



GMIT

INSTITIÚID TEICNEOLAÍOCHTA NA GAILLIMHE-MAIGH EO
GALWAY-MAYO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Academic Code of Practice No.2 **Validation and Monitoring**

Academic Year 2019/2020

As approved by the
Academic Council on 17th June 2019
and by the Governing Body on 27th June 2019

Table of Contents

SECTION A

1	CONTEXT	2
2	VALIDATION AND AUTHORISATION OF NEW PROGRAMMES LEADING TO MAJOR AWARDS	5
3	VALIDATION AND AUTHORISATION OF MINOR, SPECIAL PURPOSE AND SUPPLEMENTAL AWARDS	11
4	DIFFERENTIAL VALIDATION	17
5	AMENDING AN APPROVED PROGRAMME SCHEDULE AND NEW MODULES	20
6	PROGRAMME MONITORING	22

SECTION B

APPENDIX 1:	QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK	29
APPENDIX 2:	INDICATIVE SCHEDULE OF NEW PROGRAMME VALIDATION AND AUTHORISATION PROCESS	31
APPENDIX 3:	NEW PROGRAMME PROPOSAL (FORM QAa ₁)	33
APPENDIX 4:	NEW PROGRAMME TEMPLATE (FORM QAa ₂)	35
APPENDIX 5:	BRIEFING NOTES FOR EXTERNAL VALIDATION PANELS	39
APPENDIX 6:	EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT OF NEW PROGRAMME EVALUATION (FORM QAa ₃)	41
APPENDIX 7:	GENERIC AWARD TYPE DESCRIPTOR (MINOR, SPECIAL PURPOSE AND SUPPLEMENTAL AWARD TYPES)	43
APPENDIX 8:	GUIDELINES FOR CHANGES OF MODULES AND APPROVED PROGRAMME SCHEDULES	45
APPENDIX 9:	PROGRAMME HANDBOOK	50
APPENDIX 10:	PROGRAMME BOARD ANNUAL REPORT TEMPLATE	51
APPENDIX 11:	LEARNER FEEDBACK FORM – MODULE (QA ₁)	52
APPENDIX 12:	SUMMARY OF LEARNER FEEDBACK – MODULE (QA ₂)	54
APPENDIX 13:	LEARNER FEEDBACK FORM – AWARD (QA ₃)	55
APPENDIX 14:	MATRIX TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE AS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF PEER PANELS FOR REVIEW OF SPECIAL PURPOSE, MINOR AND SUPPLEMENTAL AWARDS	57

SECTION A

1 CONTEXT

1.1 QUALITY ASSURANCE AT GMIT

Quality Assurance is a framework designed to foster and embed a culture of continuous improvement. Policy and procedures are established to promote, support and enable the maintenance and improvement of the quality of all Institute activities.

The Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012 specifies the obligations of providers to prepare quality assurance procedures as follows:

... each relevant provider and linked provider shall establish procedures in writing for quality assurance for the purposes of establishing, ascertaining, maintaining and improving the quality of education, training, research and related services the provider provides. (Section 28 (1))

The achievement of academic excellence is a complex process involving all Institute staff and students. The educational environment in respect of teaching, learning, research, student support, academic support, accommodation, equipment, facilities, management, administration, community service and collaboration with industry are important elements in this regard.

GMIT is committed to respecting students as the central focus of all its activities. Attracting and motivating students, who are interested and determined to succeed in their chosen fields, is a key foundation for academic quality. The quality of the interaction experienced by the student, with all agents and aspects of GMIT, is of vital importance. The overall experience of the student has to be considered at all times.

Quality in all the activities and functions of GMIT requires clarity of communication and transparency of procedures. This Code of Practice is one of a series of Codes of Practice developed by GMIT. It is written to assure quality to all stakeholders, internal and external, on the policies and procedures in place at GMIT to assure the quality of its programmes of education and training.

A key element in academic quality assurance is the continuing review of academic processes, to ensure that the aims and intended learning outcomes of academic programmes are achieved on a consistent basis. The underlying thrust is for all programmes, offered by the Institute, to achieve the highest academic standards. GMIT programmes are expected to bear comparison with the best available, both nationally and internationally. This Code sets out policies and procedures aimed at ensuring that the highest standards are the norm for all the Institute's programmes.

This Code of Practice is a working document and is subject to regular review based on experience in implementation, feedback received from staff, students and other stakeholders, and new educational developments.

This code should be read in conjunction with the other Codes of Practice and Codes of Academic Policy approved by the Academic Council (Appendix 1).

1.2 NATURE AND SCOPE

This Code specifies Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology's procedures for the validation and monitoring of programmes. In addition, it outlines how the quality assurance procedures for academic and support functions and the Institute will be periodically reviewed.

1.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

1.3.1 Qualifications (Education and Training) Act 2012

The Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012 specifies the conditions under which national awards shall be made:

- (a) GMIT has delegated authority under Section 53 of the Act to make awards at Higher Certificate, Ordinary Degree, Honours Degree and taught postgraduate levels with effect from September 2004, and for postgraduate research awards in disciplines for levels 9 and 10 in Aquatic Science and Mechanical Engineering.
- (b) In accordance with the Institutes of Technology Ireland Sectoral Protocol for the Awarding of Research Masters Degrees at NFQ Level 9 under Delegated Authority (DA) from Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI) (2015), GMIT has developed NFQ Level 9 Research Discipline Area Validation Policy And Procedures and to date has validated new research degree programmes at Level 9 in the discipline area of Science.
- (c) QQI is obliged under Section 49 (1) of the Act to “determine the standards of knowledge, skill or competence to be acquired, and where appropriate, demonstrated, by a learner before an award may be made by the Authority or by a provider to which, under Section 53, authority to make an award has been delegated.”
- (d) Under Section 28 of the Act, GMIT shall establish procedures covering:
 - Evaluation, at regular intervals, of the programme of education, training, research and related services.
 - Evaluation by students and graduates.
 - Review of the application of the quality assurance procedures.
 - Publication of the evaluation report, together with an implementation plan, to address any recommendations referred to in the report.
- (e) In accordance with Section 29 of the Act, before establishing procedures under Section 28, GMIT shall submit a draft of the proposed procedures to the Authority for approval.
- (f) Under Section 30 of the Act where the Authority approves procedures under sub-section (2)(a), GMIT shall publish those procedures in such form and manner (including on the internet) as the Authority directs and shall provide a copy of the procedures as published to the Authority.

1.3.2 Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area

The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)) are the benchmark for quality assurance in Europe. The guidelines identify that higher education providers have the primary responsibility for the quality of their provision and its assurance. The guidelines also envisage an important role for external quality assurance.

GMIT's academic quality assurance practices are consistent with the 'Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.'

1.3.3 Governing Body and Academic Council

The functions of the Governing Body are specified in Section 5 of the Regional Technical Colleges' Act 1992 as amended by the Institutes of Technology Act 2006.

The functions of Academic Council are specified in Section 10 of the Regional Technical Colleges' Act 1992 as amended by Section 11 the Institutes of Technology Act 2006.

Refer to Academic Code of Practice No. 1 for the specific provisions.†

1.3.4 Review of Amendments to the Code

The effectiveness of the procedure outlined in the Code will be formally reviewed once in the lifetime of every Academic Council. All members of the Institute will be formally invited by the Registrar to provide feedback and make recommendations for improvement. They can do so by informing their Head of Department, Head of Academic Unit or by writing directly to the Registrar.

The Registrar will compile an annual report on the Institute's validation and monitoring processes and outcomes to the Academic Council. Such a report should form the basis for the development of key performance indicators.

1.3.5 External Accreditation

GMIT may seek accreditation for its programmes from relevant professional bodies including, for example, Engineers Ireland, Accountancy Bodies, The Teaching Council.

* [http://www.enqa.eu/files/ESG_3edition%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.enqa.eu/files/ESG_3edition%20(2).pdf)

† <http://www.gmit.ie/sites/default/files/public/general/docs/1-gmit-academic-council-2016.pdf>

2 VALIDATION AND AUTHORISATION OF NEW PROGRAMMES LEADING TO MAJOR AWARDS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Validation is the quality assurance process by which GMIT approves new programmes of education and training leading to awards. Specifically, it is the process by which GMIT satisfies itself that a student will attain knowledge, skill or competence for the purpose of an award made by GMIT. Validation is a core function of quality assurance, mandated by the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012*.

Validation, when implemented rigorously, fairly and transparently, supports public confidence in the quality of programmes and in the standards of awards. It also contributes to the enhancement of the quality of programmes.

Authorisation is approval from the Institute's Executive Board to proceed with the development of a proposed programme and subsequently to offer the programme following a successful validation.

2.2 POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR VALIDATION AND AUTHORISATION OF NEW PROGRAMMES

New programmes and related awards are normally proposed within the overall context of an Academic Plan for a Centre/Campus/School (hereafter referred to as the 'Academic Unit'). However, no constraints are placed on the method whereby new programme proposals can originate or on the submission of proposals for consideration. The concept for a new programme could come from a variety of sources, internal or external, including a review of the existing programme portfolio and as a result of changing circumstances or emerging needs.

2.3 RESPONSIBILITIES FOR VALIDATION AND AUTHORISATION

There are two separate, but interrelated, elements involved in the approval of new programme proposals. **Validation** is primarily concerned with the academic quality of a proposal and is the responsibility of the Academic Council. However, new programmes may have resource and strategic implications for the Institute. As such, the **authorisation** to proceed with development, and subsequently to offer the programme following a successful validation, is the responsibility of the Executive Board.

The approval process should be conducted in accordance with the principles of mutual respect, fairness and Institute norms and requirements. The Registrar shall have a particular responsibility for ensuring that this is the case.

* <http://www.oireachtas.ie/documents/bills28/acts/2012/a2812.pdf>

2.4 STAGES IN THE APPROVAL PROCESS FOR MAJOR AWARDS

New programme approval is a five-stage process:

Stage 1: Preliminary authorisation to proceed with proposed development.

Stage 2: Internal validation.

Stage 3: External validation.

Stage 4: Authorisation to offer the programme.

Stage 5: Issue of Certificate of Approval.

This process is consistent with the generic quality assurance model promoted by the ESG.

A regular review of the process should be conducted by the Registrar during the lifetime of the Academic Council and a report forwarded to Academic Council for consideration.

New programmes can only be placed in the prospectus, on the CAO website or in the CAO Handbook when the Certificate of Approval has been issued by the Registrar (see Stage 5). No marketing or promotion of the programme should take place until this has occurred. Appendix 2 provides an indicative schedule for the process of new programme validation.

Stage 1: Preliminary Proposal Authorisation

This stage is the responsibility of the Executive Board. The purpose is to authorise the team proposing the programme to proceed to develop a full proposal for validation. The Executive Board will consider the following:

- The rationale for the proposed programme and related award.
- Consistency with the Institute's mission, strategy and academic plan.
- Likely resourcing requirements and potential viability.
- Expected programme starting date in relation to submission requirements, validation, budgetary considerations, CAO deadline etc.

The Preliminary Proposal can be made using the Academic Quality Assurance 1 (AQA1) form (see Appendix 3). The form should be submitted by the relevant Head of Academic Unit to the Registrar for consideration by the Executive Board. The Board can authorise or refuse a proposal or seek further information from the proposer. Its decision will be formally communicated through the Registrar to the relevant Head of the Academic Unit.

Following authorisation by the Executive Board, the sponsoring Academic Unit may proceed to develop a full programme proposal (incorporating the material specified in Appendix 4, using Academic Quality Assurance 2 (AQA2) as a guide).

Stage 2: Internal Evaluation

The purpose of an Internal Validation is to review the academic quality of proposed new programmes. It is intended as a supportive process providing independent, constructive feedback and advice to the promoters, and as a preparation for external validation.

The membership of the Internal Validation Panel shall normally consist of the following:

- A neutral Head of Academic Unit, or the Registrar's nominee as Chairperson.
- One member of Academic Council.
- One member of Academic staff.
- A member of the Institute's Academic staff nominated by the proposing Head of Academic Unit.
- If deemed necessary, an external person with knowledge/expertise in areas relevant to the proposal.
- The Registrar, or nominee, shall act as Secretary to the Panel.

The new programme proposal will be submitted by the relevant Head of Academic Unit to the Registrar, who shall then convene an Internal Validation Panel and arrange a date for the internal validation meeting. The Internal Validation Panel shall meet with the team proposing the new award/programme, including the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit.

The key considerations for the Internal Validation Panel include, *inter alia*, the following:

- The rationale and need for the programme.
- Potential demand for entry onto the programme.
- Employment opportunities and potential demand for graduates.
- Programme title.
- Award title, type and level.
- Duration.
- Entry requirements, access, transfer and progression.
- Aims and programme intended learning outcomes, having regard to the level of the award sought in the context of the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) and related QQI guidance.
- Structure of the programme including the proposed Approved Programme Schedule (APS) and the content and sequencing of modules.
- Relevance and quality of individual module syllabi.
- Teaching and learning methodologies and approach to assessment, including a programme assessment strategy.

- Arrangements for programme management.
- Adequacy of staffing and physical resource requirements.
- Use of previously approved modules.
- Number of modules/class contact hours/assessment workload.
- Potential synergies with, and impact on, existing programmes.

The Internal Validation Panel should be particularly interested in the overall coherence, integration and consistency of the proposal.

Those who participate in the internal evaluation, the internal panel and the proposing team, will be given the opportunity to provide feedback on the process through their Head of Department and submit to the Registrar and Academic Council.

The Internal Validation Panel can approve or reject the programme proposal or make recommendations to amend the proposal as deemed necessary. The Chairperson of the Internal Validation Panel shall submit a report on the Panel's findings to the Registrar and this will be forwarded to the Head of the Academic Unit concerned, normally within two weeks of the review. In the event that the Internal Validation Panel recommends approval subject to revisions to the proposal, these shall be agreed between the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit and the Registrar or nominee within the spirit of the recommendations made in the report.

Stage 3: External Validation

All new programme proposals shall be subject to external validation by an expert panel nominated by the Registrar, following consultation with the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit.

The composition of the External Validation Panel shall be as follows:

- The Chairperson shall be a senior educationalist, business or professional person, knowledgeable in the relevant disciplinary area of the proposed programme.
- Two experienced academics in the relevant disciplinary area.
- An experienced practitioner with necessary knowledge and expertise from the industry/services/professional sector, as appropriate.
- The Registrar, or the Registrar's nominee, shall act as Secretary to the Panel.

In the event that a panel member is unable to attend at short notice, the Registrar shall decide whether the panel should proceed.

Ideally, panels shall be gender balanced and every attempt will be made to ensure this is the case.

It is the responsibility of the Registrar, or nominee, to make arrangements for the external validation meeting. This should be done in consultation with the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit. In this context, it is the responsibility of the Registrar to brief members of the Validation Panel on their role and to supply them with all necessary and relevant

documentation for the validation meeting, on a timely basis. The sponsoring Head of Academic Unit is responsible for making all the necessary arrangements relating to the team proposing the new programme.

The key considerations for the External Validation Panel include, *inter alia*, the following:

- The rationale and need for the programme.
- Potential demand for entry onto the programme.
- Employment opportunities and potential demand for graduates.
- Programme title.
- Award title, type and level.
- Duration.
- Entry requirements, access, transfer and progression.
- Aims and programme intended learning outcomes, having regard to the level of the award sought in the context of the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) and related QQI guidance.
- Structure of the programme including the proposed Approved Programme Schedule (APS) and the content and sequencing of modules.
- Relevance and quality of individual module syllabi.
- Teaching and learning methodologies and approach to assessment, including a programme assessment strategy.
- Arrangements for programme management.
- Adequacy of staffing and physical resource requirements.
- Use of previously approved modules.
- Number of modules/class contact hours/assessment workload.
- Potential synergies with, and impact on, existing programmes.
(Refer to Appendix 5 for External Panel Briefing notes)

The External Validation Panel should be particularly interested in the overall coherence, integration and consistency of the proposal.

Those who participate in the external validation will be given the opportunity to provide feedback on the process through their Head of Department and submit to the Registrar and Academic Council.

At the end of the validation meeting, the Chairperson of the External Validation Panel should make an oral presentation on their findings and conclusions to the proposing team. The Chairperson should indicate whether a recommendation for approval or rejection of the proposed programme is to be made. Key recommendations for modifying the programme, and any special conditions relating to approval, should be outlined.

A draft written report of the findings of the External Validation Panel shall be prepared by the Secretary (AQA3, Appendix 6). The draft report will first be approved by the chairperson before being circulated to other members of the panel for their comments and endorsements. The secretary shall incorporate the feedback received from panel members and agree these with the chairperson before finalising the report. A rationale should be provided for the main recommendations and conditions, if any are made. A copy of the panel's final report shall be forwarded to the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit.

The Registrar shall notify the Academic Council of the recommendations made by the External Validation Panel and seek its approval for the programme, subject to the modification of the proposed programme as required by the External Validation Panel, and the implementation of any specified special conditions. The Registrar may seek to discuss the response to the conditions with the External Validation Panel.

The sponsoring Head of the Academic Unit shall be responsible for submitting an amended award/programme documentation to the Registrar, as required. The Head of Academic Unit shall also undertake to implement any special conditions of approval and to report to the Registrar, normally within two months of receipt of the external panel report. A formal statement, from the Registrar to the Academic Council, must be made to state that any specified conditions have been met.

Stage 4: Authorisation to offer the Programme

Following approval by the Academic Council, the Registrar shall notify the Executive Board including drawing their attention to the net additional resources required, if any, to run the programme. The decision to offer the new programme is a matter for the Executive Board having regard to strategic and resource issues. A decision by the Executive Board to authorise the running of a new programme has to be approved by the Governing Body as required by Section 5 (1)a of the Regional Technical Colleges' Act 1992 as amended.

Stage 5: Issue Certificate of Approval

A Certificate of Approval will be issued by the Registrar normally for a period of five years, or up to the next Programmatic Review, whichever comes first.

On receipt of this Certificate of Approval, the final programme documentation lodged with the Registrar, incorporating any recommended changes, and the Approved Programme Schedule become the official programme documents. It is only at this point that active programme promotion may begin.

The new programme is included in the QQI Order in Council which documents the GMT list of approved awards in respect of delegated authority.

Details of all new programmes are to be sent to the Higher Education Authority (HEA) by the Registrar. New programmes are required to be provided within the agreed Institute's budget.

3 VALIDATION AND AUTHORISATION OF MINOR, SPECIAL PURPOSE, SUPPLEMENTAL AWARDS AND SINGLE MODULES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) recognises both large and smaller packages of learning. The NFQ recognises four award-types, as follows:

- Major Awards: the principal class of award made at a Level, e.g. Higher Certificate, Bachelor's degree (Level 7 & 8), Master's degree and PhD.
- Minor Awards: for partial completion of the outcomes for a Major Award. Minor awards will always form part of a Major Award.
- Special Purpose Awards: for relatively narrow or purpose-specific achievement.
- Supplemental Awards: for learning that is additional to a Major Award.

Minor, Special Purpose and Supplemental awards will not necessarily encompass learning outcomes for all eight of the sub-strands of knowledge, skill and competence. The level of the programme will be determined by the level of Programme Learning Outcomes.

Minor awards, while having relevance in their own right, are always part of at least one major award. They facilitate the recognition of part of the learning outcomes of a major award. The range of learning outcomes they specify will have relevance in its own right. These awards will always be smaller in volume than the major award of which they are part of.

Special Purpose Awards are standalone and have a distinct identity which reflects their clearly defined purpose. A Special Purpose Award will always be significantly smaller in volume than a major award. A Special Purpose Award may also relate to more limited strands of learning outcomes than a major award. It is possible that a special purpose award could, for example, focus on discrete skills (concentrating on the skill strands of learning outcomes) only.

Supplemental award-types are for learning that is additional to a previous Major or Special Purpose Award. In general, these are at the same level as the awards to which they are additional and the learning outcomes within the individual sub-strands are usually at the same level as in the previous award.

In relation to these awards:

- A minimum of 10 credits per named award will apply.
- The approval process is outlined in Section 3.5 below for Minor, Special Purpose and Supplemental Award-Types.
- A generic award-type descriptor for GMIT named awards of Minor, Special Purpose and Supplemental Award-Types is included in Appendix 7.
- These programmes are not marketed through the CAO.

3.2 TITLING CONVENTION

The titles of named awards for minor, special purpose and supplemental award-types are important. The titles of these awards should be clearly, and unambiguously, distinguished in a consistent way from named major awards and from each other, so as to enhance understanding and avoid any confusion. These distinctions should be signaled in supporting documentation and communication about the award-types, e.g. The European Diploma Supplement; provider advertising/recruitment material.

3.3 AWARD CLASSIFICATIONS

Minor awards and Supplemental awards shall not be classified.

Special-purpose awards which have a volume of at least 60 credits, and are comparable to a major award (at the same NFQ level), may be classified in accordance with the convention for the relevant major award. Otherwise, awards of this type shall be unclassified (QQI, 2013).*

3.4 ACCREDITATION AND PROGRAMME VALIDATION

All programmes leading to minor, special purpose and supplemental awards must undergo validation by an expert peer panel, which includes an external peer review element. The nature and extent of the external peer review element is contingent on the nature, level and volume of the proposed award.

A programme validation process must take place even where the proposed programme and award is already part of or linked to a major award.

The purpose of this validation is to ensure that:

- The programme has coherence, worthy of an award in its own right.
- The range and level of intended programme learning outcomes specified for the award-type is appropriate and relevant.
- The level reflects the standard to be attained by students.

It is essential that the validation peer panel agrees the level at which the award should be placed on the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ).

3.5 STAGES IN THE APPROVAL PROCESS FOR MINOR, SPECIAL PURPOSE AND SUPPLEMENTAL AWARDS

Stage 1: Preliminary Proposal Authorisation

Stage 2: Peer Panel Validation

Stage 3: Authorisation to offer the Programme

Stage 4: Certificate of Approval

* HETAC (2009). Assessment and Standards. p. 22.

Stage 1: Preliminary Proposal Authorisation

This stage is the responsibility of the Executive Board. The purpose is to authorise the programme promoters to proceed to develop a full proposal for validation. The Executive Board will consider the following:

- The rationale for the proposed programme and related award.
- Consistency with the Institute's mission, strategy and academic plan.
- Likely resourcing requirements and potential viability.
- Expected programme starting date in relation to submission requirements and validation.

The Preliminary Proposal can be made using the Academic Quality Assurance 1 (AQA1) form (Appendix 3). It should also be incorporated in the Academic Plan. The form should be submitted by the relevant Head of Academic Unit to the Executive Board. The Board can authorise or refuse a proposal or seek further information from the sponsoring Academic Unit.

Prior authorisation from the Executive Board shall be required before new programmes shall be submitted for validation. Following such authorisation, the sponsoring Academic Unit may proceed to develop a full programme proposal (incorporating the material specified in Appendix 4, using AQA2 as a guide). Library staff should be consulted in relation to library resources as part of the development of the AQA2.

Stage 2: Peer Panel Validation

All new programme proposals shall be subject to validation by an expert panel, which includes external membership. The composition of the peer panel is contingent on the nature, level and volume of the proposed award.

Normally, proposed minor, special purpose and supplemental awards at level 9, and awards at level 8 with a volume of 30 credits or more, shall be subject to validation by an external panel of the same composition as an external panel for the validation of a major award:

- The Chairperson shall be a senior educationalist, business or professional person knowledgeable in the relevant disciplinary area of the proposed programme.
- Two experienced academics in the relevant disciplinary area
- An experienced practitioner with necessary knowledge and expertise from the industry/services/professional sector, as appropriate.
- The Registrar, or the Registrar's nominee, shall act as Secretary to the Panel.
- A quorum shall be four, which must include the chair and external person.

Normally, proposed minor, special purpose and supplemental awards at level 6 and 7 with a volume of 30 credits or less shall be subject to validation by a panel with the following composition:

- The Chairperson shall be an experienced academic and/or practitioner and may be internal or external.

- One member of Academic Council.
- One member of Academic Staff with knowledge/expertise in the relevant area.
- At least one external person with knowledge/expertise in the relevant area.
- The Registrar or nominee will act as Secretary to the panel.
- A quorum shall be four, which must include the chair and external person.

Minor, special purpose and supplemental awards vary greatly in nature, level and volume. As such, the Registrar shall decide on the exact composition of the validation panel on a case-by-case basis as appropriate, within the framework of the panel compositions as outlined above. In general, the number of external people on panels will be greater the higher the level of the award and of the credit volume, and the more unique, original and specialist the proposed programme. Further guidance in this regard is provided in Appendix 14.

The Registrar will nominate the validation panel members following consultation with the sponsoring head of Academic Unit.

It is the responsibility of the Registrar to make arrangements for the validation meeting. This should be done in consultation with the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit. In this context, it is the responsibility of the Registrar to brief members of the Validation Panel on their role and to supply them with all necessary and relevant documentation for the validation meeting, on a timely basis. The sponsoring Head of Academic Unit is responsible for making all the necessary arrangements relating to the team proposing the new programme.

Considerations for the validation panel will include, *inter alia*, the following:

- The rationale and need for the programme.
- Potential demand for entry onto the programme.
- Employment opportunities and potential demand for graduates.
- Programme Title.
- Award title, type and level.
- Duration.
- Entry requirements, access, transfer and progression.
- Aims and programme intended learning outcomes, having regard to the level of the award sought in the context of the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) and related QQI guidance.
- Structure of the programme including the proposed Programme Schedule and the content and sequencing of modules.
- Relevance and quality of individual module syllabi.
- Teaching and learning methodologies and approach to assessment, including a programme assessment strategy.

- Arrangements for programme management.
- Adequacy of staffing and physical resource requirements.
- Use of previously approved modules.
- Number of modules/class contact hours/assessment workload.
- Potential synergies with, and impact on, existing programmes.

The Validation Panel should be particularly interested in the overall coherence, integration and consistency of the proposal.

Those who participate in the Validation should be given the opportunity to provide feedback on the process through their Head of Department and submit to the Registrar and Academic Council.

At the end of the validation meeting, the Chairperson of the Panel should make an oral presentation on their findings and conclusions to the proposing team. The Chairperson should indicate whether a recommendation for approval or rejection of the proposed programme is to be made. Any recommendations for modifying the programme, and any special conditions relating to approval, should be outlined.

A draft written report of the findings of the Panel shall be prepared by the Secretary and agreed by the panel. A rationale should be provided for the main recommendations made. A copy of the Panel's final report shall be forwarded to the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit.

The Registrar shall notify the Academic Council of the recommendations and conditions made by the Validation Panel and seek its approval for the programme, subject to the modification of the proposed programme as required by the Validation Panel, and the implementation of any specified special conditions.

The sponsoring Head of the Academic Unit shall be responsible for submitting an amended award/programme document to the Registrar, as required. The Head of the Academic Unit shall also undertake to implement any special conditions of approval and to report to the Registrar, normally within two months of receipt of the peer panel report. A formal statement, from the Registrar to the Academic Council, must be made to state that any specified conditions have been met. The Registrar may seek to discuss the response to the conditions with the External Validation Panel.

Stage 3: Authorisation to offer the Programme

Following approval by the Academic Council, the Registrar shall notify the Executive Board including drawing their attention to the net additional resources required to run the programme. The decision to offer the new programme is a matter for the Executive Board having regard to strategic and resource issues. A decision by the Executive Board to authorise the running of a new programme has to be approved by the Governing Body as required by Section 5 (1)a of the Regional Technical Colleges' Act 1992 as amended.

Stage 4: Certificate of Approval

A Certificate of Approval will be issued by the Registrar normally for a period of five years, or up to the next Programmatic Review, whichever comes first.

On receipt of this Certificate of Approval, the final programme documentation lodged with the Registrar, incorporating any recommended changes, and the Approved Programme Schedule become the official programme. It is only at this point that programme promotion may begin.

The Registrar shall send a copy of the Certificate of Approval and the evaluation report to QQI and request that the new programme is included in the QQI Order in Council which documents the GMIT list of approved awards in respect of delegated authority.

Details of all new programmes are to be sent to the Higher Education Authority (HEA) by the Registrar. New programmes should be provided within the agreed budget.

3.6 Approval of Single Subjects

Proposals may be made to validate and authorise 5 or 10 ECTS stand-alone modules, typically in response to industry need. These modules will not necessarily be part of an existing validated programme.

Such proposals will initially be submitted for review by an external expert nominated by the Registrar. The external expert shall provide a written report including consideration of the validity of the proposed module level and intended learning outcomes, the credit volume, the teaching and assessment strategy, the indicative content, entry requirements and proposed intake, relevance to target audience and resources required for delivery.

The proposal and the external expert report shall be submitted to the Programme Amendments Committee for consideration, and they shall make a recommendation for approval to Academic Council as appropriate.

Following successful validation, authorisation to offer the module is a matter for the Executive Board.

4 DIFFERENTIAL VALIDATION

4.1 CHANGES TO PROGRAMMES

All proposed new programmes and awards must be validated in accordance with the policy and procedures outlined in Sections 2 and 3 of this Code.

Academic Council recognises that a validated programme is not a static construct. It is expected that Programme Boards may occasionally seek to make changes to aspects of the programme based on the experience of delivery and in the context of an evolving environment. The validity of proposed changes should be considered in the context of the effectiveness of the programme in facilitating students to achieve the intended programme learning outcomes.

There are limits, however, to what may be changed. Any extensive and substantial changes that essentially result in a new programme and award must be validated *de novo*.

The interpretation of what does or does not constitute an ‘extensive and substantial’ change to a programme is a matter of professional judgement. Proposed changes to an award title and proposed material changes to the minimum intended programme learning outcomes would fall within this category. Any proposed change which runs contrary to the underlying aims, ethos and/or rationale of the programme and/or which would undermine anything which was essential to the original validation decision would also be judged to be an ‘extensive and substantial’ change.

Proposed changes to programmes other than those judged ‘extensive and substantial’ may be made through the Academic Council in accordance with a *differential validation* process or through the processes outlined in Section 5 of this Code.

4.2 DIFFERENTIAL VALIDATION

Differential validation should apply in cases where significant structural changes are proposed to a programme, but the changes do not run contrary to the aims, ethos, rationale and/or minimum intended learning outcomes of the programme and are consistent with the original validation report (or with a subsequent revalidation report following a programme review).

An example of such a change may be the conversion of a ‘3+1’ offering into an *ab initio* Level 8 programme, retaining the existing award title and without materially changing the minimum intended programme learning outcomes. Another example might be the addition of a new elective strand to a programme consistent with the minimum intended programme learning outcomes. A third example might be a significant re-distribution and re-sequencing of content without altering the fundamentals of the programme and consistent with the minimum intended programme learning outcomes.

The interpretation of what does or does not constitute ‘significant structural changes’ to a programme is a matter of professional judgement. Ultimately, it will be the Academic

Council, acting on the advice of the Standards Committee and independent external expert opinion (if deemed necessary), that will adjudicate in this regard. In the event that there is any doubt about the extent of the impact of the proposed changes on the basis of the original validation (or subsequent re-validation following programme review) then a new validation process should be undertaken.

Procedures for proposed amendments to Approved Programme Schedules and for the validation on new single modules are outlined in Section 5 of this Code.

4.3 DIFFERENTIAL VALIDATION AND COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

All programmes and awards offered through collaborative provision require validation. In certain cases, however, the differential validation process may apply. Policy and procedures relating to collaborative provision are specified in a separate Institute Code, *Collaborative Provision including Transnational Collaborative Provision and Joint Awards* (as agreed by Academic Council on 13th February 2015 and by the Governing Body on 19th February 2015).

4.4 DIFFERENTIAL VALIDATION PROCESS

A Programme Board may apply to the Registrar, through the relevant Head of Academic Unit, for proposed changes to a programme, or a suite of related programmes, to be considered through a differential validation process.

Whether the differential validation process should apply is a matter for the Registrar to decide in the first instance. In the event of any doubt, or if the judgement of the Registrar is disputed by the Head of Academic Unit or the Programme Board, the matter will be referred to the Academic Council for adjudication.

Differential validation will be approached with the same high level of rigour as a full validation. Applications for differential validation must systematically analyse and explain the proposed changes and their impact on the programme.

The Programme Board will provide the Registrar with full programme documentation. In addition, the Board will provide a summary of the proposed changes and a comprehensive explanation of the reasons for the proposed changes along with any relevant, supporting documentation.

The proposed changes to the programme shall be subject to review by an expert panel nominated by the Registrar, following consultation with the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit. The composition of the differential validation Panel shall be as follows:

- The Chairperson shall be an experienced academic and/or practitioner and may be internal or external.
- One member of Academic Council.
- One member of Academic Staff.

- At least one external person with knowledge/expertise in areas relevant to the proposal.
- The Registrar, or nominee, will act as Secretary to the panel.

A quorum shall be three, which must include the chair and external person.

It is the responsibility of the Registrar to make arrangements for the validation meeting. This should be done in consultation with the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit. In this context, it is the responsibility of the Registrar to brief members of the Panel on their role and to supply them with all necessary and relevant documentation for the differential validation meeting, on a timely basis. The sponsoring Head of Academic Unit is responsible for making all the necessary arrangements relating to the Programme Board.

At the end of the validation meeting, the Chairperson of the Panel should make an oral presentation on their findings and conclusions to the proposing team. The Chairperson should indicate whether a recommendation for approval or rejection of the proposed programme changes is to be made.

A draft written report of the findings of the Panel shall be prepared by the Secretary and agreed by the Panel. A rationale should be provided for the recommendations made. A copy of the Panel's final report shall be forwarded to the sponsoring Head of Academic Unit.

The Registrar shall notify the Academic Council of the Differential Validation and the recommendations made by the Panel.

The Registrar shall notify the Academic Council of the recommendations made by the Validation Panel and seek its approval for the amended programme, subject to the modification of the proposed programme as required by the Validation Panel, and the implementation of any specified special conditions. The Registrar may seek to discuss the response to the conditions with the Validation Panel.

The sponsoring Head of the Academic Unit shall be responsible for submitting an amended award/programme documentation to the Registrar, as required. The Head of Academic Unit shall also undertake to implement any special conditions of approval and to report to the Registrar, normally within two months of receipt of the panel report. A formal statement from the Registrar to the Academic Council must be made to state that any specified conditions have been met.

Following approval by the Academic Council, the Registrar shall notify the Executive Board including drawing their attention to the net additional resources required, if any, to run the programme. The decision to offer the amended programme is a matter for the Executive Board having regard to strategic and resource issues. A decision by the Executive Board to authorise the running of a new programme has to be approved by the Governing Body as required by Section 5 (1)a of the Regional Technical Colleges' Act 1992 as amended.

5 AMENDING AN APPROVED PROGRAMME SCHEDULE AND NEW MODULES

5.1 All proposed changes to programmes/awards require the approval of the Academic Council. The normal protocol for making changes is Programmatic Review. Changes to modules should be infrequent outside this timeframe.

Any proposed amendments to a programme or a module must first be considered by the Programme Board and decisions recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

The Registrar has the authority to agree changes in the allocation of marks or changes in the breakdown of contact hours having regard to the Academic Unit policy and similarly to agree the addition of pre-approved modules as electives. For other proposed changes, the Registrar has the following authority:

- a) To agree the proposed changes and notify the Programme Amendments Committee and the Academic Council.
- b) To refer the proposals directly to the Programme Amendments Committee for consideration.

5.2 The process is as follows:

- Programme Boards should include '*Proposals for changes to programmes/awards*' as an agenda item for a meeting.
- Any proposals for changes agreed by the Programme Board should be submitted by the relevant Head of Academic Unit or Department to the Registrar, accompanied by all the relevant documentation (see 5.4 and Appendix 8).
- The Registrar shall decide which proposals require the opinion of the Programme Amendments Committee.
- The Registrar shall inform the Programme Amendments Committee of those proposals submitted directly to the Academic Council.

A Head of Academic Unit or Head of Department or promoter are invited to attend the Programme Amendments Committee meetings to discuss the proposed amendment.

5.3 All requests for changes must be submitted by the date specified in the Operations Calendar for changes taking effect from a subsequent academic year. This date should be agreed by the Academic Council in advance of publishing the Operations Calendar.

Requests for immediate application will not be considered without the express approval of the Registrar. Applications of this type must be made to the Registrar in writing by the Head of Academic Unit, specifying a very strong case for early consideration.

5.4 Each request for an amendment to an Approved Programme Schedule must provide the following information:

- Programme name.
- The minutes of the Programme Board where the change is recommended.

- The reason(s) for the proposed change(s).
- A summary of the proposed change(s).
- A copy of the existing Approved Programme Schedule.
- A copy of the proposed Approved Programme Schedule.
- A copy of the programme intended learning outcomes, where these are affected by the proposed change.
- New and old module descriptors where appropriate.

Requests for amendments to programmes will not be considered by Academic Council, or any of its sub-committees, if the required information listed above is not provided.

Appendix 8 gives further details of the process for requesting changes to modules or programme schedules.

- 5.5** Academic Council may approve any change recommended by the Programme Amendments Committee. However, where the change will require net additional resources to be made available (i.e. additional hours), the Executive Board must be briefed on the proposal by the Registrar and its approval sought before the change can be approved.
- 5.6** The minutes of Academic Council are the official record of all authorised changes which are circulated to all Heads of Academic Units/Departments. Approved changes are communicated to the Heads of Academic Units, Heads of Department and the Office for Academic Affairs by the Registrar. The Registrar will arrange for changes to be made to the Approved Programme Schedules on the Banner System. The Registrar will place any approved changes on the official programme files. Heads of Academic Units and Heads of Departments should also update their files.
- 5.7** It is possible to validate new modules as electives or as Institute-wide common modules as part of existing programmes. Such proposals will initially be submitted for review by an external expert nominated by the Registrar. The external expert shall provide a written report including consideration of the validity of the proposed module level and intended learning outcomes, the credit volume, the teaching and assessment strategy, the indicative content, entry requirements and proposed intake, relevance to target audience and resources required for delivery.

The proposal and the external expert report shall be submitted to the Programme Amendments Committee for consideration, and they shall make a recommendation for approval to Academic Council as appropriate.

Following successful validation, authorization to offer the module is a matter for the Executive Board.

A single module, if 10 credits or more, cannot be classified as a Minor, Special Purpose or Supplemental Award without going through the approval process outlined in Section 3.5 above.

6 PROGRAMME MONITORING

6.1 OVERVIEW

Section 28 of the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012 requires that GMIT establish procedures in writing for quality assurance for the purposes of establishing, ascertaining, maintaining and improving the quality of education, training, research and related services.

Ongoing monitoring of programmes is essential to ensure that academic quality and standards are being maintained.

GMIT will monitor each programme on an ongoing basis to ensure:

- That the programme intended learning outcomes are being attained by students.
- The continuing appropriateness of the curriculum, pedagogy and assessment in relation to the intended learning outcomes.
- That programmes remain current and valid in the light of developing knowledge in the discipline and practice in application.
- That issues arising in relation to the academic quality of programme design, delivery and assessment are identified and addressed on a timely basis.

The responsibility for managing and ensuring the quality of academic processes in accordance with Institute policy lies with the Heads of Academic Units and with Programme Boards. Individual members of staff are required to co-operate with the quality management procedures within the academic structures.

The Institute will review and evaluate the effectiveness of programme monitoring processes on a regular and systematic basis.

6.2 QUALITY ASSURANCE IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EVERY STAFF MEMBER AT GMIT

6.3 THE HEAD OF ACADEMIC UNIT RESPONSIBILITY

The Academic Unit within GMIT is a Centre/Campus/School. The activities within each Academic Unit are organised into Departments.

The Head of Academic Unit has overall responsibility for all programmes/awards in the Academic Unit. This includes responsibility for: strategic planning, implementation, and co-ordination of academic and related processes; staffing and other resource requirements; programme development and management of change.

The Head of Department has responsibility for all programmes/awards in his/her Department including, the day-to-day delivery of programmes, timetabling and ensuring the ongoing quality and continued development of programmes.

Academic and support staff are assigned to a Department and are responsible to the Head of Department for the proper carrying out of individual duties.

The responsibility of the Head of Academic Unit for reporting to Academic Council on all programmes in her/his unit is specified in Section 6.6 below.

6.4 PROGRAMME BOARDS

6.4.1 Programme Board Membership

A Programme Board shall be established for each programme and/or group of programmes and/or awards, consisting of all lecturers on the programme(s), the Head of Academic Unit, the Head of Department and at least two students per stage/year (with gender balance where possible) of the programme.

6.4.2 Programme Board Responsibilities

A Programme Board shall monitor the design, delivery, academic standards, students' performance and academic development of programmes and awards.

The specific responsibilities of a Programme Board include, *inter alia*:

- Specifying quality objectives for the programme.
- Ensuring that programme details are made available to students in whatever format is deemed appropriate, ideally in the form of a Programme Handbook (Appendix 9 below outlines the suggested contents of such a Handbook).
- Recommending suitable candidates to act as external examiners.
- Reviewing external examiners' reports and addressing recommendations.
- Monitoring the results achieved by students and taking or advising appropriate action when required.
- Reviewing retention and attrition rates and taking or advising appropriate action when required.
- Reviewing student feedback on the programme and taking or advising appropriate action when required.
- Reviewing and amending the Programme Assessment Strategy as appropriate, ensuring in particular that the balance and spread of work imposed upon the student is reasonable.
- Assessing the resourcing requirements for the programme and advising the Institute executive accordingly.
- Preparing a list of texts for library purchase and the equipment to be acquired within an agreed budget.
- Preparing a Programme Board Annual Report.
- Attending and participating in the Progression and Awards Board (PAB).
- Engagement with Programmatic and Institutional Reviews.

Decisions of Programme Boards are *advisory in nature* and should be referred to the Head of Department and/or the Head of Academic Unit for approval prior to implementation. In the event that a Programme Board activity and/or proposal is

inconsistent with, or requires a change to, academic policy, it will require the approval of the Academic Council. In the event that a Programme Board activity and/or proposal has additional resource implications for the Institute, it must be approved by the Executive Board.

6.4.3 Programme Board Officers

Each Programme Board shall have a Chair and a Secretary. In addition, Board members may be appointed as liaison officers for particular stages/years of the programme.

The Board shall nominate and elect members to the positions of Chair and Secretary at its first meeting early in the academic year (in September/October). The positions of Chair and Secretary should normally rotate among members of the Programme Board on a three-year basis.

In the event that the Board fails to nominate/elect a Chair and/or Secretary, the Head of Academic Unit or the Head of Department shall appoint, by consultation, Board members to these positions.

The first meeting of the Board in the academic year will be chaired by the existing Chair or, if that person is unavailable, by the Head of Department or Head of Academic Unit. The position of Chair and Secretary will be ratified by the Programme Board at the first meeting.

6.4.4 Specific Duties of Programme Board Officers

The Chair shall:

- Chair meetings of the Programme Board.
- Consult with student representatives in advance of the meeting.
- Ensure standing orders are implemented.
- Advise the Head of Academic Unit or Head of Department on issues arising from the Programme Board meetings.

The Secretary shall:

- Schedule and organise the meetings of the Programme Board for the year in consultation with the Chair.
- Prepare and disseminate an agenda and draft minutes of Programme Board meetings on a timely basis.

Members of the Programme Board appointed as stage/year liaison officers shall:

- Liaise, on a regular basis, with students in the programme stage/year designated to them.
- Bring to the attention of the Programme Board and/or the Head of Department and/or Head of Academic Unit matters of concern in that particular stage/year.

6.4.5 Programme Board Meetings

Formal meetings of the Programme Board shall be held at least three times in the academic year - once in each term. Minutes of each meeting shall be prepared and submitted to the Head of Department. Each meeting shall have an agenda and the following items would normally be included:

For the first term meeting:

- Review of External Examiners' Reports.
- Review of student feedback on the programme and of any other stakeholder feedback on the programme received.
- Review of Summer/Autumn examination results.
- Schedule for student assessments for the academic year.
- Resource requirements.
- Annual Report for preceding academic year.
- Student Engagement and Retention.
- Research Ethics.

For the second term meeting:

- Review of the programme design, delivery and assessment.
- Review of the Programme Assessment Strategy.
- Retention Report.
- Module Performance Reports.
- Careers Survey.
- Student Engagement and Retention.
- New Student Induction.
- Planning for the next academic year, including student induction.
- Research Ethics.

For the meeting prior to Progression and Awards Board:

- Review of draft examination results (refer to Code of Practice No. 3).
- Other items should be considered on the agenda for each meeting as deemed necessary and appropriate.

6.4.6 Programme Board Annual Report

Programme Boards have responsibility for preparing an Annual Report. The Head of Department is responsible for ensuring that the reports are prepared within an agreed timeframe and that all appropriate follow-on actions are taken. It is the overall responsibility of the Head of Academic Unit to ensure that this is done.

A Programme Board's Annual Report can be prepared in a standard format (Appendix 10) or in another format deemed more appropriate.

An Annual Report would normally be expected to include the following content:

- A general review of the programme for the year, including enrolment, attrition and examination results (data to be provided by the Head of Department).
- Summary of and follow-up on External Examiners' comments, including issues to be addressed in the following academic year.
- An outline of the key actions to be taken in the coming academic year. These may include: issues relating to programme delivery; actions to be taken to remedy identified weaknesses in the programme; actions to be taken arising from student feedback; resource issues and any other relevant academic matter.
- Where programmes do not meet Institute attrition and retention targets, the Programme Board should reflect on the reasons and suggest corrective actions to be taken.
- Any other general comments and recommendations deemed appropriate for inclusion by the Programme Board.

6.4.7 Student Representation on Programme Boards

There shall be at least *two registered* students per stage/year of the programme (with gender balance where possible) on each Programme Board. They will be elected by registered students from each stage/year of the programme using whatever procedure the Students' Union recommends.

Training will be available for the student representatives regarding their role on Programme Boards.

The Chairs of Programme Boards will consult with the student representatives in advance of Programme Board meetings to ascertain if there are any items the representatives wish to have discussed.

Programme Boards should not be used by student representatives to make complaints about particular staff members or about other students. Any such complaints should be dealt with through the normal mechanisms and established channels, including the Student Complaints Procedure.

Where a Programme Board needs to consider the personal details of a student, these should be discussed as the last item on the Programme Board agenda prior to which the student representatives should be asked to leave. No examination results shall be discussed in the presence of student representatives.

6.5 STUDENT FEEDBACK

6.5.1 Legal Obligation

Under Section 28 of Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012, GMIT is obliged to have programmes of education and training evaluated by students of that programme and to have support services, related to that programme, evaluated.

6.5.2 Academic Unit Student Liaison Committee

An Academic Unit/Student Liaison Committee shall be established consisting of two student representatives for each stage/year of each programme within the Academic Unit, the various programme Chairs, the Head of Department and the Head of Academic Unit. Its purpose is to hear student views on any aspect of their programmes and to identify areas of concern to class groups.

The committee shall meet a minimum of once a term. The Head of Academic Unit is responsible for convening and chairing the meetings. In some cases, an Academic Unit may decide to hold these meetings on a departmental basis. Any personal complaint about a staff member shall not be discussed at this forum but can be addressed through the appropriate channels.

6.5.3 Student Feedback

Surveys of students shall be undertaken at the end of a programme as follows:

- Module Evaluation will be carried out by each lecturer at the end of a module using QA1 form (Appendix 11) or another appropriate means. Each lecturer will provide a summary of the survey results to the Heads of Department (Appendix 12, QA2).
- An end of stage/year, a Programme Survey (Appendix 13, QA3: Learner Feedback Form - Award) dealing with aspects of the overall programme, including facilities and services, is to be carried out by the Head of Department or nominee.
- Alternative survey mechanisms can be employed, as directed by the Institute, aligned to national policy.

Heads of Departments and Heads of Academic Units are obliged to ensure that this feedback is obtained in accordance with the agreed requirements.

Heads of Departments should provide feedback to Programme Boards on the QA2 and QA3 forms.

6.6 HEAD OF ACADEMIC UNIT ANNUAL REPORT TO ACADEMIC COUNCIL

The Head of Academic Unit shall submit an annual overview report on the programmes in their Unit to the Academic Council, through the Registrar, on an agreed date to be published in the Operations Calendar. The report should:

- Confirm that all Programme Boards met three times a year.
- Confirm that the student surveys (as specified in 6.5.3 above) were carried out.
- Confirm that each Programme Board submitted an Annual Report.
- Specify the actions taken by the Unit as a result of the Programme Board Annual Reports.
- Specify any issues which should be brought to the attention of Academic Council. In particular, the report shall focus on programmes which do not meet the agreed Institute norms for retention and progression.

The report shall be considered by the Academic Council each year and responsive actions will be initiated where necessary.

6.7 INSTITUTE ANNUAL ATTRITION REPORT

The Registrar will prepare an Institute Annual Retention Report each year for consideration by the Academic Council before Christmas each year.

6.8 SUSPENSION OR TERMINATION OF A PROGRAMME

The introduction of new programmes and discontinuation of others are considered in the preparation of the Academic Plan.

Suspension refers to temporarily ceasing to offer a programme of study. Termination refers to the permanent cessation of offering a programme of study

The criteria to be used collectively in a decision to suspend or terminate a programme are as follows:

- Student demand for the programme.
- Enrolment numbers.
- Registered numbers as of 1st March of previous year if programme was running.
- Retention numbers.
- Common modules.
- Financial considerations.
- Employment opportunities.
- Contribution to regional development.
- Alignment to Academic Unit/Institute Strategy.

The normal procedures to be adopted in such a decision are as follows:

- Review by Executive Board.
- Consultation with Programme Board/Department/School.
- Decision of the Executive Board.
- Advice and recommendation of the Academic Council.
- Approval of the Governing Body.

In special and exceptional circumstances, a decision to suspend a programme may have to be made without the consultation process. This may arise if, for example, the Institute found that there were an insufficient number of qualified applicants for the first year of a programme when the CAO application data became available in August. This would require an immediate decision following discussion between the President, Registrar and Head of Academic Unit concerned. Any such decision would require endorsement by the Executive Board and the approval of the Governing Body at its next meeting.

SECTION B (APPENDICES)

APPENDIX 1: QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance at GMIT

- 1 Policy for Quality Assurance**
 - 1.1 Quality Framework
 - 1.2 The Academic Council
 - 1.3 Research
 - 1.4 Research Ethics
 - 1.5 Taught Programmes Research Ethics Committees (TPRECs)
 - 1.6 Honorary Fellowships
- 2 Design and Approval of Programmes**
 - 2.1 Validation and Monitoring
 - 2.2 Collaboration Provision including Transnational Collaborative Provision and Joint Awards
 - 2.3 Level 9 Research Discipline Area Validation Policy & Procedures
- 3 Student-Centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment**
 - 3.1 Student Assessment: Marks & Standards
 - 3.2 Learning, Teaching and Assessment
 - 3.3 Professional Practice Policy
 - 3.4 External Examining
 - 3.5 Plagiarism
 - 3.6 Reasonable Accommodation
- 4 Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification**
 - 4.1 Access, Transfer and Progression
 - 4.2 Recognition of Prior Learning
 - 4.3 Student Retention Policy
 - 4.4 Nursing: Clinical Placement
 - 4.5 Nursing: Progression Policy
 - 4.6 Garda Vetting
- 5 Teaching Staff**
 - 5.1 Policy on Continuing Professional Development
 - 5.2 Timetabling
- 6 Learning Resources and Student Support**
 - 6.1 Online Learning Policy
 - 6.2 Child Protection Policy
 - 6.3 Student Equality Policy
 - 6.4 Social Media Policy

7 Information Management (including Public Information)

- 7.1 Code of Student Conduct
- 7.2 Cód Iompraíochta na Neach Léinn

8 Ongoing Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programmes

- 8.1 Strategic Review of Academic Units
- 8.2 Programmatic Review
- 8.3 Review of Support Services and Facilities Review

9 Cyclical External Quality Assurance

- 9.1 Institutional Review

APPENDIX 2: INDICATIVE SCHEDULE OF NEW PROGRAMME VALIDATION AND AUTHORISATION PROCESS

Activity	Timeline
Submission of AQA1 to Executive Board for authorisation.	1-2 weeks
Development of AQA2.	
Submission of AQA2/programme document to Registrar's Office and scheduling of Internal Panel.	2 weeks after submission of AQA2/Programme Document
Internal Panel Report written, circulated and agreed by internal panel. Issued to proposing Head of Department by the Registrar's Office.	2 weeks
Response to Internal Panel Report submitted with revised AQA2/Programme Document and review of same by Chair and Secretary of Panel.	1 week after receipt of response and revised AQA2/Programme Document
Submission of resource requirement sheet to Executive Board through Registrar.	1 -2 weeks
Submission of revised AQA2/programme document provided to Registrar's Office and scheduling of External Panel.	2 weeks after submission of revised AQA2/Programme Document
External Panel Report agreed by chair, circulated to External Panel and, when agreed, issued to proposing Head of Department by the Registrar's Office.	2.5 weeks
Response to External Panel Report and revised AQA2/programme document incorporating conditions and recommendations provided to Registrar's office and review of same by Registrar and/or nominee.	1 week after submission of revised documentation
Registrar notifies Academic Council of the recommendations made by the External Validation Panel and seeks its approval for programme, subject to implementation of conditions and recommendations of Panel.	Next scheduled Academic Council
Registrar notifies Executive Board that programme has proceeded through external validation and Executive Board decides whether to authorise the offering of the programme.	Next scheduled Executive Board
Executive Board decision to authorise running new programme has to be approved by Governing Body.	Next scheduled Governing Body
Certificate of Approval issued by Registrar.	1 week after approval by Governing Body

Notes:

- All programmes must be built on Module Manager and submitted with the AQA2 document for internal validation.
- Internal and External panels will not be scheduled until final documentation is received.
- Above schedule is indicative and may be slower due to the parties involved being unable to meet the deadlines suggested, or difficulty recruiting panel members.

- Programmes should have approval by Academic Council by the end of November, to be listed on the CAO for commencement at the start of the next academic year. Non-CAO programmes should have Academic Council approval by the end of February, at the latest, for commencement the following September.
- The following deadlines apply:
 - Process completed by mid-May to be included in the CAO handbook*. The Admissions Office should be informed of programmes likely to be approved in time for the CAO handbook by mid-March.
 - Inclusion on the CAO website can take place from early November onwards for programmes that miss the CAO handbook.
 - Process completed by mid-April to be included in the GMIT Prospectus*.
 - Process completed by mid-April to allow time to build programmes on Banner for commencement in September.
- Other marketing deadlines worth noting:
 - GMIT Open Day (including address to Career Guidance Teachers): mid-October.
 - CAO Annual Roadshow for Admissions Officers and Career Guidance Teachers: early November.
 - Career Guidance Teachers' Association Annual Conference: February.
- Programmes cannot be promoted until the new programme validation and authorisation process is complete.

** Inclusion in the CAO handbook and the GMIT Prospectus is for the academic year after next.*

APPENDIX 3: NEW PROGRAMME(S) PROPOSAL – Form AQA1

A soft copy of this template is available on the Registrar’s SharePoint site (under the Centre for Educational Development tab)

Full Award	Higher Cert.		Special Purpose Award	Minor	
	Degree			Supplemental	
	Hons. Degree			Special Purpose	
	PG Dip				
	Masters			Level of Award	

Programme Title(s):

(Where a number of interrelated programmes are being developed, all programme titles should be included)

Department:

School/Campus:

1. General:

Projected Numbers:

Proposed Starting Date:

Mode: (Full-time/Flexible/ACCM)

Is this proposed programme included in the Academic Plan?

2. Aims and Objectives: Describe briefly aims and objectives of the programme.

3. What needs will be served by this programme? Give details of any research undertaken to justify provision of this course.

4. Potential Employment Opportunities.

5. Additional resources required under (a) Human, (b) Physical, (c) Equipment.
(Use additional sheet if necessary).

6. Proposed Programme Design/Common Modules, clearly indicating those already being delivered.

Signed:

Date:

Head of Academic Unit

For Office Use:

Received by Registrar's Office:

Date:

Decision of Executive Board:

APPENDIX 4: NEW PROGRAMME TEMPLATE (Form AQA2)

The AQA2 submission contains two parts. Part 1 provides the rationale and justification for the programme along with information on demand, programme design and management, and resourcing. Part 2 of the AQA2 is developed on the Module Manager system and contains full details of the programme including the Approved Programme Schedule, module descriptors, entry requirements, transfer and progression opportunities, and teaching and assessment strategies.

Below is the recommended template for Part 1 of the AQA1. The full template is available on the Registrar's SharePoint under the Centre for Educational Development tab. There is also detailed guidance the creation of Part 2 of the AQA2 on Module Manager.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Proposed Programme Title(s) (incl. exit awards)
- 1.2 Award(s) Sought (and Level(s))
- 1.3 Proposed commencement date

2 Overview of GMIT

- 2.1 Context and History
- 2.2 Vision, Mission and Values
- 2.3 Profile of the Institute

3 Introduction to School and Department

- 3.1 Overview and Profile
- 3.2 School Strategy
- 3.3 Programmes currently offered

4 Rationale for Programme

- 4.1 Justification for the Programme
- 4.2 Research and Consultation
- 4.3 Similar Programmes
- 4.4 Influence of Findings
- 4.5 Strategic Relevance of the Programme
- 4.6 Programme Title
- 4.7 QQI Award Standards Used

5 Demand for this Programme

5.1 Profile of Learners and Anticipated Demand

5.2 Employment Potential for Graduates

5.2.1 Employment Opportunities

6 Programme Design and Management

6.1 Structure of Programme

6.2 Employability

6.3 Capstone Project

6.4 Work Placement

6.5 Unique Features for the Programme

6.6 Professional Body Recognition

6.7 Programme Delivery

6.8 Programme Management

6.9 Common Delivery

6.10 Requirements for Embedded Award(s)

6.11 Special Regulations

6.12 Programme being Replaced

7 Resources available and required for Programmes

7.1 Staffing

7.2 Library

7.3 Academic Supports

7.4 Information Technology

7.5 Laboratories and Equipment

7.6 Student Supports

7.7 Staff Supports

7.8 Financial Implications of Offering the Programme

8 Programme and Module Descriptors

9 Degree Profile

10 Appendices (Sample)

10.1 Survey of Employers and Findings

10.2 Survey of Graduates and Findings

10.3 Letters of Support

10.4 Detailed Analysis of Similar Programmes

10.5 Work Placement/Capstone Project Guidelines/Workbook

10.6 Professional Body Requirements

10.7 Staff CVs

10.8 Response to Internal Panel Report

APPENDIX 5: BRIEFING NOTES FOR EXTERNAL VALIDATION PANELS

A Programme Validation Panel is required to make an impartial judgement on the level, intended learning outcomes, standard, content and objectives of the proposed programme and on its comparability with other similar programmes offered elsewhere in Ireland and/or internationally.

The general issues considered and evaluated by the Board should include the following:

1. Need for the course

- (a) Philosophy of the programme.
- (b) Rationale for the development of the programme in terms of demand at regional and national level.
- (c) i) Aims and objectives.
ii) Intended learning outcomes.
- (d) Expected intellectual development and learning experience of students taking the programme.
- (e) Delivery mode.

2. Resources

- (a) Resources required to provide the programme.
- (b) Facilities and resources available to the programme and their adequacy to ensure the standard proposed.
- (c) Lecture rooms, laboratories, learning resources, IT access, other infrastructural support required.
- (d) Justification for the programme having regard to need and the resources required.

3. Access, Transfer, Progression

- (a) Clarity of admission criteria, progression and transfer, having regard to the National Qualifications Framework.
- (b) Projected student numbers including provision for mature students.

4. Pedagogy relevant to the programme

- (a) Relevance of the programme design, teaching and learning methodologies, and assessment procedures to the intended learning outcomes of the programme.
- (b) Inclusion of a Programme Assessment Strategy.
- (c) Coherence, reliability and standards of the modules in achieving the programme learning outcomes.
- (d) How well the assessment/methodologies proposed assess the Intended Learning Outcomes specified/Teaching/Learning/Assessment balance and workload.

- (e) Appropriateness and progression of the modules throughout the programme.
- (f) Appropriateness of the academic standard in the final stage of the programme to the proposed award.

5. Staff

- (a) Quality of staffing available to the programme.
- (b) Staff Development.
- (c) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the teaching methods, learning and assessments/methodologies to the standard of the proposed award.
- (d) Liaison with industry, commerce, public agencies, professional bodies and other third level institutions in Ireland and abroad.
- (e) Research.
- (f) Publications.

6. Programme Management and Quality Assurance

- (a) Mechanisms for managing the programme.
- (b) Student support, counselling and tutoring arrangements.
- (c) Aspects of programme which foster study skills, independent learning, individual responsibility and professional behaviour in students.
- (d) International links and EU dimensions in the programme.
- (e) Mechanisms for monitoring the programme to maintain the standard of teaching, learning and student performance, including feedback from the various stakeholders.

APPENDIX 6: EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT OF NEW PROGRAMMES (Form AQA₃)



EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT OF NEW PROGRAMMES

1. **Title of Programme(s):**
(incl. Award Type and specify embedded Exit Awards)
2. **NFQ Level(s):**
3. **Duration:**
4. **ISCED Code:**
5. **School / Centre:**
6. **Department:**
7. **Type of Review:**
 New Programme: Yes: No:
 Differential Validation: Yes: No:
8. **Date of Review:**
9. **Delivery Mode:** Full-time Part-time Blended
10. **Awarding Body:**
11. **Panel Members:**
12. **Proposing Staff:**
13. **Programme Rationale:**
14. **Potential Demand for Entry:**
15. **Stakeholder Engagement:**
16. **Graduate Demand:**
17. **Entry Requirements:**
18. **Access, Transfer & Progression:**
19. **Calculation of Award:**
20. **Programme Structure:**
21. **Module Syllabi:**
22. **Learning, Teaching & Assessment Strategies:**
23. **Resource Implications:**
24. **Synergies with Existing Programmes:**

25. Findings and Recommendations:

General:

Special conditions attaching to approval (if any):

Recommendations of the panel in relation to award sought:

26. FAO: Academic Council:

Approved:

Approved subject to recommended changes:

Not approved at this time:

Signed:

Chair

Secretary

APPENDIX 7: GENERIC AWARD-TYPE DESCRIPTOR (MINOR, SPECIAL PURPOSE AND SUPPLEMENTAL AWARD TYPES)

Class	Minor, Special Purpose and Supplemental.
Title	As per titling convention proposed above: ALL LEVEL 6 = Certificate in... LEVEL 7-10 < 60 credits = Certificate in... LEVEL 7-10 > 60 credits = Diploma in...
Purpose	Refer to the purpose of each individual award-type category above.
Level	Any Level – best-fit. The scope for including intended learning outcomes from lower levels than the level of the named award is dependent upon the overall volume of intended learning outcomes for the named awards.
Volume	Minor – smaller than the major award of which it is a part. Special Purpose – usually limited to a small number of sub-strands. Supplemental - between small and medium.
Comprehensiveness (The number/volume of sub-strands included in the named award)	The number of sub-strands is usually small for these award categories. The sub-strands refer to the knowledge, skill or competence at the appropriate level in the framework for special purpose awards. For minor and supplemental award types, the sub-strands refer to the knowledge, skill or competence of the major awards at the appropriate level.
Credit	A minimum volume of 10 credits per named award will apply to each of the three award-type categories. Minimum credits apply irrespective of the combination of sub-strands of knowledge, skill or competence (<i>Credit is based on the notional workload of ECTS credit system (European Credit Transfer System)</i>).
Knowledge – breadth	<p>The subs-strands for these awards are variable, as the nature of each award type cannot prescribe any particular set of knowledge, skill or competence.</p> <p>A minimum volume is set for all named awards as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The named award may incorporate the sub-strands of knowledge, skill and competence by way of a reduced volume, but should include at least one (or more) of the subs-strands in each of the three strands of knowledge, skill and competence or • Should incorporate all of the sub-strands for one of the main strands of Knowledge or Skill or Competence.
Knowledge – kind	
Know-how and skill – range	
Know-how and skill – selectivity	
Competence – context	
Competence – role	
Competence – learning to learn	
Competence – insight	

Progression & Transfer	<p>Minor awards – transfer to programmes leading to attainment of a part of one or more major awards. Transfer to programmes leading to special purpose awards.</p> <p>Special purpose awards – transfer to major or minor and other related special purpose awards at the same level or above.</p>
Articulation	<p>Supplemental – From major or special purpose award at the same level.</p>
Link to other Awards	<p>Special Purpose – Intended learning outcomes may form part of those of a major award, minor award or supplemental award.</p> <p>Minor – Intended learning outcomes form part of those of a major award.</p> <p>Supplemental – learning outcomes are closely linked to those of a major award or of a special purpose award – they generally reflect a deepening of learning, updating or specialisation.</p>

APPENDIX 8: GUIDELINES FOR CHANGES OF MODULES AND APPROVED PROGRAMME SCHEDULES

	Change in contact hours	Addition of new module	Amendment of APS regulations	Change to module title	Change to Module Learning Outcomes	Change to Syllabus Content < 30% *	Change to CA Methodology	Change in Breakdown of hours	Move of modules between semesters	Addition of pre-approved module as elective	Change to CA % Breakdown
Send to:	Executive Committee	Programme Amendments Committee	Programme Amendments Committee	Programme Amendments Committee	Programme Amendments Committee	Module Leader	AMM Administrator	Registrar	Registrar	Registrar	Registrar
Information/ Documents to be sent:											
Programme(s) and Year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Module Name and Code	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Description of Proposed Change	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rationale for Change	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Date Proposed Change Approved by Programme Board(s)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Change in contact hours	Executive			N/A	N/A	Yes
Addition of new module	Programme Amendments Committee			Yes	N/A	Yes
Amendment of APS regulations	Programme Amendments Committee			N/A	N/A	N/A
Change to module title	Programme Amendments Committee			N/A	N/A	N/A
Change to Module Learning Outcomes	Programme Amendments Committee			Yes	Yes	N/A
Change to Syllabus Content < 30% *	Module Leader			N/A	N/A	N/A
Change to CA Methodology	AMM Administrator			No	N/A	No
Change in Breakdown of hours	Registrar			N/A	N/A	Yes
Move of modules between semesters	Registrar			N/A	N/A	Yes
Addition of pre-approved module as elective	Registrar			N/A	N/A	Yes
Change to CA % Breakdown	Registrar			No	N/A	No
Send to:						
Information/ Documents to be sent:						
Indicate impact on Programme Learning Outcomes						
Indicate impact on Module Learning Outcomes						
Indicate impact on delivery resources**						

	Change in contact hours	Executive			No	No	No	Yes	No
	Addition of new module	Programme Amendments Committee			Yes	No	No	Yes	No
	Amendment of APS regulations	Programme Amendments Committee			No	No	No	Yes	No
	Change to module title	Programme Amendments Committee			No	No	No	Yes	No
	Change to Module Learning Outcomes	Programme Amendments Committee			No	No	No	No	No
	Change to Syllabus Content < 30% *	Module Leader			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Change to CA Methodology	AMM Administrator			No	No	No	No	No
	Change in Breakdown of hours	Registrar			No	No	No	No	No
	Move of modules between semesters	Registrar			No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Addition of pre-approved module as elective	Registrar			No	No	No	Yes	No
	Change to CA % Breakdown	Registrar			No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Send to:									
Information/ Documents to be sent:									
Evidence of external examiner feedback / approval***									
Old APS									
New APS									
New APS with changes highlighted									
Old Module Descriptor									

Change in contact hours	Executive			
Addition of new module	Programme Amendments Committee		Yes	No
Amendment of APS regulations	Programme Amendments Committee		No	No
Change to module title	Programme Amendments Committee		No	Yes
Change to Module Learning Outcomes	Programme Amendments Committee		No	Yes
Change to Syllabus Content < 30% *	Module Leader		N/A	N/A
Change to CA Methodology	AMM Administrator		No	Yes
Change in Breakdown of hours	Registrar		No	Yes
Move of modules between semesters	Registrar		No	No
Addition of pre-approved module as elective	Registrar		No	No
Change to CA % Breakdown	Registrar		No	Yes
Send to:				
Information/ Documents to be sent:				
New Module Descriptor			No	No
New Module Descriptor with changes highlighted			Yes	No

* No change to learning outcomes.

** Additional resources will have to be referred to and approved by the Executive.

*** In specific circumstances modules may be referred to the External Examiner by Standards.

Submission to Programme Amendments Sub-Committee of the Academic Council

Academic Department: _____

Date: _____

Programme: _____

Proposer: _____

1. Description of Proposal

2. Rationale for Proposal

3. Impact on Learning Outcomes

4. Implications for Resources

5. Appendices

- i) Module Descriptor with changes highlighted.
- ii) Existing and Approved Programme Schedule (if necessary).
- iii) External Examiner comments or approval (if necessary).
- iv) Other documents as necessary.

Notes:

In order to ensure that you have all the relevant documentation for your submission to the Programme Amendments Committee, please note the following prior to completion of proposals:

1. All submissions must be completed by the proposer and forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs **no later than two weeks in advance** of the scheduled Standards meeting.
2. All relevant documentation should be merged into one document.
3. Please refer to the *Guidelines for Submissions to Standards* before submitting your proposal.

APPENDIX 9: PROGRAMME HANDBOOK

Table 1: Suggested Contents of Programme Handbook

<p>(a) Introduction to GMIT.</p> <p>(b) Introduction to School and Department.</p> <p>(c) Title of Programme.</p> <p>(d) Programme Intended Learning Outcomes.</p> <p>(e) Programme Structure.</p> <p>(f) Programme Outline (Degree profile) – Refer to AQA2 (Appendix 4).</p> <p>(g) Programme Assessment Strategy to include: Schedule of Assessments and Examinations.</p> <p>(h) Regulations (special purpose areas, attendance at practicals, health and safety modules ineligible for compensation etc.).</p> <p>(i) Names of lecturers and contact details.</p> <p>(j) Approved Programme Schedule (Include ‘Fitness to Practice Programme Statement’).</p> <p>Appendix 1: Module Descriptors.</p>
--

Note: The Programme Handbook should make reference to the *Code of Student Conduct* covering, *inter alia*, regulations relating to admissions, registration and examinations. The Programme Handbook should also make reference to the following, as relevant: required equipment, placement information, option to study abroad, professional body/Teaching Council information, Health & Safety, agreed grading rubric, Style Guide, Plagiarism Policy, sources of information/mechanisms for feedback, Student Supports, (Academic Writing Centre, Maths Learning Centre, Student Services, Library, Access Office, Careers Office), College Calendar.

APPENDIX 10: PROGRAMME BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

Institiúid Teicneolaíochta na Gaillimhe-Maigh Eo
Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology

School: _____

Department: _____

Programme Title(s): _____

(List all programmes/levels covered by this report)

Academic Year: _____

(1) Enrolment and Student Performance

	Year Stage			
	1	2	3	4
Number registered on programme				
Number who sat examinations				
Number passed				
% passed over number who sat exams				
% passed over number who registered for programme				
Number progressing with less than 60 credits				
% eligible to progress over number registered on programme				

(Student performance statistics available on Registrar's Sharepoint in November each year)

(2) Programme Board Meetings

(a) Number of meetings for the year: _____

(b) Issues considered and actions taken: _____

(e.g. induction, student engagement, stakeholder engagement, curriculum changes, assessment strategy, employability, environmental changes, professional practice, relevant Staff Development.)

(3) Programme Feedback

(a) Main feedback from students. _____

(b) Main points in External Examiners' reports _____

(4) General Comments and Recommendations

(5) Where programmes do not meet Institute targets for attrition and retention, specify the proposed actions to be taken.

(e.g. reflection on retention rates and causes, student performance, retention initiatives undertaken and evaluation of same, challenges faced by Programme Board.)

Signed: _____

Head of Academic Unit

Head of Department

Date: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX 11: LEARNER FEEDBACK FORM – MODULE (QA1)

Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology		Form QA1
Learner Feedback Form - Module		
Lecturers Note: This Form QA1 can be used in place of the existing Form QA1.		
Student's Note: The purpose of this form is to enable you offer feedback on your modules of study. It should NOT be used to make personal comments about staff or students. It will take less than 5 minutes to complete and should be handed back to the lecturer.		
1. Course and Student Details		
1.1 Module Title	<input type="text"/>	
1.2 Award Title	<input type="text"/>	
1.3 Tick which of the following choices best describes your attendance on this module?		
<input type="radio"/> less than 50% <input type="radio"/> between 50% and 90% <input type="radio"/> more than 90%		
2. Teaching & Learning Environment		
2.1 Tick which of the following indicates your level of satisfaction with the room(s) used on this module using the scale provided? (labs, lecture theatres, tutorial rooms, etc...)		
<input type="radio"/> 5 (very satisfied) <input type="radio"/> 4 (somewhat satisfied) <input type="radio"/> 3 (neutral) <input type="radio"/> 2 (somewhat dissatisfied) <input type="radio"/> 1 (very dissatisfied)		
2.2 Tick which of the following indicates your level of satisfaction with the equipment used on this module using the scale provided? (lab equipment, IT, overhead projectors, etc...)		
<input type="radio"/> 5 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 1		
2.3 What suggestions would you make to improve the teaching and learning environment?		
<input type="text"/>		
3. Module Evaluation		
3.1 Did this module challenge you?		
<input type="radio"/> Yes, all of it <input type="radio"/> Yes, most of it <input type="radio"/> Yes, some of it <input type="radio"/> None of it		
3.2 Were the explanations in class easy to understand?		
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> Most of the time <input type="radio"/> Some of the time <input type="radio"/> No		
PLEASE TURN OVER AND COMPLETE SECTION 3		

3.3 Were the notes you received useful and easy to follow?

- Yes Most of the time Some of the time No

3.4 If you received feedback on your assessments, was it useful?

- Yes, it was useful No, it was not useful I did not receive any feedback on my assessments I had no assessments

3.5 What did you enjoy **most** about this module?

3.6 What did you enjoy **least** about this module?

3.7 Are there any suggestions you would like to make towards improving this module?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

APPENDIX 12: SUMMARY OF LEARNER FEEDBACK – MODULE (QA2)

Form QA2

SUMMARY OF LEARNER FEEDBACK – MODULE

Instructions: Lecturers should use this form to report to their HOD on the Feedback received from Learners (Form QA1) and what suggestions for improvement (if any) might be considered by the Programme Board.

This Form should be submitted to the HOD as soon as the feedback is collected but no later than the end of December for Semester 1 modules and no later than the end of April for Semester 2 modules. Additional pages may be used if appropriate.

Module Name:	
Lecturer:	
Date:	

Learners commented positively on the following;

--

Learners commented negatively on the following;

--

Learners' suggestions for improvement (if any) included ;

--

Actions by HOD (if any)

--

APPENDIX 13: LEARNER FEEDBACK FORM – AWARD (QA3)

Form QA3

Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology
Learner Feedback Form - Award**Staff Note:** This Form QA3 can be used in place of the existing Form QA3.**Student's Note:** The purpose of this form is to enable you offer feedback on your programme of study leading to your Award. It should NOT be used to make personal comments about staff or students. It will take less than 5 minutes to complete.**1. Award and Student Details**

1.1 Award Title

1.2 Tick which of the following choices best describes your attendance at classes?

- less than 50%
 between 50% and 90%
 more than 90%

2. Teaching & Learning Environment2.1 Tick which of the following indicates your level of satisfaction with the room(s) used on this programme of study?
(labs, lecture theatres, tutorial rooms, etc...)

- 5 (very satisfied)
 4 (somewhat satisfied)
 3 (neutral)
 2 (somewhat dissatisfied)
 1 (very dissatisfied)

2.2 Tick which of the following indicates your level of satisfaction with the equipment used on this programme of study?
(lab equipment, IT, overhead projectors, etc...)

- 5
 4
 3
 2
 1

2.3 What suggestions would you make to improve the teaching and learning environment?

3. Learner Experience

3.1 Did this programme of study challenge you?

- Yes, all of it
 Yes, most of it
 Yes, some of it
 None of it

3.2 Which module(s) challenged you the **most**?
3.3 Which module(s) challenged you the **least**?

3.4 How would you rate the balance between theory and practical work on the overall programme of study?

- Good balance
 Too much theory
 Too much practical work

3.5 How would you describe the level of workload (classes, private study and assessments) expected from you throughout the year?

- Very demanding
 Demanding
 Manageable
 Reasonable
 Unreasonable

PLEASE TURN OVER AND COMPLETE SECTION 3

3.6 Was it difficult to get in touch with lecturers to discuss any issues?

- No, it was easy Sometimes it was difficult Always it was difficult I never tried to contact lecturers

3.7 If you received any tutorials, were they useful?

- Yes, they were No, they were not I did not attend many, or any, tutorials I had no tutorials

3.8 What did you enjoy **most** about this programme of study

3.9 What did you enjoy **least** about this programme of study

3.10 Are there any suggestions you would like to make towards improving this programme of study?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

APPENDIX 14

Matrix to Provide Guidance as to the Constitution of Peer Panels for Review of Special Purpose, Minor and Supplemental Awards

Level ↓							
9	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
8			A	A	A	A	A
7	B	B	B			A	A
6	B	B	B			A	A
Credits →	10	20	30	40	50	60	60+
Panel Type A							
Panel Type B							

Note: Above is a guide only. The decision about the most appropriate constitution of the panel will be made by the Registrar with due consideration to the level and size of the proposed award.

Any programme over 60 credits should have Panel Type A.

Types of panel

Panel A

- The Chairperson shall be a senior educationalist, business, or professional person knowledgeable in the relevant disciplinary area of the proposed programme.
- Two experienced academics in the relevant disciplinary area.
- An experienced practitioner with necessary knowledge and expertise from the industry/services/professional sector, as appropriate.
- The Registrar, or the Registrar's nominee, shall act as Secretary to the Panel

Panel B:

- The Chairperson shall be an experienced academic and/or practitioner and may be internal or external.
- One member of Academic Council.
- One member of academic staff
- At least one external person (academic/industry) with knowledge / expertise in areas relevant to the proposal.
- The Registrar or nominee will act as Secretary to the panel.



GMIT

INSTITIÚID TEICNEOLÁOCHTA NA GAILLIMHE-MAIGH EO
GALWAY-MAYO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY



An Roinn Oideachais
agus Scileanna
Department of
Education and Skills



EUROPEAN UNION
Investing in your future
European Social Fund



Ireland's European Structural and
Investment Funds Programmes
2014-2020
Co-funded by the Irish Government
and the European Union

Administrative Headquarters

Dublin Road, Galway, Ireland.

Tel: +353 91 753161

Fax: +353 91 751107

E-mail: academic.affairs@gmit.ie

Website: <https://www.gmit.ie>

Príomhionad Riaracháin

Bóthar Bhaile Átha Cliath, Gaillimh, Éire.

Teil: +353 91 753161

Faics: +353 91 751107

R-phost: academic.affairs@gmit.ie

Láithreán Gréasáin: <https://www.gmit.ie>

Mayo Campus

Westport Road, Castlebar,
Co. Mayo, Ireland.

Tel: +353 94 9025700

Fax: +353 94 9025757

Campas Mhaigh Eo

Bóthar Chathair na Mart, Caisleán an Bharraigh,
Co. Mhaigh Eo, Éire.

Teil: +353 94 9025700

Faics: +353 94 9025757

National Centre for Excellence in Furniture Design & Technology

Letterfrack, Co. Galway, Ireland.

Tel: +353 91 742653 / 742650

Fax: +353 95 41112

Lárionad Náisiúnta um Barr Feabhais i nDearadh & Teicneolaíocht

Leitir Fraic, Co na Gaillimhe, Éire.

Teil: +353 91 742653 / 742650

Faics: +353 95 41112

Centre for the Creative Arts & Media

Cluain Mhuire, Monivea Road,
Galway, Ireland.

Tel: +353 91 770661

Fax: +353 91 770740

Lárionad do na hEalaíona Cruthaitheacha & na Meáin

Cluain Mhuire, Bóthar Mhuine Mheá,
Gaillimh, Éire.

Teil: +353 91 770661

Faics: +353 91 770740