

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Stage 1: Proposal</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Section A – Programme Outline .....	2
Section B – Market Demand and Academic Rationale .....	2
Section B Prompts .....	3
Section C – Resource to Deliver the Programme.....	4
Section D - Financial Model and Tuition Fee Approval.....	4
Section E – Ready to Publish and Recruit .....	4
Section F – Faculty and School Endorsement .....	5
<b>Stage 2: Documentation</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Section G – Full Programme Design .....	5
Any changes to Sections A-F since publishing STA? .....	5
Programme content, design and delivery .....	5
Pathways .....	5
Teaching and Learning.....	6
Teaching and Learning Prompts .....	6
Placement Learning/Study Abroad.....	7
Response to Internal and External Advisers.....	7
<b>Nomination and Role of Internal Adviser</b> .....	<b>7</b>
Internal Academic Adviser Prompts.....	7
<b>Nomination and role of an External Adviser</b> .....	<b>9</b>
Exam Board/Committee Management .....	10
External Examiner Responsible for Programme .....	10
HEAR.....	10
Section H – School Endorsement .....	10
Section I - Faculty Decision/Flexible Learning and Transnational Education Academic Director for Approval.....	11
<b>Stage 3: Submission and Approval</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Cross-school or cross-faculty programmes</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Stage 4: Setup</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Campus Solutions.....	12
Approved New Programme Circulation List.....	12
<b>Useful links:</b> .....	<b>12</b>

## Introduction

For the development and approval of new undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes of study that lead to a named award of the University, a New Programme Proposal (NPP) Form must be submitted.

- [University of Manchester New Programme Proposal Form \(Word\)](#)
- [University of Manchester New Programme Proposal Form \(PDF\)](#)

All on-campus programmes must be fully approved by **31st March (for Undergraduate programmes) or 31st May (for Postgraduate taught programmes)** of the year they are intended to be delivered for the first time (or minus 6 months in circumstances where the programme has a non-standard start date). These deadlines ensure that the programmes will be operational on Campus Solutions for student registration and unit selection and considers advertising deadlines for promotional medias (UCAS, prospectus etc.). Your Faculty Quality Administrator will be able to develop an approval schedule with you.

The New Programme Proposal Form is divided into 9 sections, A-I, with signature approval checkpoints throughout. Stage 1: Sections A – F proposes the business case and ensures that the proposed programmes fit strategically within School, Faculty and University objectives. Stage 2: Sections G-I details the structure and content of the programme.

The NPP form can either be completed in two distinct approval stages (Stage 1: A-F, Stage 2: G-I) or developed as a combined one stage approach, A – I. The programme must **not** be publicised until **all parts of sections A-F** have been **fully completed and approved**. Following approval of Sections A-F, programmes can be published as **‘subject to approval’**.

## Stage 1: Proposal

Stage 1 of the programme approval process is to gain ‘approval in principle’ from the School and Faculty for the development of the programme. Approval in principle requires a commitment from the School to develop the proposed programme and therefore applications should be submitted as early as possible to allow sufficient lead time for the full development, approval and marketing of the programme.

### Section A – Programme Outline

This section provides the necessary information to set up a provisional record of the programme on the Student Records System (Campus Solutions) and allows creation of a marketing record. It also captures data and information in relation to the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) and DiscoverUni information, in addition to HESA reporting requirements.

The section requires information relating to Recruitment, Admissions and International Development and will be used for marketing the programme. Marketing information will be input to Campus Solutions for the University website and will be attached to the academic plan code.

As part of CMA requirements, and in order to maintain quality data, you are required to provide details of the programme structure by submitting a [UOM Course Unit Summary Publication \(STA\)](#) that lists all mandatory and optional course units for all years of study.

### Section B – Market Demand and Academic Rationale

This should:

- set the programme in the School, Faculty, University and wider context to enable the academic and strategic merit of the proposal to be considered by the School and Faculty
- for Undergraduate programmes, demonstrate how to support the development of graduate attributes, outlined in the '[The Purposes of a Manchester Undergraduate Education](#)' ([The Manchester Matrix](#))
- demonstrate the academic case for the proposed programme
- demonstrate that the programme proposers have considered the potential impact of the new programme development on existing activities, including those of other schools and discipline areas (programme proposers are required to consult with other affected parties and to obtain their comments on the proposal)
- provide evidence of demand for the programme

*NB. This is an important section of the proposal as the School/Faculty will consider this information when determining whether the programme proposer can proceed to Section G: Full Programme Design of the template.*

### **Section B Prompts**

#### **Rationale for the development of this programme other than for reasons of market demand**

Consider:

- How the proposed development will align with the strategic objectives of your School and the University.
- Strong reputation and strength of the academic area at UoM
- Specific specialisms or combinations of subjects unique to the University of Manchester?
- Links to the University's research  
beacons: <https://www.manchester.ac.uk/research/beacons/>
- Opportunities presented by the availability of new sources of funding
- Professional/statutory body requirements
- New developments within a subject area
- Utilisation of new areas of staff expertise or sources of funding
- Reorganisation of previously offered programmes into a new structure for reasons of 'economies of scale, shared teaching, utilisation of course units offered in other programmes etc.
- Inter-disciplinary development or opportunities
- Widening student choice
- Creation of opportunities for progression to PGR
- eLearning strategy

#### **Statement to support the academic case for this programme**

Consider:

- Recruitment statistics of similar delivery elsewhere in the UK, and how the proposed programme stands out from its competitors
- Is this a brand-new area that others may later follow? Does the programme recognise new pathways or combinations of subjects unique to UoM?

- Consult with colleagues to assess the impact on existing or overlapping provision within the School, Faculty and University
- Enquiry data where applicable. Will the new programme be attractive to students applying to, but failing to get in to, other over-subscribed HEIs or higher entry grade programmes?
- Outputs from direct market research (e.g. Open days, liaison with VI Form Colleges, current students' opinions, employer groups, sponsors) to determine interest.

### **Demonstrate the demand for the programme based on the analysis of market research**

Consider:

- Statistical evidence: HESA data, University data
- Feedback from the International Centres
- Evidence of gaps in the market
- National and international trends: in the subject area or other areas which may impact on this discipline
- The potential for growth and scalability
- The scale of student enquiries in this area
- The size of the potential recruitment pool
- What is being offered by competitor institutions and how successful this is
- What would make the proposed programme distinct from others already being offered in the discipline
- Feedback from students/alumni/employers/Professional Bodies

### **Section C – Resource to Deliver the Programme**

If additional resources are required to support the proposed programme, then confirmation that they will be provided is required, and colleagues from each respective Division or Department will need to be consulted, along with obtaining approval by the relevant resource manager. Resources include Library Services, Information Systems, eLearning, Personnel, Consumables and Equipment and Space (incl. Estates and Facilities and Timetabling).

*NB. It is no longer necessary to submit separate resources forms as the information captured by these forms is now embedded with Sections A to F.*

### **Section D - Financial Model and Tuition Fee Approval**

For both undergraduate and postgraduate proposals the financial case should be demonstrated for a minimum 3-year period or an estimated period before recruitment reaches a steady state. This should include full estimates of costs, revenues and the impact of the proposed programme on the School.

Please confirm that the programme fees payable by students have been agreed and approved by the School Finance Team and Head of Faculty Finance.

### **Section E – Ready to Publish and Recruit**

Confirmation is required that the programme is ready to be marketed with a 'subject to approval' (STA) tag and arrangements are in place to prepare a full marketing plan, including the preparation

of additional materials such as brochures and multimedia. Programmes should only be published 'STA' once fully endorsed with School and Faculty signatures in Section F below.

### **Section F – Faculty and School Endorsement**

This confirms that there has been appropriate academic input by staff to the programme, that the resource implications of the programme are acceptable and that an appropriate programme management structure has been agreed.

### **Stage 2: Documentation**

#### **Section G – Full Programme Design**

This section includes:

#### **Any changes to Sections A-F since publishing STA?**

You should state if anything has changed from the original approval in principle stage and if so, provide a summary. This is essential to ensure that the information on Campus Solutions is accurate. The proposer should also consult with the Head of School, IT Manager and Librarian to ascertain that the required resources to deliver the revised programme will be available.

#### **Programme content, design and delivery**

This section should provide information on the programme structure, content, design and delivery. A [programme specification](#), and [course unit specifications](#) (please refer to the [notes for guidance](#) for the completion of the template) for all core units and any new optional units should be provided. For undergraduate programmes, this section should provide a statement on how student learning will be personalised in accordance with the [Policy on Personalised Learning](#). Details of any specialisations or pathways that will be available should also be included in this section. Please see below for more information about including pathways within programmes.

*Please note: If the programme does not comply with the University's [Undergraduate/Taught Postgraduate Degree Regulations](#), this should be highlighted and a [Degree Regulations Variation Form \(UG/PGT\)](#) completed.*

#### **Pathways**

Pathways are approved, structured routes through a programme which allow specialisation within the overall aims and intended learning outcomes of that programme. Pathways can be embedded within the existing programme title or can be identified in the programme title as BA/BSc/MA/MSc in Programme Title (Pathway Title). The Faculty Quality Administrator and Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning will be able to advise on the best option. This structure will be displayed in the programme and plan set up on Campus Solutions, so a defined structure is important. Approved pathways will be highlighted within marketing material for the purpose of recruitment.

Any programme with pathways should have some generic aims and intended learning outcomes (ILOs) which apply to all pathways and some aims or ILOs that are specific to each pathway. These can be demonstrated through recognising variations within the generic aims/ILOs or through stating explicit aims and ILOs for each pathway.

Pathways within a programme should have commonality through sharing at least one common subject based unit. The pathway specialism should normally constitute at least one third of the programme credits and should include the dissertation/project element, if appropriate. This can

involve units that are compulsory for the pathway but available as options for students on other pathways or programmes. For PGT programmes, the distinct pathway requirements should be reflected in the dissertation and at least one taught unit.

### **Teaching and Learning**

This should provide information on teaching, learning and assessment methods. A statement of how these methods can be adapted to meet the needs of students with additional support needs and details of placement learning and field trips (where applicable) should also be included. Please refer to the below prompts.

### **Teaching and Learning Prompts**

- Please explain the choice of the teaching methods that will be employed on the programme. Explain how the variety and balance of methods have been chosen and how they relate to each other. For Distributed Learning programmes, please also discuss the choice of materials, mode of delivery and support mechanisms.
- Are the proposed teaching, learning and assessment methods capable of being adapted to meet the needs of students with additional support needs? Please comment and, where relevant, give details of how field trips will be accessible to disabled students. More information can be found on the [Disability Advisory and Support Service \(DASS\)](#) web pages.
- Please explain why the methods of assessment are appropriate to the measurement of the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the programme. Explain why you have chosen these methods and how the different methods of assessment measure the different types and levels of achievement. Comment on the balance between the types of assessment. This information may be available in part through the programme specification if so, please cross refer as necessary.
- What methods will be employed to ensure the security and integrity of the assessment procedures? In particular, explain how the integrity of assessments not undertaken in invigilated examinations is ensured and how [plagiarism and impersonation](#) will be avoided.
- If your programme includes teaching delivered by members outside the University, please explain how their expertise is used to enhance the student learning experience and how this experience is managed.
- Please provide details of any teaching methodology or assessment that will be employed on the programme that you would like to highlight as innovative or an example of good practice.
- Please provide details of Personal Development Planning, support for online learning and dissertation/project supervision as appropriate.
- If the new programme is an Undergraduate programme, please provide details of how this programme will address the principles outlined in the [Policy on Personalised Learning for](#)

[Students on Taught Programmes](#) (The Manchester Experience), with reference to the role of the Academic Advisor, small group work and interaction with peers and academic staff.

- Please provide details of how eLearning will be utilised in the programme design, in accordance with the eLearning Strategy's minimum standards.
- Please provide details on how feedback will be given on formative and summative assessment, in accordance with the University's [Policy on Feedback to Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Students](#).

### **Placement Learning/Study Abroad**

This should detail how programmes that include any period of study outside of the University, will safeguard the student experience (please refer to [Placement Learning \(Students\)](#), and [Guidance for Staff on Placement Learning](#)).

### **Response to Internal and External Advisers**

In this section, comments from internal and external advisers should be attached. A response and summary of actions taken by the school must be included to demonstrate that the feedback of internal and external advisers has been considered, please refer to Nomination and Role of the Internal Adviser and the Nomination and Role of the External Adviser below.

### **Nomination and Role of Internal Adviser**

An Internal Academic Adviser provides feedback on the academic content of the programme/pathway documentation at appropriate points in the drafting stage. They should be a member from the same Faculty but a different school from the proposed programme. They do not have to be senior colleagues or members of the committee overseeing the approval of the programme. Where it is not possible for the Internal Academic Adviser to be from a different School within the Faculty, it is permissible to engage a colleague from the home School, provided they are considered sufficiently independent and objective in the process and will not be directly involved in the delivery of the programme, preferably from a different academic subject area.

Any concerns or issues that would prevent the internal adviser from recommending the proposal for approval should be discussed with the proposer to allow for amendments and reconsideration by the adviser. Please note that any issues or concerns arising from this process that the internal academic adviser believes requires the reconsideration of the approval in principle, should be notified to the Chair of the UG/PGT Committee and the Faculty Administrator.

The following prompts provide guidance on the areas of the proposal for which feedback is required. These prompts should not preclude the consideration of other issues arising from the documentation.

### **Internal Academic Adviser Prompts**

#### **Academic issues**

- Does the programme/pathway fit with the University /Faculty/School objectives?
- Have external requirements been taken into account?
- Does the proposed programme/pathway demonstrate academic coherence?

- In your opinion is the programme/pathway, including its aims and intended learning outcomes, demonstrably at or above the stated level as determined by the [QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications](#)?
- Is progression through the programme/pathway appropriate and made explicit through the programme/pathway specification?
- Are there any intermediate awards associated with the programme? Have appropriate aims and intended learning outcomes been specified in the programme specification?
- Is the structure of the programme consistent with the University of Manchester [credit framework](#) (multiples of 10 credits for UG and 15 credits for PGT; 15 or 20 credits for UMW PGT programmes)?

### **Teaching, learning and assessment**

- Are plans for the student learning experience and contact hours appropriate?
- Is there sufficient diversity of teaching and learning methodology?
- Are the explicit links between learning outcomes, teaching and learning methods and assessment made clear in the programme/pathway specification and do they match those in the course unit outlines?
- Is the assessment regime appropriate and sufficiently diverse? Please reflect on the assessment load across the programme.
- Are the teaching, learning and assessment methods flexible enough that reasonable adjustments can be made to satisfy the needs of disabled students, specific learning difficulties or long term medical conditions?
- If teaching is undertaken by staff external to the school or University, are appropriate measures in place for maintaining and supporting those members of staff and the students?
- Have measures been taken to ensure plagiarism and impersonation are avoided?
- Is there any eLearning in the programme?

If yes:

- Does the proposal provide details of pilot schemes to test and revise eLearning methods?
- Does the proposal include full details of how the programme/pathway is to be delivered?
- Does the proposal describe adequate support mechanisms for eLearning?
- Does the proposal consider how e-assessment will be conducted ie. be fair and avoid cheating?

If no:

- Are there any areas that could be developed for online learning or support?

### **Student Support**

- Are PDP schemes and student support systems addressed adequately?
- Are students offered opportunities for representation regarding their programmes(s), eg on programme committees?
- Are the needs for different types of student (part-time, disabled, overseas, distance learning) addressed (eg additional induction activities)?



### Placement learning

- Are the learning outcomes for the placement activity clearly defined, relevant to the programme and achievable within the context of a placement?
- Are appropriate measures in place to assure the student experience and provide support whilst on placement?

### **Study Abroad**

- Is the study abroad integrated into the curriculum and does it enhance the overall learning experience?
- Are the learning outcomes of the study abroad placement relevant to the programme, achievable and clearly defined in the programme specification?
- If the period of study abroad is assessed are clear assessment strategies in place?

### **Programme/pathway management and student support**

- Are appropriate management structures in place?
- Are appropriate management structures in place in any partner institutions/faculties/schools?

### **Good practice**

- Are there any examples of good practice and/or innovation described in the programme/pathway proposal that should be highlighted?

### **Nomination and role of an External Adviser**

An External Adviser serves as a critical friend that provides comments and feedback on the academic coherence of the new programme proposal. Comments from at least one external adviser are required as part of the approval process of new programmes. The External Adviser should be nominated by the School and approved by the Faculty at the approval in principle stage. Their comments and feedback should be submitted and addressed during the detailed content provision of Sections G-I. The specific time/s at which the feedback from the external adviser will be requested by the School will be agreed between the proposer and the Faculty Quality Administrator.

The External Adviser should be a subject specialist but not a current External Examiner at the University of Manchester. They should hold a senior academic position at another higher education institution. If appropriate, a second external adviser from industry may be appointed.

The External Adviser should not be subsequently appointed as an External Examiner, unless there are exceptional circumstances, such as there only being a small pool of suitable people available in a particular specialist subject. Where possible, External Advisers should be based within the UK. However, in cases where this is not possible, you should contact TLD ([quality@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:quality@manchester.ac.uk)) for advice on the process for appointing Advisers from abroad.

External Adviser comments should be more than an indication that the proposal is 'interesting'. They should include analysis of and comments on the academic content and structure of the programme. The external adviser should make address:

- the appropriateness of the programme aims, learning outcomes and content in relation to relevant subject benchmark statement/s (where they have been published);
- the relationship of the programme to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications;
- the relationship of the programme to any other external reference points.

External advisers feedback can be provided via the [External Advisor Feedback Pro forma](#), which guides them through the proposal and offers prompts for issues to feedback on. The document should be completed within 2 weeks of receipt of the proposal and returned to the Faculty Quality Administrator.

The constructive advice provided by the external advisers' comments should be considered during the development of the new programme(s). If the programme team, after consideration, decide not to incorporate certain elements recommended by the external adviser, the programme proposer must include an explanation in the proposal.

On receipt of written feedback, a payment of **£100 to each external adviser** will be made from Faculty. If a proposal involves considering a **cluster of cognate programmes**, the external adviser will receive **£100 per new programme proposal plus £50 per each additional cognate programme**, to reflect the additional work required.

*NB. If there is a significant delay in receiving comments from an external adviser, a second nominee will be considered by Faculty.*

### **Exam Board/Committee Management**

This section should provide an overview of how the programme will be managed within the School and, for collaborative provision, within the partner institution(s). It should explain how the programme committee or equivalent fits into the School structure, and, if appropriate, into the structures of any partners (where possible this should be provided in diagrammatic form). The section should also stipulate the name of Examination Board with responsibility for this Programme (please refer to [Guidance on Examination Boards](#)).

### **External Examiner Responsible for Programme**

As part of the programme approval procedure, programme teams should arrange to appoint an [External Examiner](#) for each new programme, in accordance with the guidance contained within the [Guidance on External Examiner Procedures](#). The nomination forms of the External Examiner should be attached in this section.

The External Examiner should not be the external advisor of the programme, unless in exceptional circumstances, such as there only being a small pool of suitable people available in a particular specialist subject.

### **HEAR**

In this section, a [HEAR statement](#) (max 3000 characters, 400 words) should be included (for undergraduate programmes only). This statement should be added to Campus Solutions when the programme is set up. Please see [HEAR information for staff](#).

### **Section H – School Endorsement**

This confirms that the programme meets all quality assurance standards, is a sound strategic and market fit for the University and is fully compliant with Competition and Markets Authority

regulations (including the content of the programme and all information published at the time of providing the endorsement). This is signed by the School T & L Committee and Head of School.

### **Section I - Faculty Decision/Flexible Learning and Transnational Education Academic Director for Approval**

This is the final confirmation of approval of the new programme(s) with signatures of Faculty Programme Approval Committee and Faculty Programme Approval Committee Chair.

### **Stage 3: Submission and Approval**

Complete submissions must be agreed at School level (either through committee or by Chair's action) and signed by the Head of School before it can be considered at Faculty level. If the proposal involves contributions from other Schools, a note of their approval of the full documentation must also be included with the submission.

### **Cross-school or cross-faculty programmes**

If the proposal is a cross-school or cross-faculty programme, then evidence of the approval of collaborating schools must be provided. This can be submitted as multiple signatures on the pro-formas, a letter/memo/email from Head of School or Associate Dean as appropriate, or minutes of an appropriate committee meeting.

The following aspects must be discussed and approved by all schools or faculties involved:

- Income and costs to each school (to be demonstrated in the financial modelling)
- Resources to be provided by each school. Additional resources to be identified and approved in the Resources Form.
- Administrative arrangements for programme management to be recorded in Sections G-I on the NPP form.

Sections G to I should be forwarded to your Faculty Quality Administrator when the proposer and both internal and external advisers are satisfied with the proposal. An Associate Dean may also wish to act as a third internal adviser at this point. The programme submission will be considered by the members of the appropriate Faculty committee: by this stage, the internal and external advisers will normally be able to recommend to the committee that the submission should be approved. The decision of the committee will either be **approved** or **not approved**.

If the submission is approved, it is forwarded to the Vice-President (Teaching, Learning and Students) via the Head of Teaching and Learning Delivery (TLD), for ratification on behalf of Senate. The Head of TLD will circulate a list of approved programmes to Associate Deans for information. The Vice-President will not expect to consider the submission in detail, but will wish to see whether it raises policy issues or may impact on other Faculties. Staff in TLD will prepare a summary of all programme proposals ratified by the Vice-President for receipt by Senate.

If the submission is not approved by the Faculty committee, then the proposal may be amended and resubmitted to the committee. Clear feedback will be provided to the School on the actions necessary and the timeframe for resubmission. The Faculty committee has the right, if these actions are not implemented, to withdraw approval in principle for the programme proposal.

## Stage 4: Setup

### Campus Solutions

Once a proposal has received full approval from the Faculty, an [approved administrator](#) can set up the programme structures on campus solutions and upload the undergraduate programmes statement to be included in the HEAR (Higher Education Achievement Report).

### Approved New Programme Circulation List

Once a proposal has received full approval from the Faculty, please liaise with your Faculty Quality Administrator to forward approved copies to:

- Student Admissions and Administration Division - [coursechanges@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:coursechanges@manchester.ac.uk)
- University of Manchester Academic Engagement Librarian - Please consult this [contact list of engagement librarians](#).
- Director of Teaching and Learning Delivery (TLD) - [quality@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:quality@manchester.ac.uk)
- Faculty IS Manager
- Faculty eLearning Manager
- Administrative contact in School
- Colleague responsible in School for inputting marketing information into Campus Solutions
- Student Services Manager - [Sophie.Hargreaves@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:Sophie.Hargreaves@manchester.ac.uk)
- TNE Programmes – [sarah.thompson@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:sarah.thompson@manchester.ac.uk)

### Useful links:

- For advice on each stage of the approval process (especially if pursuing a combined approach), please contact your Faculty Quality Administrator or Teaching and Learning Manager:
  - FSE: Jenny O'Mara, [J.O'Mara@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:J.O'Mara@manchester.ac.uk)
  - HUM: Lisa McAleese, [lisa.mcaleese@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:lisa.mcaleese@manchester.ac.uk)
  - BMH: Sarah Chesters, [sarah.chesters@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:sarah.chesters@manchester.ac.uk) AND [FBMH-TL@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:FBMH-TL@manchester.ac.uk)
- For support with the preparation of documentation, please contact administrative staff within your School or Faculty.
- For advice from the Taught Programme Enhancement Team in Teaching and Learning Delivery (TLD), please contact [quality@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:quality@manchester.ac.uk).
- For help with market research into the demand for a programme, please contact [Market insight Team](#).
- [Guidance notes](#) on providing evidence for programme approval are also available.
- For Collaborative Proposals, please contact the academic advisor assigned to the programme.
- For online, blended, transnational and flexible learning programmes, information can be found on the [Transnational Education website](#) or via IT Services [eLearning support](#) page.