**Guidance for internal reviewers**

**Structure of the process**

Proposals are developed within a School and undergo a three-stage approval process:

* Strategic approval of the portfolio development
* Academic design phase
* Compliance and University approval

Compliance and University approval is a two-phase stage comprising University confirmation that the proposal complies with YSJU, sector and PSRB regulatory and framework requirements followed by an external approval event. External and internal reviewers are involved in the second of these phases.

The reason we involve an internal reviewer is to provide an academic perspective independent from the proposing School. Internal reviewers can comment on matters of quality and standards and make comparisons against other University awards.

The comments from the reviewers are considered as part of the decision on whether or not to recommend the course for approval to the University through its Quality and Standards Committee.

**Documentation**

You will receive the:

* Programme specification(s)
* Programme design narrative
* Module specifications

A report form is attached which includes a series of questions which it would be useful for you to address in your review. However, if you have any comments which fall outside these questions, please feel free to include them.

Your report will form the basis of discussion at the external event held to affirm the proposed programmes relevance and quality and to provide an opportunity for discussions that could develop and enhance the programme delivery.

**Internal review report form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Award and Programme title(s):** |  |
| **Name of internal reviewer:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **University for Social Impact Strategy** |
| * How has the programme(s) addressed the strategic aims identified in the [University for Social Impact Strategy](https://www.yorksj.ac.uk/about/2026-strategy/)? |
|  |
| How does this apprenticeship fit with the University’s priority of social justice? |
|  |
| **Recruitment** |
| * Are strategies/entry pathways in place to address the agenda for widening participation? |
|  |
| **Employer engagement** |
| Is there evidence that the appropriate employers have been consulted in the design of the programme and will be involved in programme delivery? |
|  |
| Do the proposed workplace mentoring arrangements seem effective? For example, the induction processes for workplace mentors and proposed ongoing support for them in undertaking the role by both employers and the University.  Is there evidence of communication strategies between employers, providers, apprentices, etc. e.g. tripartite meetings |
|  |
| **Curriculum** |
| * Are the design principles underpinning the programme appropriate? * Does the programme meet national requirements for the academic standards and quality of higher education qualifications? * Is there evidence to indicate that external reference points including national qualifications frameworks for higher education, subject benchmark information, and the requirements of professional and statutory bodies have been taken into account? |
|  |
| **Learning Outcomes** |
| * Are the programme learning outcomes clear and appropriate? * Can the programme learning outcomes be met by the modules? * Are the programme learning outcomes appropriate to the FHEQ? |
|  |
| **Knowledge, Skills and Behaviors** |
| Do the programme PLOs and academic content map well to the KSBs of the apprenticeship standard? This is particularly relevant for programmes where the EPA is integrated. |
|  |
| Are there clear arrangements for how the apprentice will be supported in the workplace to develop the duties and KSBs specified within the apprenticeship standard? |
|  |
| **Learning Strategy** |
| * Is there a coherent learning strategy for the programme? * Is learning strategy suited to the programme and the student profile? |
|  |
| Is the quality of the learning opportunities consistent with that of other higher education programmes? For example, who will be delivering the academic content of the programme, clear arrangements of responsibilities of all parties involved in learning, teaching, and enabling student achievement.  Are there processes to ensure that the apprentice's progression through their apprenticeship is tracked, across all forms and locations of delivery and that interventions and or adjustments to delivery by a range of stakeholders is managed and recorded. |
|  |
| Does the programme provide apprentices who are undertaking it with equal opportunities for a high-quality learning and training experience; for example, is there evidence that the range of working contexts and the variety of employment settings within which the apprenticeship will be undertaken have been considered.  This should include:   * the relationship between the structure of programme, * approaches to learning, teaching and assessment in relation to work patterns, * geographical location(s), * and the specific requirements of work required |
|  |
| **Assessment** |
| * Is the overall assessment strategy for the programme balanced and appropriate? * Do the new modules proposed have appropriate and related assessment strategies? * Are the assessment principles and practice valid? * Is the assessment diet and timings appropriate? * If exams form part of the assessment strategy, do you consider them to provide an authentic form of assessment that enables students to meet the programme learning outcomes? |
|  |
| Does the EPA reflect the requirements of the apprenticeship standard?  Does the programme enable apprentices to have adequate access and practice to these forms of assessment throughout their programme and prior to the Gateway?  Does the programme provide provision for apprentices to achieve level 2 English and Maths prior to undertaking EPA? |
|  |
| **Module Choice (if applicable)** |
| * Will issues of group size affect module choice and availability? * Have issues around the timetabling of modules been considered? |
|  |
| **Student Support** |
| * What support is available for students from varying backgrounds? * Are study skills embedded in the programme? |
|  |
| Where apprenticeships do not follow the standard academic year cycle, has there been consideration given to how communications and information will be provided at a time appropriate to the point in the apprenticeship.  Are there clear expectations regarding the arrangements (including training) for workplace mentoring, together with the requirements related to the off-the-job learning and training? |
|  |
| Has there been consideration given to how the programme team will work with employers to ensure that the working environment within which apprentices are operating is appropriate to enable them to develop the required duties and KSBs for the Apprenticeship Standard? Are the proposed arrangements for pastoral support, safeguarding, prevent duty, equality and diversity, and health and safety effective? |
|  |
| **Student and Employer feedback** |
| Are the opportunities to capture the apprentice voice sufficiently agile to allow opportunities to facilitate feedback about the apprentice experience and enhance learning opportunities?  Are there opportunities to obtain employer feedback and to identify actions taken to respond to that feedback? |
|  |
| **Off and On the job training** |
| The integration of on and off-the-job learning, and training is fundamental for delivery of a high-quality apprenticeship. This integration, and the focus on delivering occupational competence, are what differentiate an apprenticeship from part-time learning while at work.  Has the 20% Off-the-job training time been clearly defined? And is the mode of delivery appropriate?  Is there evidence that on-the-job training is linked to academic content or assessment and vice versa? |
|  |