


# Liverpool Hope University



## Academic Quality Handbook 2 (QH2):

### Approval of New Courses of Study Leading to an Award of the University

(This document covers new courses that might involve parts of existing provision but where new provision makes up **50% or more** of the new course).


March 2024 version

**This handbook should be read in conjunction with Quality Handbook 1 (QH1) which gives an overview of the principles of course design and approval at Liverpool Hope University.**

## Core stages in the Approval Process

The approval of all courses at Hope involves four core stages. All courses are approved using a process that includes these four stages although the detail of that process at each stage varies, dependent on the nature of the provision and its audience.

- Stage 1: Course Viability Proposal (CVG Group),
- Stage 2: Approval to proceed for an initial proposal,
- Stage 3: Course Portfolio,
- Stage 4: Approval to deliver the fully complete course.



This document (QH2) describes the process for **approval of new courses leading to awards of the University**. This includes:

- New credit bearing UG and PGT courses that consist entirely of novel curriculum content.

- New courses that might involve existing provision but where new provision makes up **50% or more** of the new course. So, for example, if a new single honours course is made up of one existing 60C block and one new 60C block at Level C the processes in this guide (QH2) should be followed.

If the proposed course consists of more than 50% existing provision, then the processes described in document QH3 should be followed. For example, if the course uses two existing 60C blocks at Level C the process in document QH3 should be followed.

For clarity, Appendix 1 gives an overview of processes described in both QH2 and QH3.

## Stage 1: Course Viability Proposal (Meeting of the CVG Group)

### STAGE 1: COURSE VIABILITY PROPOSAL

*Proposal receives support from School Academic Committee*

The relevant FEM will work with the relevant course lead to complete the Course Viability Group (CVG) *Agreement to Proceed Paperwork*

Meeting of the CVG will be arranged. CVG to make a recommendation to UEB.

### (a) Identification of new courses

Potential new courses, both credit bearing and non-credit bearing may be identified through reflective meetings, by individuals (Executive Deans, Heads of School/Department, academic tutors), through cross-school/departmental collaborations, or because of identifiable gaps in the market. The initial proposal for any new course / course reapproval must in the first instance be presented to the Course Viability Group (CVG).

### (b) Agreement to proceed paperwork

If the School/Departmental Academic Committee (and specifically the Executive Dean and HOS/ support the proposal, the relevant UEM will work with Course leads to complete the CVG's '*Agreement to Proceed*' paperwork (see Appendix 1) and a meeting with the CVG is arranged. The CVG will scrutinise the proposal and make a recommendation to UEB taking into account the following:

- Evidence of Demand;
- Applicant profile;
- Competitor Market;
- Career/further study opportunities;
- and any other areas deemed relevant

## Stage 2: Approval to Proceed with an Initial Proposal for New Provision (Completion of the Course Specification)

### STAGE 2: APPROVAL TO PROCEED

Requires completed Course Specification Document

The University Executive Board (UEB) agrees to development of this course

Initial approval will be noted at Senate via Academic Committee.

### (a) CVG recommendation

The CVG will advise the UEB Secretary that a course has been considered and the proposal should be included in the agenda for the next UEB meeting. The CVG Chair will include an overview report and recommendations. UEB will discuss whether the proposed provision accords with wider institutional goals and corporate strategy. UEB will also consider the resources and staffing needed to deliver the course. UEB may:

1. approve in principle the proposal - report to Academic Committee and to Senate or
2. refer the matter back to the School for further clarification/detail or
3. reject the proposal.

### (b) Approval in Principle

After appropriate local discussions with relevant HOS the subject team, with the support of the UEM, should complete the Course Specification Document via the online course approval system following the procedure as set out below:

- The Course Specification Document sets out the fundamental properties of the provision and how the provision links to both internal and external reference points.
- This form requires initial marketing information, which will be used to advertise the course whilst the approval process is underway. Subsequent marketing documentation will be required for all courses but may vary dependent on the course and audience.
- Information on the Course Specification Document will also be used to populate SITS to create a course outline ready for further detail as it is agreed, to include a new course in the timetable as early as possible and to make an initial entry for the course on the Curriculum Overview Record.

When the online course proposal is finalised, the course leader submits the proposal and the UEB Secretary will record the approval to proceed on the online system. This outcome will also be recorded on the formal Curriculum Overview of courses. This will trigger the release of the stage three documentation to the subject team.

It will also trigger the request for the course to be included in the agenda for Academic Committee and then to Senate. Once UEB has noted the approval in principle of UEB the relevant team may move forward with curriculum design and according to the agreed timeline, complete the full definitive document for approval.

The completed Course Specification proposal should be included as an agenda item at the next School Academic Committee.

**NOTE** that Stage 2 is common to all new provision although the content of the Course Specification Document varies slightly according to the nature of the provision being proposed. The initial selections on the online system will generate the correct version of the document.

### **(c)Completion of the Course Specification Document**

**All courses should be proposed on a standard Course Specification Document following the procedure as set out below:**

All courses are initially proposed on a standard **Course Specification Document**, which must be received by the University Executive Board (UEB). This form requires initial marketing information, which will be used to advertise the course whilst the approval process is underway. Information on the Course Specification Document will also be used to populate SITS to create a course outline ready for further detail as it is agreed, to include a new course in the timetable as early as possible and to make an initial entry for the course on the Curriculum Record.

For new courses of study leading to an award of the University (including new courses that might involve existing provision but where new provision makes up **50% or more** of the new course) the following fields are required to complete the Course Specification Document:

<b>SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT</b>	Select from drop down box
<b>TITLE</b>	Enter the title of your new course from a disciplinary point ONLY. You do not need to add 'BA' or 'major' or any other similar terms.
<b>TYPE</b>	Select from drop down box whether UG or PGT
<b>AWARD</b>	Select from drop down box
<b>NORMAL EXIT AWARDS</b>	The system assumes normal University outcomes unless you specify otherwise
<b>RATIONALE</b>	Explain why you think the University should add this course to its portfolio
<b>OVERALL AIMS</b>	What would a student on the course be aiming to achieve?
<b>GRADUATE PROFILE</b>	What would your normal graduate have to offer an employer or other institution?
<b>EVIDENCE OF DEMAND / EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES</b>	What evidence is there that this course will recruit students in sufficient numbers to make it viable? You might want to include why it will make students employable.
<b>ADDITIONAL STAFFING and RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS</b>	Indicate whether this course can be run successfully using existing resources in the School/Department or whether it will require additional resources or staffing.

<b>SUBJECT BENCHMARK STATEMENT[S]</b>	Indicate which benchmark statements apply to this course – see the Hope QA website for links to subject benchmark statements
<b>YEAR AND MONTH OF FIRST ENTRY</b>	Select from drop down box
<b>MODE[S] OF STUDY</b>	Select from drop down box
<b>LANGUAGE</b>	Select from drop down box
<b>ADMISSION CRITERIA</b>	Select from drop down box. Normal Hope admission criteria apply unless you specify otherwise.
<b>ACCREDITATION OR PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION</b>	Indicate if this a course will carry professional accreditation. If so indicate the status of the accreditation.
<b>MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM DURATION OF STUDY</b>	Select from drop down box
<b>LOCATION</b>	Select from drop down box
<b>FEES</b>	Select from drop down box
<b>ADDITIONAL COST TO STUDENTS</b>	Indicate if the course will require students to incur any costs over and above standard fees and living costs.
<b>FREQUENCY OF INTAKE</b>	Select from drop down box
<b>FHEQ LEVELS</b>	Select from drop down box – see link on Hope Academic Quality website to FHEQ level guidance
<b>INITIAL MARKETING STATEMENT</b>	Include an initial statement that can be used by the marketing team to promote this course whilst it is being approved.

If information entered into any of these fields suggest that the proposed provision may have non-standard requirements, the online system will automatically divert the form to the Registrar for consideration. The completed Course Specification Document should be included as an agenda item at the next School Academic Committee.

### **(c) Recommendation of the proposed course to the University Executive Board (UEB)**

If School/Departmental Academic Committee (and specifically the HOS/D) support the proposal, the University Executive Manager (UEM) should indicate this on the online system. This will indicate to the UEB Secretary that the Course Specification Document should be included in the agenda for the next UEB.

The Course Specification document will then be presented by the HOS/D to UEB (or the Chair of Senate if the matter is urgent). UEB will discuss whether the proposed provision accords with wider institutional goals and corporate strategy. UEB will also consider the resources and staffing needed to deliver the course. UEB may:

- i) approve in principle the proposal for report to Academic Committee and to Senate and for the relevant team to start course development **or**
- ii) refer the matter back to the School/Department for further clarification/detail **or**
- iii) reject the proposal.

The Head of Committees will record the relevant outcome on the online system and will indicate

whether an external reviewer is required. (Note external panel members are always required as part of this co-design panel).

#### **(d) Actions following initial approval to proceed**

If the proposal is approved this will then trigger the request for it to be included in the agenda for Academic Committee and then passed onwards to Senate. At this point Stage 2 will be released on the online system and the relevant team may move forward with curriculum design and subsequent completion of the Course Portfolio documentation for approval.

At the start of Stage 2 two requests are sent by the online system:

1. To the relevant Head of School/Department, Subject leader and the Learning, Teaching and Quality Officer to **start the process of identifying members of the co-design panel and to make arrangements for dates for the panel to meet**. The participant lists for the co-design event must be signed off by a member of UEB or the Chair of Senate prior to the event. (See Appendix 3 for further detail).
2. To the Chair of Academic Committee to **start the process of selecting External Reviewer (if required)** needed at the end of Stage 2. (See Appendix 6 for further detail).

## **Stage 3: Course Portfolio (Completion of the Course Portfolio)**

### **STAGE 3: COURSE PORTFOLIO**

Requires construction of a curriculum/syllabus, collation of other relevant material and final completion of a Course Portfolio.

Should involve relevant stakeholders as appropriate

External input is required for most courses

Every Course must go through the process of course design. This must involve the design of a detailed curriculum and syllabus in addition to a range of other information. This suite of information about each individual course is collated together to form the Course Portfolio. Once the Stage 2 documentation has been released on the online system the relevant subject team are able to start to complete their course portfolio.

#### **(a) Course design through Co-design**

For new courses leading to an award of the University the subject team are required to undertake a full co-design event to ensure that an appropriate curriculum/syllabus are produced. The process of

co-design is set out in Appendix 3. The extent of this process may vary depending on the proportion of existing provision but in the case of courses covered by this handbook (QH2) a full co-design event is required. The output of the co-design event should be recorded on the day to ensure that the team have the information they need to complete the Course Portfolio (Appendix 4).

### (b) Curriculum and Syllabus check

The co-design process should produce a full Curriculum and Syllabus for the new course. Liverpool Hope expectations for both Curriculum and Syllabus can be found in Appendix 5. These should be checked carefully during the co-design process.

### (c) Construction of the course Portfolio

Once co-design has taken place, the online system should be used to complete the Course Portfolio. The following fields will need completion to construct the course portfolio:

<b>COURSE STRUCTURE</b>	Select the pattern of UG blocks or PGT modules that will be used to build your course. The system will then create fields for you to complete syllabus, assessment and reading associated with each of those blocks or modules.*  *If these are existing blocks/modules you will need to copy and paste the information into this system from existing documents. As the system matures it is intended that existing blocks/modules will be available for you to select and simply transfer full details into a new document.
<b>SYLLABUS</b>	List a full syllabus of what will be taught in each block or module.**  ** In the case of new courses of study leading to an award of the University (including new courses that consist of <b>50% or more of new provision</b> , the creation of a course portfolio involves a full co-design of the new syllabus and curriculum. It is essential that the outcome of the co-design process is a full syllabus for the provision contained within a well-structured curriculum. Guidance relating to co-design, the Hope curriculum and syllabus design more generally are included in Appendices 3, 4 and 5 of this document respectively. More comprehensive guidance can be found on the Hope QA website.
<b>TEACHING PATTERN</b>	Enter the teaching pattern of numbers of lectures/seminars/tutorials etc. for each block/module.
<b>ASSESSMENT DETAILS</b>	Enter assessment patterns and weightings for each block/module.
<b>INDICATIVE READING.</b>	Enter essential reading material for each block/module.
<b>EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS</b>	State what your expectations of students who complete each block/module will be.
<b>PLACEMENT INFORMATION</b>	Enter the details of any compulsory or optional placements in your proposed course. Also indicate whether you would recommend the creation of an additional version of the course with the option of a full placement year.
<b>PARTNERSHIP/ COLLABORATION</b>	Include details of any partners/partner institutions/collaborators involved in the delivery of this course. You should report the date of approval of this partnership by UEB and the detail of how the partner will be involved.



<b>LEARNING AND TEACHING</b>	There is an assumption that the course design and delivery will be underpinned by the ten principles of Learning and Teaching as identified in the Hope LTA strategy and these will be inserted into your document. You are asked to identify any factors of enhancement or clarification relating to this new course.
<b>STUDENT SUPPORT</b>	There is an assumption that the normal Liverpool Hope Student Support Systems will provide support to students and these will be inserted into your document. Please indicate here if any additional arrangements will be necessary for this cohort.

### **Important Note:**

**If the whole new course is comprised of existing provision, then rather than constructing a new course portfolio the existing documentation can be presented to the HOS/D in its place as the formal Course Portfolio. This is only possible if the following are true:**

- **The full co-design panel agree that the material is fully appropriate.**
- **The existing provision being used has all undergone review in the last 5 years.**
- **The existing documentation is complete and includes all information included in the table above.**

**If this is the case then existing documentation can be used in place of a new Course Portfolio, provided it is appended to a new Course Specification (which has been agreed by University Executive Committee) and that it is accompanied by a single page of clarification of the three bullet points above as appropriate.**

### **(d) Consideration of the Course Portfolio by the Head of School/Department**

Once the Course Portfolio is complete the course team (through the Subject Leader) should submit the final version through the online system (where it is available or manually in other cases). This should be joined to the Course Specification Document and sent to the HOS/D for approval. The HOS/D may:

- i) approve the Course Portfolio for dispatch to external reviewer for their consideration **or**
- ii) refer the Course Portfolio back to the subject team as not yet ready for External scrutiny **or**
- iii) indicate that development of this course should not be pursued any further.

This approval process should be completed through the online system where it is available.

The remaining stages of the course approval process are not currently available on the on-line system and the appropriate paper forms should be used as indicated.

### **(e) External Scrutiny of the Course Portfolio**

Once the HOS has indicated that a course portfolio is ready for external scrutiny, the UEM will send the relevant course portfolio and course specification to the External reviewer already identified by

the DVC or Chair of Senate (Appendix 6). The External reviewer is required to provide a detailed report about the proposed provision to inform the approvals process. This is completed in a structured format, on the appropriate form (See Appendix 7).

Once the reports are received, the subject team are required to provide a response to the external comments - this forms part of the Final Approval Form (See Appendix 8). They should revise the course portfolio accordingly and in line with the expected timeline.

## **Stage 4: Approval to Deliver** **(Creation of the Definitive Document)**

### **STAGE 4: APPROVAL TO DELIVER**

Documentation is reviewed and commentary acted upon as necessary.

Final approval will be noted at Senate via Academic Committee

The definitive Document is formed from the Course Specification, Course Portfolio and the Approval documents.

### **(a) Review of Response to External Scrutiny and the final Course Portfolio**

The HOS reviews the revised documentation and the subject team's response to the External Comments. This is the final scrutiny in the approval process. Its purpose is to confirm that the report from the external academic has been appropriately actioned, the relevant amendments clearly incorporated into the documentation and the criteria for approval have been met. Its purpose is also to confirm that the Executive Dean is convinced that the provision is well considered and will make a substantive addition to the work of the School/Department.

In exceptional circumstances, where the external reviewer's recommendations have not been accepted, the HOS must be provided with a full justification for why this is the case.

There are three possible outcomes of this review:

- i) Recommendation to the Chair of Academic Committee for approval to deliver the course (this may be accompanied by a requirement to make minor amendments to the documentation) **or**
- ii) Requirement for the team to address significant issues, followed by a resubmission of the documentation\* **or**
- iii) A decision not to offer the course in the Hope portfolio.

\*These may include revisions to curriculum/delivery or aims. A further conversation with the external reviewer may also be required if

appropriate.

In the case of (i) i.e. the HOS/D is satisfied that the course is ready for the final approval of the University, they should sign the Approval form and pass to the relevant FEO who will combine Course Specification, Course Portfolio and Approval form into the final Definitive Document.

### **(b) Review of the Definitive Document by Chairs of Senate Committees**


The Definitive Document should be passed to the Chair of Academic Committee to gain final assurance that the approval process has been satisfactorily completed and the course is indeed ready to be recommended for approval at Senate. The approval should then be reported at Academic Committee and Senate via the Head of Committees. After Senate approval has been given, the Head of Committees will update the official Curriculum Overview record.

After final approval, a copy of the completed definitive document must be dated and lodged with the Student Administration Team/ Registrar. This is the formal record of the course approval.

### **(c) Regular review of the course**

This course should be reviewed annually through the ARE process and in more depth on a five-year review cycle (see QH4).

## Appendix 1: Overview of Process



## Appendix 2: Timescale

The normal timeline for a completely new course is two years from inception to delivery. This allows for appropriate marketing to take place. In reality, many new courses may be introduced on a much reduced timescale in order to meet market demands.

<b>Approval to proceed with Initial Proposal</b>	September	Identification of need (reflective meetings)
	September	Subject Team completes Course Specification document
	September	Meeting of the CVG
	October	Initial proposal to University Executive Board (UEB) and approval to proceed
	November	Approval to proceed noted by Academic Committee and Senate
	November	Initial marketing of course on Social Media and Website
<b>Curriculum/Syllabus Design</b>	November	External Reviewer and Co-design panel identified and invited. Names to be sent to Learning and Teaching team.
	November	Co-design date agreed
	February	Marketing material included in relevant prospectus
	February - June	Curriculum design including full co-design
	February - June	Documents sent to HOS/D (max 6 weeks after co-design)
	February - June	Documents sent to External reviewer
<b>Approval to Deliver</b>	February - June	HOS/D review (Max 2 weeks after receipt of External Comments)
	June	New Definitive Document constructed
	June	Definitive Document sign off by Chair of Academic Committee
	June	Approval to deliver noted by Academic Committee and Senate.
	June	New Definitive Document is lodged with Registrar
<b>Course is included in Hope Portfolio</b>	June	Course added to curriculum overview.
	June to November +1 year	Course team present new course at Open Days
	September + 1 year	Applications commence
	January - May	Offers made and applicants converted
	August	Students admitted
	September +2 years	Delivery commences

## Appendix 3: The Process of Co-Design

Inspired by the ongoing collaboration with the Université Catholique de Lille, Liverpool Hope has embraced the principles of Co-Design into a wide range of its practice, including the Curriculum Design and Approval process outlined in this document. The Co-Design process seeks to generate innovative and collaborative solutions to complex problems by creating spaces where the insight from a wide range of diverse stakeholders can be utilised to best inform the approach to any design problem. In this instance, a Co-Design event acts as the central component to the Curriculum Design process for new awards at Liverpool Hope University and will generate the insight necessary to create high quality and innovative curriculum that will best equip our students for their future work when they graduate.

Rather than the conventional curriculum development process, which is traditionally led by a small subset of curriculum stakeholders, Co-Design opens up the curriculum design process not only to all academic teaching staff involved with the course, but also to academic staff in related disciplines, external professional stakeholders, University support staff and students. A core goal is to generate cutting edge insight on the discipline, by exposing core curriculum decision makers to challenging and diverse perspectives through creative and explorative thinking.

### Participants

The participants at a Co-Design event will demonstrate a cross-section of the discipline from an academic, professional and student experience perspective. The participants of the co-design event. It is for the HOS/D, working with the Subject Leader and UEM to determine the range of stakeholders to be invited to each co-design event. It is expected however that a broad range of stakeholders will be included, drawn from the following constituencies, as well as members of Hope academic and related staff as appropriate for example a full co-design event may involve:

- The full subject team
- Members of academic staff from related disciplines
- Subject specialists from other HEIs\*
- Prospective Employers\*
- Professional Stakeholders\*
- Students and Alumni
- Members of Academic and Administrative Support

\* Expenses will be covered for external stakeholders and in some cases a small fee will be made available from the Faculties for those with sector-leading insight.

The Learning and Teaching Department will manage invitations to the co-design event, based on information supplied by the School.

The Co-Design event itself is designed to stimulate innovation and creativity and is structured around several activities that will provide the context for the collaborative construction of the curriculum

syllabus, assessments, and student experience. To best facilitate the generation of creative ideas, a Co-Design Pre-event is held prior to the main event that will establish the core framework and design of the Curriculum with close consideration of National and Subject benchmarks.

It is important that although the co-design event itself will be organised and facilitated by the Learning and Teaching team, the responsibility for the progress of this process is with the host School of the developing curriculum.

### **Schedule**

A full Co-design event should be expected to last for a working day. A typical schedule is as follows although this is subject to change dependent on the nature of provision being proposed:

9.30 – 11.00 Introduction to Co-design and initial creative activities

11.15 – 13.00 Applying outcomes of creative activities to curriculum design

14.00 – 15.00 Identification of priorities for the new curriculum/syllabus in the light of the key considerations below.

15.00 – 17.00 Initial writing for Course Portfolio.

The subject team are expected to be present for the full event, External colleagues and those from the wider University may not be required to stay for the full afternoon. This is at the discretion of the facilitator.

### **Key considerations**

Co-design teams are expected to ensure that the proposed new course:

- reflects the 10 principles of the University's Learning, Teaching and Enhancement strategy (including guidance on the Hope Curriculum and Syllabus –see Appendix 5).
- is designed in accordance with the appropriate level within the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ).
- meets the national subject benchmark statements (and, as appropriate, European reference points, requirements of PSRBs and of industry/employers).
- addresses appropriately the concept of progression to ensure that the curriculum imposes an increasing level of demand on the learner during the course.
- has an appropriate balance of content, for example, in relation to academic and practical elements, personal development and academic outcomes, breadth and depth in the curriculum and in the forms of assessment used.
- is coherent and that the overall experience of a student has a logic and an intellectual integrity related to clearly defined learning outcomes.
- makes reference to the principles of inclusive curriculum design (and the need to reflect the recommendations for education providers in the Equality Act 2010).
- meets internal reference points, such as University Regulations.
- has had student input into its design and the development.
- has career opportunities (and further study) articulated in its design.

The Head of School/Department takes responsibility for the event (which is facilitated by the Director of Student Learning or their nominee). Discussion will focus primarily on the design and content of the proposed course and on matters such as assessment, progression, placements (where applicable). The role of facilitation is an essential component of a successful co-design event as facilitators provide ways for people to engage with each other as well as providing ways to communicate, be creative, share insights and test out new ideas.

The outputs from the co-design event should be used by the Subject Leader in the development of the provision. These outputs should be recorded on the appropriate document for ease of use later (Appendix 4).

**Note:** In cases where a new course consists of existing provision being brought together or where co-design is part of a 5-year review of an existing course then the process/schedule and also the list of participants described above may be amended or truncated by the facilitator as appropriate. In these cases, this would normally be either a 'Light Touch' co-design (for new courses made up of existing provision) or a Type R co-design (for courses requiring 5-year review).



# Appendix 4:

## QF2a Post co-design record for document creation

Name of Award/Major .....  
 Person Responsible (usually Subject Lead/HOS/D) .....

### COMPLIANCE

A co-design event has been held on [ insert DATE]. We can confirm that the event ensured that the new/revised provision: (please tick as appropriate)

- Meets integrated curriculum requirements
- Acknowledges and/or references subject benchmark statements (where available)
- Acknowledges and/or references FHEQ level descriptors
- Acknowledges and/or references PSRB requirements (if relevant)
- Adheres to the principles of inclusive curriculum design

### CURRICULUM/ ORGANISATION/ INNOVATION

Essential Components of the Curriculum

	List agreed curriculum components
Level F	
Level C	
Level I	
Level H	
Level M	

Main organisational ideas from the day

	List agreed organisational ideas
Level F	
Level C	
Level I	
Level H	
Level M	

Main innovations from the day

	List main innovations
Level F	
Level C	
Level I	
Level H	
Level M	

### OUTSTANDING ISSUES (add further rows if necessary)

	Issue	Responsibility (when/by when)
1		
2		
3		

**Agreed timeline (insert relevant dates as appropriate)**

Action	Date
Completion of first draft of documentation and sign off by HOS/D (max 30 days after co-design event). Document should be sent to the external reviewer at this time.	
Comment to be received from External Reviewer (max 30 days after receipt of documents).	
School/Department to make formal response to External comments.	
Confirmation Meeting. Following this meeting any necessary amendments should be made and the final version should be recommended to Senate.	

Signed by  
HOS/D (or their representative .....

Co-design Chair .....

## Appendix 5: Liverpool Hope's approach to Curriculum and Syllabus

### Curriculum

The following core principles are central to the Hope Curriculum:

1. As a University, we have moved beyond a fragmentation of learning (often associated with a modular curriculum structure) to having a rounded formation of the graduate in the discipline.
2. The notion of a 'disciplinary core', ensuring that all students studying a subject area (whether as single honours/combined honours) have a commonality of experience and learning which reflects the concept of the graduate in the discipline is essential to all provision.
3. Students should be provided with opportunities for enhanced engagement and deep learning, with the design of provision at all levels encompassing seminars and small group tutorials.
4. The curriculum should be designed to actively support student progression and enhancement.
5. Academic staff/teams are central to learning and teaching in the discipline and teaching should be research informed.
6. Students are provided with a minimum of 12 contact hours per week of term-time during their first year of full-time study, with 10 hours per week minimum provided during second and third years.

As part of the Co-Design process, participants will seek ways in which a holistic and integrated curriculum can be generated that meets the above principles and provides a robust, well-rounded, and rigorous experience of a discipline. Rather than being led by Learning Outcomes, the Curriculum is designed *syllabus first* and a core business of the Co-Design event is to discover what disciplinary knowledge students should engage with throughout their course of study.

### Syllabus

A Syllabus generated from the Co-Design process should:

1. Provide, at an appropriate level, detail of what is to be learned at each year of study.
2. Represent a broad and well-rounded cross section of the discipline.
3. Should be appropriately developmental, with increasing depth and complexity emerging throughout the three years of study.
4. Be underpinned by the principles of both the FHEQ and the relevant subject

benchmark.

This Syllabus should provide:

1. Information that will guide the operational implementation of the Curriculum.
2. Information to the students to allow them to personalise and supplement their own learning experience with personal study.
3. Information to prospective employers of our graduates.

**For further information subject teams should consult the Liverpool Hope Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy.**

## Appendix 6: Appointment of External Reviewers

**All proposed new courses leading to awards of the University must be considered by at least two academic experts external to the University, reflecting the sector-wide commitment to quality assurance by peer review.**

At least two External Reviewers should be appointed to provide independent expert opinion on the draft provision. They should have had no previous involvement with the development of the programme, should not be closely associated with the Department and should not have been an external examiner within the subject area at Hope in the last five years.

Once University Executive Board (UEB) has approved the course specification form for a new course, the Senate Secretary will confirm to the Chair of Academic Committee/DVC (through the online system where it is available) that they are now able to **start the process of selecting External Reviewers**.

External reviewers **must be formally approved by the DVC (or where the DVC has a conflict of interest the Chair of Senate)** and must have:

- the ability to form an expert and objective opinion of the overall standards of the course/s and the comparability of those standards within the UK HE sector.
- academic qualifications at least to the level of the proposed course.
- expertise relevant to the subject area under consideration.
- familiarity with current developments in the field of study concerned.
- understanding and experience of current practice and developments in teaching, learning and assessment in HE.
- for courses with professional elements, awareness of the educational requirements for the profession.
- for courses with professional elements the contribution of one or more representatives from the PSRB concerned is additional to and cannot replace the requirement for an academic External Assessor.

Once the HOS/D has indicated that a course portfolio is ready for external scrutiny, the FEO will send the relevant course portfolio and course specification to the identified External reviewers. External reviewers are required to provide a detailed report about the proposed provision to inform the approvals process. This is completed in a structured format, on the appropriate form (See Appendix 7).

## Appendix 7: QF2b External Scrutiny Document



External Reviewers are asked to consider the following questions in relation to the proposed course portfolio:

*For undergraduate courses, please include a commentary by 60C block.*

*For postgraduate courses, please include module specific comments.*

*For both UG and PG awards please also include an overall reflection of the course under each of the following criteria.*

**External Reviewer: Name**.....

**Proposed Course: Title** .....

### 1. Course Curriculum and Syllabus

This section should provide comment and recommendations on the curriculum and syllabus of the course in relation to its stated course specification and might also include comment on:

- the coherency and currency of the course and its component parts.
- the extent to which the course reflects any additional Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements.
- the structure of the course and its delivery pattern.

### 2. Academic Standards

This section should provide comment and recommendations on whether:

- the course meets the threshold academic standards set for its award in accordance with the frameworks for higher education qualifications (FHEQ) and applicable benchmark statements.
- the academic standards and the achievements of students are comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions.

### 3. Assessment

This section should provide comment and recommendations on whether assessment:

- is appropriately designed.
- measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended expectations of the course.

It might include comments on whether:

- the assessment methods and balance between them, and volume of assessment are appropriate.

- assessment criteria, marking schemes and award classifications are set at the appropriate level.

#### **4. PSRB requirements**

This section should be used (where appropriate) to provide comment and recommendations on:

- Whether the proposed course meets the appropriate professional requirements.

#### **5. The UK Quality Code /Other Issues of Note**

This section should be used (where appropriate) to provide comment and recommendations on:

- Whether the proposed course meets the requirements of the UK Quality Code.
- Any further issues not referred to above.

**External Reviewer signature..... Date.....**

## Appendix 8:

### QF2c Final Approval Form



## Liverpool Hope University Final Approval for Course Delivery

Name of Course .....

Final Award of Course .....

### Recommendation from the Head of School/Department.

I recommend that this course is approved for delivery. I assure the University that I am satisfied with the content of the Course Portfolio and that External Scrutiny has taken place and that the subject team have responded appropriately.

Name: ..... Position.....

Signature..... Date.....

Approval from the Chair of Academic Committee.....

Signature.....Date.....

Received by Academic Committee (Date).....

Approved at Senate (Date) .....

Date for 5-year Review.....



## QF2d Team response to issues raised by External Reviewers

Please use the Table below to record the issues raised by the External Reviewers and the relevant subject team's response to them. If there are issues which were raised but you have chosen not to act upon this must be accompanied by a strong justification.

Issue raised by External Reviewer	Response from Subject Team	Changes made to Course Portfolio

Once completed this form should be sent to the relevant Head of School / Department along with the Course Specification and the amended Course Portfolio.