**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/)? |
|  |
| **Recruitment**   * Are strategies/entry pathways in place to address the agenda for widening participation? |
|  |
| **Curriculum**   * Are the design principles underpinning the programme appropriate? * 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 and employers, where appropriate, have been taken into account? |
|  |
| **Programme Learning Outcomes**   * Are the programme learning outcomes clear and appropriate? * Can the programme learning outcomes be achieved through the module assessments? * Are the programme learning outcomes appropriate to the [FHEQ](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/the-frameworks-for-higher-education-qualifications-of-uk-degree-awarding-bodies-2024.pdf?sfvrsn=3562b281_11)? |
|  |
| **Learning Strategy**   * Is there a coherent learning strategy for the programme? * Is the learning strategy suited to the programme and the student profile? |
|  |
| **Assessment and Standards**   * 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? |
|  |
| **Work-Related Experiential Learning (WREL)**  Please comment on how well you think the programme incorporates WREL activities and how appropriate those activities are |
|  |
| **Student Support**   * What support is available for students from varying backgrounds? * Are study skills embedded in the programme? |
|  |
| **Regulatory Risks**  Is there evidence that progression, continuation and retention have been considered within the design of the programme? |
|  |
| Do you have any other comments on any aspect of the documentation? |
|  |