Annex 3: Suggested standard questions to guide Scrutiny Panel members

The questions below are intended as a guide to the evaluation of a new programme that Scrutiny Panel members are expected to undertake and, therefore, to the format of the Report the Panel has to make. They certainly do not represent a set of questions to be posed mechanically in any meeting with the Programme Team/Director-elect. Depending on the type of proposal being made, Scrutiny Panels should select from the questions shown below. Student members of scrutiny panels may respond to any of the questions below, but may be especially interested in the questions on the programme, its delivery and assessment (sections 1, 2, 3 and 5 below, excluding 1(e) and (f)).

1. The proposed programme
   (a) Are the aims of the programme clear and appropriate?
   (b) Are these aims translated into clear, appropriate and achievable learning outcomes throughout the parts of the programme?
   (c) Is it clear how the aims and learning outcomes will be achieved through the design and content of the curriculum?
   (d) Is the programme structure coherent and of appropriate breadth and scope?
   (e) Have relevant Subject Benchmarking Statements and the Qualifications Descriptors in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications informed the development of the programme and its intended learning outcomes?
   (f) Are the stated learning outcomes of the programme appropriate for the level of award with regard to the relevant Qualifications Descriptor?

2. The programme description
   (a) Are the teaching, learning and assessment strategies clear?
   (b) Is the programme content and structure appropriate to the students to be recruited?
   (c) Is the Programme Specification complete?
   (d) Will the programme engender appropriate academic skills development (including Career Management Skills and discipline-specific research skills)?

3. Proposed programme delivery
   (a) Is the student workload appropriate and correctly balanced?
   (b) How are the intended learning outcomes to be achieved?
   (c) Will appropriate use of learning technologies be made in delivering the programme?
   (d) How will student reaction be collected and used? Are the provisions for feedback to students adequate and appropriate?

4. Resources
   (a) Are staffing levels and specialisms consistent with the programme content and workloads?
   (b) Has there been effective liaison between the Programme Team/Director-elect and the various central support services, where necessary?
   (c) Have the implications for residential accommodation been taken into account, if relevant?
5. Assessment
   (a) Are proposed assessment regimes fit for the purpose in question?
   (b) Will the methods of assessment be effective in measuring student attainment of the intended learning outcomes and in promoting effective student learning?
   (c) How will assessment criteria be communicated to students?

6. Quality management and enhancement
   (a) Is it clear that the programme will be evaluated and monitored according to standard University quality management practice?
   (b) What attention has been paid to external advice (especially, where relevant, from industrial/professional sources)?

7. Procedures
   (a) Is the proposal supported by agreement from Schools/Module Providers who will be contributing to the programme?
   (b) Is the draft Programme Specification acceptable?