

PROPOSED CHANGES TO REVALIDATION PROCEDURES: BLACKPOOL & THE FYLDE COLLEGE

A RISK BASED APPROACH

OVERVIEW

Lancaster University has been in partnership with Blackpool and the Fylde College for over 30 years. The University's approach to its collaborative teaching partnerships is underpinned by a commitment to help partners build their own capacity to manage quality and standards effectively. Over recent years the revalidation of programmes at Blackpool and the Fylde College has often been achieved without any conditions imposed by the revalidation panel. Over the last 4 years, out of 21 programmes revalidated, 16 (76%) have been with no conditions. AQSC therefore propose a revised risk-based approach to revalidations at B&FC.

Validation

The validation of new programmes is considered higher risk and will continue under the established validation processes.

Revalidation (incorporating Periodic Review)

The revalidation of existing provision is considered to be lower risk for the reasons outlined above. All Programmes undergo a revalidation process every five years. The Colleges internal quality assurance processes consist of a two-stage panel meeting, including an external advisor. A series of conditions are set following these meeting for action prior to the external review stage with Lancaster University. The College's internal process has been shown to work very effectively, resulting in clear and robust documentation and programmes at the final stage of review requiring few or no conditions.

Documentation

Along with the revalidation documentation the panel will receive minutes from the College internal Stage 2 revalidation meeting and a report from the College's External Advisor.

Panel

The Panel will consist of a Lancaster University Chair; Subject Specialist; External Assessor to ensure externality and a member of AQSC.

The fee for panel members following the revised revalidation process will be £300. If a short meeting is deemed necessary with the programme team a further £50 will be paid as a half day rate.

Process

The revised revalidation process is designed to be less onerous for both the Panel and the Programme Team. Following a review of the revalidation documentation the Panel will be asked to provide any possible Conditions and Recommendations to AQSC by correspondence. If potential Conditions are identified then a short meeting with the College would be organised to discuss only those points raised as potential Conditions. B&FC will provide a report of the meeting.

If only Recommendations are identified then these would be communicated to the College for a response by the programme team along with the revised documentation in the usual way.

Amendments to the documentation

The College will submit revised documents containing a response to any Conditions and Recommendations, **within six weeks of the report being sent to the College**. The revised document(s) should be submitted to AQSC at the University, highlighting clearly in the body of the text where revisions have been made.

Panel Decision and Conditions and Recommendations

Following necessary clarifications from the Programme Team, the Panel will take a decision on the revalidation proposal, and will recommend **one** of the following to the University.

- (a) **To validate/revalidate** the programme as it stands for the following five years.
- (b) **To validate/revalidate** the programme for the following five years **subject to** a number of Conditions (changes which must be satisfactorily addressed prior to the commencement of the delivery of the programme) and/or Recommendations (areas that the Programme Team are invited to review but which are not considered essential changes).
- (c) **Not to validate/revalidate the programme at this stage** due to substantial concerns about one or more aspects of the programme, e.g. staffing/resources, academic content/coherence, etc. The Panel will then advise the College as to whether or not a resubmission of the proposal is possible and, if so, the time-scale for resubmission.

The recommendation will be reported by AQSC to the appropriate University committees and/or representatives.

Following this, the programme will be submitted for **final approval** to the Director of Quality Assurance and Enhancement, who has delegated authority from Senate.

If, following consideration by the Panel of the revised documentation, there remain substantive issues with the programme which need wider discussion within the University; these may be referred to the Regional Provision Teaching Committee (RPTC) for wider consideration.