate to the programme's intended learning outcomes? Specifically
 - i. What evidence is there that the prospective learners may achieve the intended programme learning outcomes?
 - ii. Is the programme's strategy for enabling learners to move from the minimum access standard to the minimum intended programme learning outcome explicit, realistic and viable?
 - iii. Does the programme *involve* authentic learning opportunities to enable the achievement of the intended programme learning outcomes?
 - iv. Are any and all exceptions to the provision of reasonable accommodations clear?

8. Staff Capacity

- a) Are the programme's staff (assessors, teachers, etc.) as a group must be competent to enable learners to develop (achieve) the intended programme

⁷ "Assessment lacks precision. ... [I]t is not always possible to specify or assess important consequences of education." Is it understood that "the role of professional judgement [is] to be part of the assessment process, alongside the use of explicit criteria?" *A Marked Improvement*, Higher Education Academy, pp. 41-43.
https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/A_Marked_Improvement.pdf

learning outcomes and to assess learners' achievements and expert in their respective disciplines?

- b) Are the staff members who are to provide both academic and administrative support for the provision of this programme familiar with any national standards?
- c) What training/induction has been provided for these staff members?
- d) What are their precise roles and responsibilities?
- e) Are the nominated persons competent to fulfil their roles?

9. Student Needs including Physical and Virtual Environment

- a) Is it evident that the diverse student population (such as mature, part-time, employed and international students as well as students with disabilities), as well as the shift towards student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, has been taken into account when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources and student support?
- b) Is the programme's learning environment (physical, social, and intellectual and recognising that the environment may be virtual) consistent with the intended programme learning outcomes? Consider
 - i. its resources, such as libraries and online databases and physical resources, such as laboratories, equipment, areas and studios;
 - ii. human resources, such as tutors, counsellors, advisors and peers where applicable
 - iii. other student supports
- c) Does the programme make reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities?
- d) Are any and all exceptions to the provision of reasonable accommodations clear?
- e) Is the programme content including reading lists, lecture notes, and any other material used by the programme appropriate?

10. Learner Feedback

- a) How are learners represented and how is feedback obtained?
- b) Are there appropriate student representation opportunities and student feed-back opportunities?
- c) Have learners been explicitly consulted during the development/review of this programme?

11. Clear information

- a) Has **clear information** been prepared for students on the intended learning outcomes of all modules, content, study and learning methodology, assessment, credits, learning materials, qualification level, etc. presented in a clear **programme handbook**?

- a) Are the entry requirements for this programme **clear** and in keeping with national and relevant international norms?
- b) In the case of a modular programme the pool of modules and learning pathway constraints should be explicit and appropriate in light of the intended programme learning outcomes. Are there effective guidance services for learners on the selection of appropriate learning pathways?
- c) Is the proposed **public information** about the programme as well as its procedures consistent with national policies?
- d) Is there **clear information** about career opportunities arising from the programme? (E.g. The presentation of the programme should not lead learners to presume that successful completion of the programme will entitle them to enter a particular profession or progress to another programme unless this is actually the case. If, for example, the programme is designed to meet the educational requirements of a regulated profession or recognised professional body this should be stated explicitly.)
- e) Are issues of student support and guidance clear?
- f) Have all matters regarding the professional recognition or international recognition of the qualification been stated clearly?

11. Workload and Credit

- a) Has student **workload** been considered carefully and realistic credit assigned? (E.g. consider advice in Gonzalez & Wagenaar Tuning documents or ECTS Handbook 2015)
- b) Is the programme to be provided in a way that its intended learning outcomes can be reliably and efficiently attained by the learners?
- c) Is the programme's use of ECTS or other **Credit** systems according to the ECTS handbook?
- d) Are Credit and RPL provisions consistent with any national policy on these areas?

12. Mode of Learning

- a) Is there recognition within the programme team that a different mode of provision constitutes a different programme, and each type of provision is unique?
- b) Have the specific needs of different modes of provision and types of higher education been considered, e.g. distance, part-time, online, professional, vocational, academic, etc.
- c) Has the **mode of learning** – distance, electronic, part-time, full-time, blended, etc. been clearly stated and is it appropriate to the cohort of intended participants and the intended learning outcomes.
- d) Where relevant is there a well-structured placement opportunity?

13. International

- a) Are there opportunities for Erasmus and other international exchange students?
- b) This programme is available to international students. Have appropriate provisions been made in keeping with Provision of Education to International Students: Code of Practice and Guidelines for Irish Higher Education Institutions (IHEQN) 2009 and Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of Education and Training to International Learners (QQI, 2015)⁸?
- c) Is there transparency in the documentation and proposed public information on the programme that would be accessible to an international audience?

⁸ <http://www.qqi.ie/Publications/Code%20of%20Practice.pdf>

Appendix Two

Administration of the Validation Process

Responsibility for administrative arrangements around the external programme validation process rests within the Registrar's area, and is managed by the Cross Institute Administrator. Duties include:

- Contacting and liaising with prospective panel members
- Arranging any travel and accommodation requirements for panel members
- Collating required information (tax status, bank details, etc.) from panel members in order to ensure payment for site visits, and sending the information to HR and Finance departments for set up and processing
- Ensuring the Faculties deliver the final programme document within an agreed time limit to Registrar's office for final approval, prior to distribution to panel members
- Proof reading the document to ensure it conforms to IADT template guidelines, and checking accuracy of standard information in relation to IADT policies (i.e. admissions, eligibility)
- Distributing the programme document and agenda (e-mail is the preferred 'green' option for distribution) to the external panel members, along with any other relevant information.
- Organising the schedule of events on the day of the validation process (venue, lunch, taxis etc.) and any other duties to ensure the smooth running of the validation process
- Attending the validation process and taking minutes of the procedure
- Writing a report of the process, based on the minutes, and recording the decision of the panel, to include recommendations, conditions and observations of the panel
- Sending the completed draft report initially to the Registrar, and then to the Chair and members of the validation panel for sign off
- Making any amendments or additions to the report proposed by the Chair or panel
- Submitting the final report to the Registrar and Head of Faculty for consideration of the panel's findings