

**ROYAL COLLEGE OF ART
QUALITY HANDBOOK
2014/15**



Royal College of Art
Postgraduate Art and Design

CONTENTS	INTRODUCTION	4
	NATIONAL EXPECTATIONS AND REFERENCE POINTS	4
	THE ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICE	5
	PROGRAMME APPROVAL AND VALIDATION	7
	PURPOSE AND GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES	7
	DEFINITIONS	7
	NEW PROGRAMME PROPOSALS	8
	EXPRESSION OF INTEREST STAGE	8
	EXPRESSION OF INTEREST OUTCOMES	9
	ASC WORKING GROUP	9
	VALIDATION PANEL – TERMS OF REFERENCE	9
	VALIDATION PANEL – MEMBERSHIP	10
	THE ROLE OF EXTERNAL ASSESSORS	11
	THE ROLE OF INTERNAL ASSESSORS	11
	DOCUMENTATION	11
	CRITERIA	12
	MEETING OF THE PANEL	13
	OUTCOMES, CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
	REVALIDATION	14
	REVALIDATION PANEL AND TERMS OF REFERENCE	15
	DOCUMENTATION	16
	CRITERIA	17
	RESEARCH PROGRAMMES	17
	MEETING OF THE PANEL	18
	OUTCOMES, CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19
	INTERIM REVIEW	20
	MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMMES	21
	COLLABORATIVE PROVISION	22
	DEFINITIONS	22
	EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FOR COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS	23
	PARTNERSHIP APPROVAL	24
	PARTNERSHIP REAPPROVAL	26
	PROGRAMME APPROVAL	28
	QUALITY ASSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS	28
	REVALIDATION SCHEDULE 2014/15 – 2019/20	30
	PROGRAMME MONITORING AND REVIEW	32
	ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW	32

THE REVIEW PROCESS	32
STUDENT FEEDBACK	33
SCHOOL REVIEW OF APRs	34
REVIEW SCHEDULE 2014/15	34
EXTERNAL EXAMINERS	36
EXTERNAL EXAMINERS – MASTER OF ARTS	36
THE ROLE OF THE EXTERNAL EXAMINER	36
CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT	36
LENGTH OF APPOINTMENT	37
DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	37
EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS	38
EXTERNAL EXAMINERS – RESEARCH	39
THE APPOINTMENT PROCESS	40
CONFIRMATION OF THE APPOINTMENT	41
TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENTS	42
PAYMENT OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS	42
INTERNAL MODERATORS – MASTER OF ARTS	43

INTRODUCTION

The Royal College of Art is committed to ensuring the excellence of the standards of its awards and the quality of the learning experience of students enrolled on its programmes of study. This commitment is enacted through the day-to-day work of all College staff – academic, academic support and administrative – and is formalised in the College’s Mission Statement:

“The Royal College of Art aims to achieve national and international standards of excellence in the postgraduate and pre-/mid-professional education of artists and designers and related practitioners, as a major contributor to cultural, social and economic well-being. It aims to achieve these through the demonstrable quality of its teaching, research and practice, through its relationship with relevant institutions, industries and technologies and through the achievements and innovations of its graduates and staff in the professional worlds of art and design.”

The College has established a series of policies and procedures to assure and enhance the quality of its educational provision, all of which address national expectations. This handbook is intended to provide an overview of these policies and procedures, and should be read in conjunction with the RCA Regulations.

NATIONAL EXPECTATIONS AND REFERENCE POINTS

The expectations of the national quality assurance framework are expressed in the UK Quality Code devised by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAAHE), the component parts of which are reviewed regularly by the College’s Academic Standards Committee (ASC). The Quality Code includes the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ), which describes the achievement represented by higher education qualifications, and which is therefore crucial in assuring the standards of the College’s awards (via, for example, validation, Annual Programme Review and External Examining).

In addition to its responsibilities for assuring itself of the academic standards of its awards, the College is also, and equally, committed to identifying and addressing opportunities to enhance the learning experience of its students. The College's Learning and Teaching Strategy

sets out how to achieve this through four aims:

- To create a learning environment that challenges and supports students to demonstrate a mastery of their practice
- To offer each student an equal opportunity to realise their creative potential
- To sustain a community of practice that draws on a diversity of talent and experience
- To enable students to translate their creative abilities and skills into a professional context

The ambitions described in this strategy are informed by the UK Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education.

THE ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

The Academic Development Office (ADO) coordinates the development and implementation of the College's quality assurance and enhancement systems. The ADO works closely with Schools, programmes and administrative and academic support departments across the College, as well as the Students' Union, and administers the two College committees with chief responsibility for overseeing quality assurance and enhancement activities – the Academic Standards and Learning and Teaching Committees. The core responsibilities of the ADO are as follows:

- Approving, modifying and (re)validating the College's academic programmes;
- Overseeing programme monitoring, including the Annual Programme Review process;
- Gathering, analysing and reporting on student feedback;
- Identifying and addressing opportunities to enhance the student learning experience;
- Offering and promoting opportunities for learning and teaching-related staff development and curriculum development;
- Reviewing and publishing accurate information about the student learning experience and quality management processes;
- Preparing for external reviews of the College's academic provision, for example by the QAAHE;
- Appointing and liaising with External Examiners and Internal Moderators.

The ASC monitors these functions and in turn reports to the College's Senate on their operation. The Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), a sub-committee of ASC, takes an overview of all learning and teaching-related activity throughout the College, including the development and implementation of the Learning and Teaching Strategy. The committees' terms of reference can be found on Space:

<http://space.rca.ac.uk/Administration/Committees>

If you require any additional information, or would like to provide feedback on the contents of this handbook, please contact us at ado@rca.ac.uk. Further details, including downloadable forms, can also be found on the Academic Development Office section of Space:

http://space.rca.ac.uk/Administration/Academic_Development

Academic Development Office Staff

Head of the Academic Development Office: Chris Mitchell (ext: 4557)

Quality Assurance Manager: Hugo Burchell (ext: 4397)

Administrative Assistant: Ellen Delbourgo (ext: 4137)

PROGRAMME APPROVAL AND VALIDATION

PURPOSE AND GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The validation process is intended to encourage effective and responsive programme development and review whilst enabling the Senate (the body responsible for the academic work of the College) to be assured that the highest educational standards and relevance of programme provision are maintained and enhanced. The Senate considers that the model of critical and analytical peer review, involving both internal and external colleagues, is the best way of judging the appropriateness and standard of a programme.

The general responsibilities of the College in connection with validation, approval and review are to:

- a. ensure that programmes are designed and operated in accordance with approved principles and regulations;
- b. maintain the standards of awards and to ensure that no programme continues to operate without adequate staffing and other resources;
- c. establish and maintain procedures for the regular monitoring of programmes;
- d. ensure that once a programme has been approved any conditions for approval are implemented, and that any recommendations arising from the validation process are fully considered and appropriate action taken;
- e. ensure that the reports of External Examiners and Internal Moderators are received and formally considered as part of the Annual Programme Review and that, where necessary, appropriate action is taken within an appropriate timescale.

DEFINITIONS

Validation: Validation is the process whereby a judgment is reached by a group including external peers as to whether a programme designed to lead to an academic award of specified level meets the accepted requirements for that award.

Approval: Outline approval is the process whereby the College's Senior

Management Team has agreed that a proposal for a new programme of study is approved to proceed to full validation.

Approval is the outcome of a validation where a programme of study has been judged to meet the College's requirements and is authorised to recruit students.

Revalidation: Revalidation is the process whereby the progress of an existing programme is critically appraised by a group of people including external peers and any plans for change are considered. The purpose is to confirm that the programme remains of an appropriate quality and standard.

Monitoring: Monitoring is the regular internal process by which an institution appraises critically a programme between reviews and ensures that appropriate standards are maintained. Each programme should be monitored annually as part of the Annual Programme Review process.

NEW PROGRAMME PROPOSALS

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST STAGE

Academic planning and resource approval is the responsibility of the Senate. All new programme proposals must first receive approval by Academic Standards Committee (ASC) before being scrutinised by the College's Senior Management Team (SMT); if those committees agree, the proposal will then be submitted to the Senate for approval to proceed to full validation.

If you have an idea for a new academic development (a new MA, for example, or a new mode of study), you should in the first instance complete the 'Expression of Interest' template, available from [Space](#). The purpose of this form is to enable ASC to evaluate the academic and business case for the proposed development; including consideration of its 'fit' with the College's Mission and Strategic Plan, an analysis of its likely market and a summary of the resource requirements. It should be accompanied by a finance plan that enables applicants to model cost and revenue options dynamically in both the short and longer term, and thus to make a business case for the proposal.

Any expression of interest must have the support of the appropriate

School and of the relevant Heads of Programme/Service. It is the responsibility of the School's Leadership Team to ensure that a strong case has been made for any change in academic provision.

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST OUTCOMES

ASC and SMT will consider the expression of interest and will decide whether the proposal:

- has outline approval to be presented to the Senate with a recommendation to proceed to validation, subject to further scrutiny by ASC of the academic content of the programme of study (see below);
- requires further work for presentation before outline approval can be given;
- proposal is not approved.

ASC WORKING GROUP

ASC is charged with approving the academic content of a proposed new programme of study before it proceeds to a full validation event. ASC may devolve detailed consideration of the proposal to a small sub-group of the Committee (usually comprising the Chair, the Secretary and/or Head of the Academic Development Office, and one member of academic staff who may or may not be a member of ASC), which will assist the proposer in developing the content and organisation of the curriculum and shaping the requisite documentation. It will meet no later than one month before the validation is scheduled to take place. To guarantee the objectivity of the event, the academic staff member would not normally be involved in the subsequent validation.

VALIDATION PANEL – TERMS OF REFERENCE

The responsibilities of validation panels are to ensure that the academic standard of each award granted and conferred by the Senate is set and maintained at an appropriate level and to ensure that programmes of study are of an appropriate quality to fulfil these requirements.

A validation panel will act on behalf of the Senate under the following terms of reference to:

- examine the philosophy, aims and objectives of the programme in

relation to the College's Mission Statement, existing and planned programmes in the School and the relevant policies agreed by the Senate;

- ensure that the learning outcomes of new awards are of an appropriate level in relation to the national Framework for Higher Education Qualifications;
- pay particular regard to the structure, coherence, currency and integration of the programme curriculum;
- scrutinise the academic content and organisation of the programme;
- ensure that the teaching, learning and assessment strategies used are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the programme;
- ensure that the programme team has sufficient coherence, leadership and spread of expertise;
- ensure that the necessary staff expertise is available, and that staff development has been planned appropriately;
- ensure that the resource implications of a new proposal have been fully considered;
- ensure that there is an equivalence between full-time and part-time modes of study, where applicable;
- review the accuracy, completeness and reliability of the information provided to students.

VALIDATION PANEL – MEMBERSHIP

The number and balance of members (including external representation) is established through consultation between the Chair of the Academic Standards Committee and the Head of Programme, final approval resting with the Academic Standards Committee. The validation panel will normally include:

- the Chair of the Academic Standards Committee (or a Dean of School or Head of Programme nominated by the Academic Standards Committee);
- at least two external assessors, one of whom should have relevant industrial or professional background with appropriate knowledge of the discipline, and the other with an educational background;
- two members of the College, representing the Academic Standards Committee, external to the School concerned, normally a Dean of School, Head of Programme or Senior Tutor.
- A student representative, usually a student sabbatical officer.

The panel may also include an observer from within the College as part of

the staff development process.

THE ROLE OF EXTERNAL ASSESSORS

Programme teams are asked to nominate the two external members of the panel themselves, for approval by the Academic Standards Committee. External assessors should be able to take an objective, impartial view of the programme. Recent tutors or External Examiners are therefore not appropriate nominations; an occasional guest lecturer may not be deemed unsuitable.

External assessors are chosen for the relevance of their subject-based knowledge. They may be drawn from another College or University or from the relevant industry or profession. As subject experts, external assessors are asked to comment in particular (but not exclusively) on the currency, coherence and relevance of the curriculum and, for those with an education background, on the proposal's 'fit' with the national Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.

THE ROLE OF INTERNAL ASSESSORS

Internal assessors are appointed from another School within the College. They provide non-subject specific expertise and will advise on issues such as learning and teaching methods, workload, assessment strategies, and the equivalence of the student experience within the RCA environment.

DOCUMENTATION

As far as possible, documentation should be self-contained and not require extensive reference to other sources. However, additional information may be supplied if panel members make requests in good time. Documentation may differ (in order or emphasis) from that set out below, but it should as a minimum comprise:

- confirmation from the Dean of School that the submission has the academic support of the School and an overview of the context of the programme within the School;
- a brief history of the development process, clearly indicating major decisions and developments and any issues raised at the outline approval stage;
- a draft programme specification, using the College template. This will

include a statement on the programme's aims and learning outcomes, its structure and curriculum, learning and teaching strategies, and the regulations and criteria relating to admission, progression and examination;

- brief syllabus outlines including indicative book lists or equivalent;
- details of staff and staff development policies with particular reference to recent research and professional and scholarly activities;
- details of the management of the programme, the organisation and allocation of responsibilities to staff, arrangements for programme monitoring and evaluation and the mechanisms for seeking student feedback;
- information on the resources available for the programme in sufficient detail to show that the expenditure in relation to all aspects of the programme (including College-wide provision such as learning resources, student welfare and computing provision), accommodation, equipment, educational visits, etc. has been calculated and can be met from the resources likely to be available;
- details of institutional collaboration, if any, with other (educational, industrial, commercial or public service) establishments including, where necessary, Memoranda of Co-operation and full details of the academic and managerial arrangements proposed.

The validation documents should be circulated two weeks in advance of the meeting. The papers should be sent to the Academic Development Office in sufficient time to allow for photocopying (please allow at least two days). The documents should be collated ready for photocopying, i.e. single sided, unstapled, with a title sheet, an index and pages numbers.

Panel members will be invited to request additional information or seek clarification on particular issues before the event.

CRITERIA

The following criteria are normally used:

- the validity and appropriateness of the structure and content of the programme, its coherence and progression, the level of the intellectual demands made on students, its success in meeting its aims and objectives, the appropriateness of its content and its relevance to good professional practice;
- the general subject authority and intellectual quality of the staff as

demonstrated, for example, by particular research and subject strengths, contribution to the profession through exhibitions, commissions, publications, conference papers, consultancy etc.;

- the ability of the School to monitor, critically evaluate and maintain the standards of the programme, the potential for future development, and the quality of programme leadership and management;
- the level and deployment of resources – the appropriateness of staffing, accommodation, technical and learning resources.

MEETING OF THE PANEL

Detailed schedules will be drawn up by the Secretary to the validation panel in consultation with the Chair and the programme team. This schedule is subject to confirmation or alteration at an early private session of the panel.

Validations are typically half-day events that enable the panel to interrogate the curriculum documents with the programme team. The panel may request to visit the partner institution and/or specialist facilities, where applicable. A further half-day event is normally scheduled later in the academic year, to enable the panel to review the programme team's progress and the final version of the curriculum documents.

A typical timetable for a validation would begin with a private meeting of the panel to set the agenda and identify issues for discussion, followed by a lengthier meeting of the panel and the programme team to discuss the proposal. Typical areas of discussion would include:

- Level of the award and 'fit' with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications;
- Philosophy, aims and objectives;
- Curriculum – currency and coherence;
- Learning, teaching and assessment strategies;
- Resources: staffing, facilities and learning resources.

A final, private meeting of the panel would then precede a concluding meeting with the programme team to outline the outcome of the validation.

OUTCOMES, CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A programme may be approved, or validated, for an indefinite period subject to regular reviews (the first of which usually falls within 3 years). Alternatively, the programme proposal may be rejected or the validation may be continued at some later time.

The conclusions of the report of an event will include two types of formal requirement:

- conditions: which the School and/or programme team is required to meet or respond to within an agreed period of time or according to an agreed schedule of actions. It may be specified that certain conditions must be met before students may be enrolled on the programme, for example, finalisation of the programme specification or final agreement between collaborating institutions;
- recommendations: which the School and/or programme team must consider but need not necessarily act upon other than reporting whatever action is taken (together with explanation) to the Academic Standards Committee.

The validation panel will specify a deadline by which the programme team should report to Academic Standards Committee on the actions it has taken in respect of any conditions or recommendations.

The validation report will also identify aspects of programmes of study which are particularly innovative or which represent good practice.

The report of the validation will be circulated to members of the panel for comment before being confirmed. The report is then subject to approval by the Academic Standards Committee, prior to formal agreement by the Senate. Schools should consider and, if appropriate, take action on this finalised report. Academic Standards Committee is required to confirm that any conditions of the validation have been met within the period specified by the validation panel.

REVALIDATION

The revalidation process is intended to encourage effective and responsive programme development and review whilst enabling the Senate to be assured that the highest educational standards and

relevance of academic provision are maintained and enhanced. The Senate considers that the model of critical and analytical peer review, involving both internal and external colleagues, is the best way of judging the quality and standard of a programme of study (a taught Masters programme, MPhil or PhD programme).

REVALIDATION PANEL AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

The composition of a revalidation panel, and the roles of its constituent members, is typically the same as that for the validation of a new programme:

- the Chair of the Academic Standards Committee;
- at least two external assessors;
- two members of the College, representing the Academic Standards Committee.

In 2014/15, the panel will also normally include a student representative.

The panel's terms of reference are also identical, although the following items additionally apply:

- ensure that the programme has undergone a sufficiently critical, rigorous and objective annual review and that appropriate academic standards are being maintained and, wherever possible, enhanced;
- with regard to the academic content and organisation of the programme, ensure that student involvement has been given appropriate emphasis;
- ensure that appropriate external advice has been taken and that External Examiners have been appropriately involved and any necessary action arising from their reports has been taken;
- ensure that the resource implications of any change to an existing programme have been fully considered and that resource requirements have been agreed in advance by the Senior Management Team;
- ensure that the philosophy, aims and objectives, together with the overall structure and context of the programme, have been effectively communicated to the students;
- view the students' work and the facilities available to the programme.

DOCUMENTATION

Documentation may differ (in order or emphasis) from that set out below, but it should as a minimum comprise:

- A brief overview by the Dean of School including:
 - information on the School context;
 - the relationship between the programmes within the School;
 - future plans for the School.
- An overview report by the Head of Programme
An analysis of the current status of the programme including:
 - a brief summary of the history of the programme, indicating major developments;
 - confirmation of current student numbers;
 - priorities and aspirations for the future.
- MA Programme:
 - the MA programme specification;
 - the MA programme handbook;
 - any additional information provided for students by the programme.
- Research Students:
 - any additional information provided for research students by the programme team.
- Appendices:
 - details of the admission process and criteria for entry;
 - Annual Programme Review reports (minimum of two years);
 - External Examiners' and Internal Moderators' reports (minimum of two years);
 - student statistics (provided by the Registry as part of the Annual Programme Review process);
 - a brief explanation of the programme budget (including external income);
 - staffing details including the names, position, days per week, curriculum vitae for all contracted staff and details of visiting staff;
 - summary of graduate destinations (minimum of five years).

The validation documents should be circulated two weeks in advance of the meeting. The papers should be sent to the Academic Development Office in sufficient time to allow for photocopying (please allow at least two days). The documents should be collated ready for photocopying, i.e. single sided, unstapled, with a title sheet and an index.

Panel members will be invited to request additional information or seek clarification on particular issues before the event.

CRITERIA

The following criteria are normally used:

- the validity and appropriateness of the structure and content of the programme, its coherence and progression, the level of the intellectual demands made on students, its success in meeting its aims and objectives, the appropriateness of its content and its relevance to good professional practice;
- the general subject authority and intellectual quality of the staff as demonstrated, for example, by particular research and subject strengths, contribution to the profession through exhibitions, commissions, publications, conference papers, consultancy etc.;
- the ability of the School to monitor, critically evaluate and maintain the standards of the programme, the potential for future development, and the quality of programme leadership and management;
- the level and deployment of resources – the appropriateness of staffing, accommodation, technical and learning resources;
- the effectiveness of the learning process – the quality of teaching and the performance of students as measured by programme work, studio work, projects, examinations, and through the principles and processes of assessment.

RESEARCH PROGRAMMES

The panel will also consider the arrangements for supporting research students (MPhil and PhD) in addition to the review of the MA programmes. Validation panels will receive College, School and programme-level documents relating to research students and will have the opportunity to meet with a small number of research students.

Research programmes are not formally part of the College's validation process in the same way as MA programmes but validation panels will be invited to make suggestions or recommendations for improvements.

MEETING OF THE PANEL

Detailed schedules will be drawn up by the Secretary to the validation panel in consultation with the Chair and the Head of Programme. This schedule is subject to confirmation or alteration at an early private session of the panel.

During the event, validation panels will consider College and programme-level documentation and may see programme and School facilities, teaching materials, studio work, project briefs, student project reports and examples of present and past students' work, Critical & Historical Studies dissertations or other types of written work as appropriate. One member of the panel (usually the Chair) will have responsibility for reviewing the programme's student records to ensure that written feedback to students is in compliance with good practice agreed by the Senate. The panel will meet both academic and technical staff and will have the opportunity to talk informally with students. There will also be a private meeting with 6-8 student representatives to enable them to comment on the content, delivery and operation of the programme of study and their experience of the College.

A typical timetable for a revalidation is as follows:

9.30am – 10.15am	Private meeting of the revalidation panel
10.15am – 11.45am	Meeting of revalidation panel and the programme team
11.45am – 12.00pm	Private meeting of the revalidation panel
12.00pm – 1.00pm	Meeting of the revalidation panel with student representatives
1.00pm – 2.00pm	Working lunch for the revalidation panel
2.00pm – 2.30pm	Tour of programme facilities
2.30pm – 3.30pm	Review of student work and student files
3.30pm – 4.30pm	Meeting of revalidation panel and the programme team
4.30pm – 5.15pm	Private meeting of the revalidation panel to agree the main themes of the draft report and the conclusion, conditions and recommendations

5.15pm – 5.30pm

Summary meeting of the revalidation panel and the programme team

ASC has the discretion to extend revalidations to two days, for example in cases where major changes to the MA curriculum are proposed or where the programme involves a partnership with another institution.

OUTCOMES, CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An MA programme may be revalidated for a period of up to six years (subject to the submission of Annual Programme Reviews). Alternatively it may be agreed that the programme should not be validated or revalidated in its present form or that the event should be continued at some later time. The validation panel may also make suggestions or recommendations relating to the programmes for research students.

The conclusions of the validation report will comment on the quality and standard of the programmes of study and may include recommendations for action to remedy any identified shortcomings and for the further enhancement of quality and standards. There are two types of formal requirement:

- conditions: which the School and/or programme staff are required to meet or respond to within an agreed period of time or according to an agreed schedule of actions. It may be specified that certain conditions must be met before the next intake of students may be enrolled on the programme;
- recommendations: which the School and/or programme staff must consider but need not necessarily act upon other than reporting whatever action is taken (together with an explanation) to the Academic Standards Committee.

The validation panel will either specify a deadline by which the programme should report to Academic Standards Committee on the actions it has taken in respect of any conditions or recommendations, or it will agree that this responsibility can be discharged within the Annual Programme Review process.

The validation report will also identify aspects of programmes of study which are particularly innovative or which represent good practice.

The report of the validation will be circulated to members of the panel for comment before being confirmed. The report is then subject to approval by the Academic Standards Committee, prior to formal agreement by the Senate. Schools should consider and, if appropriate, take action on this finalised report. Academic Standards Committee is required to confirm that any conditions of the revalidation have been met before admitting the next cohort of students.

INTERIM REVIEW

Interim review is a new process that has been introduced for 2014/15. Its purpose is to enable ASC to address academic concerns at a programme or School level, over and above revalidation and Annual Programme Review.

ASC has the discretion to trigger an interim review if it identifies a significant matter of concern. This might be:

- an External Examiner stating that the standards set for the awards are not appropriate for qualifications at this level;
- in the annual student survey, an overall student satisfaction rate of less than 70%, or a concern about responses within any of the categories in the survey;
- the non-submission of an Annual Programme Review.

If a programme, or an aspect of a programme, is identified as of academic concern, the following measures will be taken:

- The relevant Dean of School and/or Head of Programme will be required to attend ASC to discuss the issue(s) identified. At this point, if ASC is confident that the concern is a) unwarranted or b) being satisfactorily addressed, then no further action will be taken and the School and/or programme would no longer be considered as a concern.
- If ASC feels that the concern is significant, or that the actions developed to address the concern are insufficient, ongoing monitoring will take place, with the Dean of School and/or Head of Programme being required to attend future meetings of ASC to discuss the issue(s). The School/programme will continue to be considered an academic concern and be included as a standing item in the list of ASC actions.
- If, after this second discussion, ASC is still unconvinced as to the definition or delivery of actions to address the concern, a revalidation will be convened.

MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMMES

The College recognises that periodic changes will be made to approved programmes of study in the light of student feedback, External Examiner reports, the Annual Programme Review process and developments in the professional and educational context of each subject area. For procedural purposes, such modifications to programmes are classified as **minor** or **major**, and are defined below.

A **minor modification** is a change to the content or organisation of a programme that has only a limited impact on the experience of students on that programme. An example of a minor modification would be a change to the length or structure of the workshop induction programme, or an alteration in the balance between a programme's structured project programme and the time given to students for personal research.

A **major modification** is one that leads to a significant change in the experience of students on the programme, particularly where the aims and learning outcomes of the programme are affected. Major modifications would typically include proposed alterations to:

- the planned duration of a programme;
- a programme's title or the nature of the award on offer (for example, from an MA to an MPhil);
- the overall structure of a programme or its system of assessment (including the form, process and/or operation of assessment);
- the operation and delivery of a programme (for example, where a collaboration with another institution or organisation, or a part-time or distance learning route, is proposed).

Major modifications would also include the addition to a programme of:

- specialisms or routes;
- platforms, pathways or themes.

The cumulative effect of a number of minor modifications may be deemed by the Academic Standards Committee to constitute a major modification if the overall nature of the programme is altered.

Proposed alterations to programmes should be first approved by the relevant programme committee, which includes both staff and student

representation, and by the School Leadership Team (in the case of major modifications). All programme modification proposals should then be submitted to the Academic Standards Committee for consideration, although minor modifications will normally only be presented via the Review process for information. It is possible that ASC will decide that major modifications will entail a revalidation event.

Further advice on the approval process, and what constitutes a minor/major modification, can be sought from the Academic Development Office.

COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

The College has entered into collaborative or partnership arrangements which enable it to provide access to facilities, resources and academic expertise which are beyond its range, and thereby make it possible to deliver programmes of study and research in these areas. The partnership arrangement with the Victoria and Albert Museum, for example, provides access to historic collections, curatorial, conservation and scientific expertise, technical facilities and research resources which could not be provided other than through partnership with a major museum.

DEFINITIONS

Dual award: collaborative arrangements under which two or more awarding institutions together provide programmes leading to separate awards of both, or all, of them.

Partnership: an agreement to collaborate with another institution, usually one which does not hold degree awarding powers.

Validation: the process by which an awarding institution judges that a programme developed and delivered by another institution is of an appropriate quality and standard to lead to one of its awards.

Current collaborative arrangements are:

Dual award: The Innovation Design Engineering and Global Innovation Design programmes offer a dual award with Imperial College London. Students are registered with, and are eligible to receive awards from, both institutions – the MA(RCA) and the MSc of Imperial College.

Partnership agreements: The History of Design programme offers a joint MA in History of Design and MPhil and PhD programmes with the Victoria and Albert Museum.

Validation: The College validates the National Film and Television School's MA in Film and Television.

The Senate of the College is responsible for the quality and standard of programmes and awards delivered through collaborative arrangements. All collaborative arrangements are, therefore, considered in the context of the RCA's strategies and policies for fulfilling its responsibilities for all its awards, irrespective of the mode or place of study.

All new collaborative development proposals should be consonant with the College's Mission Statement and Strategic Plan.

The academic standards of all awards made under a collaborative arrangement should meet the expectations of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, should be comparable to awards for programmes delivered by the College, and should be comparable with any relevant benchmark information recognised within the UK.

All collaborative arrangements must meet the precepts of the UK Quality Code on 'Managing higher education provision with others' (section B10), which specifies that the procedures for assuring quality and standards of collaborative arrangements should be as rigorous, secure and open to scrutiny as those for programmes of study provided wholly within a single institution.

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FOR COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Academic planning and resource approval is the responsibility of the Senate. All new proposals for collaborative arrangements must first receive approval by Academic Standards Committee (ASC) before being scrutinised by the College's Senior Management Team (SMT); if those committees agree, the proposal will then be submitted to the Senate for approval to proceed to full validation.

If you have an idea for a new collaborative arrangement (partnership, dual

award or validation), you should in the first instance complete the 'Expression of Interest' template, available from [Space](#). The purpose of this form is to enable ASC to evaluate the academic and business case for the proposed development; including consideration of its 'fit' with the College's Mission and Strategic Plan, an analysis of its likely market and a summary of the resource requirements. It should be accompanied by a finance plan that enables applicants to model cost and revenue options dynamically in both the short and longer term, and thus to make a business case for the proposal.

ASC and SMT will consider the expression of interest and will decide whether the proposal:

- has outline approval to be presented to the Senate with a recommendation to proceed to validation, subject to further scrutiny by ASC of the academic content of the programme of study (see below);
- requires further work for presentation before outline approval can be given;
- proposal is not approved.

PARTNERSHIP APPROVAL

Partnership review is a process through which the RCA considers whether a potential new partner shares similar values to those of the College. It is undertaken in association with the potential partner and is designed to enable both organisations to satisfy themselves that collaboration at an institutional level will be harmonious, fruitful and beneficial to future students and the organisations themselves. In this context it is important to note that potential partners are offered the opportunity to conduct such a review of the RCA.

The form the partnership review process will take will be informed by a risk assessment of the proposed partner by the Academic Standards Committee. Whether a review is by documentation alone or by a visit to the partner organisation will be influenced by the level of risk associated with the proposed partnership. It is anticipated that most proposals would be capable of review by documentation alone, with visits reserved for high-risk proposals.

It is recognised that potential partners vary in nature and standing and

that some proposals will be deemed low risk due to the partner's characteristics. Nevertheless it is essential that due diligence applies to all proposals, and hence a certain level of scrutiny is essential however prestigious the potential link. The UK Quality Code (Section B10, page 3) states that there is a need for 'a conscious formality in some aspects of the management of a collaborative relationship, which may sometimes seem to run counter to the notion of the equality of the partners'. That formality 'offers protection to all, students as well as collaborating organisations, and its adoption in this spirit should help to bolster, not undermine, mutual confidence in the operation of partnerships.'

Whether the review is by documentation alone or with an additional visit, the underlying principles are the same. The review will examine whether the potential partner has an infrastructure in place to deliver a high quality learning experience for students comparable in standard to that provided by the College. The review will also consider the academic, financial and legal aspects of the potential partnership, at institutional level. Note will be taken of relevant strategies, policies and practices.

The potential partner will be asked to provide documentation in respect of:

- Legal status – Memorandum and Articles of Association;
- Financial standing – the last three years' audited accounts;
- Academic standing and infrastructure – organisational infrastructure; mission, aims and objectives; scope of activities; standards/levels of provision; quality assurance and enhancement policies and procedures; learning resource infrastructure; student experience.

As well as considering the ability of potential partners to contract, and confirming financial probity, the review will consider:

- The partner's organisational arrangements and infrastructure;
- How standards are maintained;
- The partner's strategic approach to, and arrangements, for quality assurance and enhancement;
- The effectiveness of the learning infrastructure provided by the partner;
- The student experience and how this is provided and ensured

The review panel will normally consist of: the Pro-Rector (Academic), the Academic Registrar, the Head of Programme proposing the collaborative

arrangement and a member of the Academic Standards Committee who is independent of the proposed partnership. Other members of staff may be consulted as required and it may be necessary to consult with the College's lawyers to satisfy the panel with regard to the proposed partner's financial probity and capacity to contract. For a documentation-only review, reviewers may request additional documentation and/or recommend a review visit.

Where a proposed partnership is deemed high risk – for example, with a private sector organisation or an overseas educational provider – a review visit must be undertaken in addition to receipt of the documentation listed above. In such instances the potential partner will be asked to provide the necessary facilities for the review to be conducted (such as a suitable meeting room, availability of staff, and access to additional documents).

A member of the Academic Development Office will act as secretary to the review panel. A report of the review will be submitted to the Academic Standards Committee outlining conclusions and further actions and recommending one of the following:

- that the proposed partnership can proceed;
- that the proposed partnership can proceed, subject to the satisfactory resolution of any issues requiring further clarification;
- that the proposed partnership should not proceed at this time.

Note: if the financial and/or legal requirements are not met then the partnership cannot proceed.

Partnership approval will be subject to periodic review as specified by the review panel.

PARTNERSHIP REAPPROVAL

All collaborative partnerships are subject to periodic review, at least once every six years, to enable the College to ensure that the partnership continues to be operationally effective and strategically beneficial. Partnership re-approval is normally a documentation-only process; a site visit may be agreed, however, in the case of high-risk collaborations or where a recent programme revalidation has indicated particular areas of concern. The re-approval process may also be brought forward in the event that significant concerns about the partnership emerge from other

sources. Re-approval will normally be timed to coincide with either the relevant programme revalidation, the review of an associated Memorandum of Cooperation or Written Agreement between the RCA and the partner institution, or the review of the validation fee charged by the College.

Approximately six months prior to the re-approval date, the Academic Development Office will ascertain whether re-approval is sought by both the College and the partner institution itself. If not, then processes for withdrawal must be put in place, as stipulated in the associated Memorandum of Cooperation or Written Agreement.

Where re-approval is sought, the Academic Development Office will contact the partner institution with a series of due diligence enquiries relating, *inter alia*, to its continued financial and legal standing. The ADO will concurrently make a recommendation to Academic Standards Committee about the level of risk associated with the partnership and therefore whether or not a site visit should take place.

The re-approval panel will normally comprise the Chair of ASC, the Quality Assurance Manager and a member of ASC who is independent of the partnership. Other members of staff may be consulted as required and it may be necessary to consult with the College's lawyers to satisfy the panel with regard to the partner's financial probity.

For documentation-only re-approvals, the panel will be provided with a due diligence report compiled by the Academic Development Office together with the most Annual Programme Review(s) or equivalent, External Examiner(s') report(s) and revalidation report(s). The panel may also request further documentation, and may recommend a site visit. For site visits, the panel will, in addition to scrutinising the above documentation, meet with senior institutional staff at the partner, staff involved in the teaching of the associated programme(s) and with students.

The re-approval panel will produce a report for ASC that addresses the operation of the partnership and that makes one of the following recommendations about its continuation:

- Re-approval of the partnership for a maximum of six years;

- Re-approval of the partnership subject to certain conditions and/or recommendations;
- Discontinuation of the partnership.

The recommendation of the panel will be considered by ASC and then submitted to the Senate for ratification.

PROGRAMME APPROVAL

Once a proposed collaboration has been approved through the partnership review process, proposals for the delivery of an academic programme such as MA or MPhil/PhD may be considered under the College's validation procedures (see above).

If approved, all collaborative arrangements will be subject to a written Memorandum of Co-operation signed by the Heads of the contracting parties which will include details of:

- general principles;
- the period of operation;
- termination and arbitration arrangements;
- financial arrangements;
- the respecting responsibilities of the contracting parties for academic standards and quality assurance;
- arrangements for:
 - the enrolment and registration of students;
 - examination of students;
 - external examiner and internal moderator appointments;
 - issuing of award certificates;
 - provision of documentation and information to the College;
 - approval of publicity and promotional material;
- responsibilities relating to student discipline, complaints and appeals.

QUALITY ASSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS

All collaborative arrangements are subject to the College's quality assurance arrangements for validation, annual review and external examination (specific details to be specified in the Memorandum of Co-operation) and to any additional requirements of external agencies associated with the College such as the Higher Education Funding Council for England and the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

Collaborative arrangements will, in addition to the College's usual quality assurance requirements, normally be subject to the establishment of a Joint Academic Advisory Board comprising members of the partner institutions which will advise on the planning, delivery and future direction of the programme.

REVALIDATION SCHEDULE, 2014/15 – 2019/20

2014/15

Fashion	Postponed from 2012/13
History of Design	Postponed from 2013/14
Textiles	Postponed from 2013/14
Architecture	
Visual Communication	
Curating Contemporary Art	
Service Design	
Interior Design	
Information Experience Design	
Global Innovation Design review	
Partnership reapprovals: Imperial College London and V&A Museum	

2015/16

Critical and Historical Studies	Postponed from 2014/15
Painting	Postponed from 2014/15
Film and Television (NFTS)	
Global Innovation Design	
Sculpture interim review (summer)	
Partnership reapproval: NFTS (by December 2016)	

2016/17

Animation	Postponed from 2015/16
Photography	Postponed from 2015/16
Design Interactions	
Design Products	
Jewellery & Metal / Ceramics & Glass interim reviews	

2017/18

RIBA revalidation of Architecture

2018/19

Critical Writing in Art and Design
QAA Higher Education Review

2019/20

Jewellery & Metal

Ceramics & Glass
Vehicle Design
Printmaking
Sculpture

PROGRAMME MONITORING AND REVIEW

ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

The purpose of the Annual Programme Review (APR) process is to evaluate the quality of the learning experience of students enrolled on the College's MA and research programmes, and to enable the Senate to ensure that academic standards are maintained and enhanced.

The responsibility for monitoring the standard of all academic provision (MA programmes, MPhil and PhD programmes) rests with the School. Heads of Programme are required to present their Review report annually in the autumn term to their School Leadership Team, providing an analytical and evaluative account of their programme's performance.

THE REVIEW PROCESS

To be effective the Review process should result from an open and constructive consultation with staff and students and should represent the summary of a continual process of monitoring and evaluation.

Programmes must hold a minimum of two Programme Review Committees (PRCs) per year to review their academic health and progress. PRCs are the primary formal mechanism at a programme level for overseeing the academic standards of the College's awards and the quality of its students' learning opportunities,

The discussions held at PRCs contribute to and inform the submission of the APR. There are standard terms of reference, and membership, for PRCs across the College, available to download from [Space](#). Elected Student Representatives are members, and must have the opportunity to comment on the MA External Examiner(s') report(s).

Minutes of the PRCs should be included in the Annual Programme Review. Staff (including key Visiting Lecturers) and Student Representatives taking part in the Review should receive a copy of the final version of the report.

PRCs should not be confused with Programme Forums, which bring the

entire programme together – staff and students – to exchange information and facilitate discussion as a group on important changes or plans for the programme’s future. Standard terms of reference also apply, and can be found on [Space](#).

STUDENT FEEDBACK

Student representatives are elected by their peers to represent the views and interests of students to College staff, and to provide student input into the monitoring, development and planning of academic programmes.

Every programme at the RCA has four (two first year and two second year) MA student representatives and one research student representative, all of whom are elected at the start of the autumn term. Student representatives attend Programme Review Committees (see above), and meet regularly with their Head of Programme to feed back student views. The Student Representatives serve from 1 December to 30 November annually.

The Student Representatives form a Council, which is the ruling body of the Students’ Union, responsible for decision-making and Union democracy for College-wide purposes. Student Representatives bring forward issues from Programme Review Committees and Programme Forums to the President and Vice-President of the Students’ Union who then, where appropriate, present these issues at College committees or to the senior management of the College. Student Representatives are expected to attend the relevant programme and Students’ Union meetings to report student views and concerns.

The Academic Standards Committee recommends that, as good practice, students should have the opportunity to meet as a group and report their views to the Programme Review Committee via the elected Student Representatives.

MA student feedback is also obtained through a College-wide survey that enables students to comment anonymously on their experiences of the College. The survey is distributed in the spring/summer by the Academic Development Office, which then collates the data – and distributes it to Schools and programmes – by the end of June. The College participates in the national Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), in lieu of this internal survey, and the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey

(PRES) every other year.

Heads of Programme are required to analyse and respond to student feedback in the Annual Programme Review report and report back to students on actions taken. It is recommended that a standing item relating to responses to the student survey is included on programme forum agendas. Minutes of these meetings should be circulated to all students, and Heads of Programme may also like to consider posting them on programme websites.

Student reports and questionnaires are also considered by the Students' Union and the Academic Standards Committee.

SCHOOL REVIEW OF APRs

School Leadership Teams discuss and evaluate all APR reports from their School in the autumn term; Deans of School subsequently submit an overview report to Academic Standards Committee in the spring. It is important that Reviews are received punctually to enable SLTs to give each one appropriate attention.

REVIEW SCHEDULE 2014/15

The timetable for Annual Programme Reviews for 2014/15 is as follows:

- June 2014: student survey data sent to programmes; APR and School Overview templates circulated;
- July 2014: Registry statistics circulated; External Examiner and Internal Moderator reports circulated;
- Monday 29th September 2014: Deadline for APR submission;
- October 2014: SLTs discuss and evaluate APRs;
- November 2014: Dean drafts School overview and circulates to Heads of Programme for comment;
- Monday 1st December 2014: Deadline for School Overview submission;
- Wednesday 17th December 2014: ASC discussion of School Overview reports;
- Monday 26th January 2015: Deadline for submission of ILTS Review;
- Wednesday 11th February 2015: Draft summary of issues arising from

APRs discussed at ASC;

- Wednesday 25th February 2015: Executive summary of issues arising from APR process received by the Senate.

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS – MASTER OF ARTS

THE ROLE OF THE EXTERNAL EXAMINER

External Examiners enable the College to ensure that the:

- academic standard for each award is set and maintained at an appropriate level and that student performance is properly judged against this;
- standards of awards are comparable with those of other UK higher education institutions;
- process of assessment and examination is fair and has been fairly conducted.

CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT

An External Examiner's academic/professional qualifications should be appropriate to the programme to be examined, with both the level and the subjects of those qualifications generally matching what is to be examined. An External Examiner should have appropriate standing, expertise and experience to fulfil the role. An External Examiner should have relevant teaching, assessment or external examining experience, preferably at postgraduate level, or comparable related experience to indicate competence in assessing students in the subject and ensuring comparability of standards.

If the proposed examiner has no previous external examining experience at postgraduate level, the application should be supported by either:

- other external examining experience;
- extensive internal examining experience;
- other relevant and recent experience likely to support the External Examiner role.

In special circumstances more than one External Examiner may be appointed.

External Examiners should be drawn from a variety of institutional/professional contexts. There must not be reciprocal external examining

between programmes in the College and another institution or replacement of an External Examiner by another individual from the same institution. External Examiners should not have previous close involvement with the College which might compromise their objectivity. Over the last three years a proposed External Examiner should not have been a member of staff, a member of the Council, a student, or a near relative of a member of staff or an examiner for another MA programme in the College. External Examiners should not normally hold more than the equivalent of two substantial examining appointments or three smaller appointments at the same time. Exceptionally, for example in a particularly small discipline, an External Examiner may be re-appointed to examine a programme after a period of three years.

External Examiners are appointed by the Senate on the recommendation of the Academic Standards Committee following nomination by the Head of Programme.

LENGTH OF APPOINTMENT

The normal term of office of an External Examiner will be three years. The appointment will normally commence in the January before the first examination.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Although there is inevitably some variability in the roles of External Examiners across the College, due to the breadth, complexity and differing philosophies of the programmes on offer (and, in some cases, the requirements of professional bodies), there are nevertheless certain core duties that they are expected to fulfill.

These can be summarised as follows:

- to judge whether the standards set for the awards are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject;
- to judge whether student performance is comparable with the standards in similar programmes in other UK institutions with which they are familiar;
- to judge whether the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted;
- to attend all meetings of the Final Examination Board, including

Referral Boards;

- to have an equal voice in the deliberations of the Examination Board, and to sign, with other members, the examination results list issued by the Registry;
- to ensure that each student being examined is fairly dealt with by the Examination Board, and that the laws of natural justice prevail;
- to make an annual report on the performance of the students and the conduct of the examination, using the pro forma established for this purpose.

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS

External Examiners are required to report annually on the performance of the students and the conduct of the examination.

The purpose of the report is to enable the Senate to judge whether the programme is meeting its stated objectives and to make any necessary improvements, either immediately or at the next review of the programme as appropriate. Examiners are asked to respond to the following statements:

- in the view of the examiners, the standards set for the awards are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject, and in accordance with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ);
- in the view of the examiners, the standards of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which they are familiar;
- in the view of the examiners, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound, fairly conducted and in line with the College's policies and regulations.

External Examiners are also asked to comment under the following headings:

- curriculum design;
- learning and teaching;
- innovation or good practice;
- administration of the examination;
- further suggestions, recommendations or other comments on the programme.

In the final year of appointment External Examiners are invited to provide a brief overview report on developments in the programme during their term of office. Heads of Programme are required to consider and respond to External Examiners' reports as part of the Annual Programme Review process. **As part of this process the External Examiners' reports will be available to the programme's Student Representatives.** External Examiners will receive a summary of the programme's response to their comments.

EXTERNAL EXAMINERS – RESEARCH

External Examiners for research (MPhil / PhD) degrees must be competent in the specialised area of research and should have appropriate standing, expertise and experience to maintain the College's academic standards.

Following the receipt of the thesis/written report and comprehensive evidence of studio work, but prior to examination, External Examiner(s) should submit written comments to the Director of Research outlining their initial response to the work and suggesting areas to be discussed at the examination. These notes do not constitute a formal report and they are strictly confidential to the Examination Board. However, in the event of referral, information in the pre-viva reports may be incorporated (in an edited form) into the letter sent to the student to assist in the process of revision.

After the oral examination, the External Examiners report on the performance of the student and the conduct of the examination.

1 STANDARDS

- The overall performance of the student in relation to the requirements for MPhil or PhD degrees. External Examiners are asked to pay particular attention to evidence of originality in relation to the:
 - the research questions that have been addressed, or the area that has been explored in the course of the research
 - the research methodology
 - the research context
- The overall performance of the student in relation to his/her peers on comparable programmes, as far as the examiner is aware
- The strengths and weaknesses of the student and his/her work

- The quality of knowledge, innovation and skills demonstrated by the student

2 ASSESSMENT

- The assessment procedure
- The criteria, consistency, fairness and appropriateness of the assessment method

3 EVIDENCE OF INNOVATION OR GOOD PRACTICE WITH REGARD TO:

- Presentation of the body of work
- Supervisory support

In order to derive most benefit from the report, it will be available to the Head of Programme and supervisor(s). If an External Examiner wishes to make any comments in confidence, he or she may write separately to the Pro-Rector (Academic).

THE APPOINTMENT PROCESS

Masters programmes usually have one External Examiner, although additional External Examiners may be approved to cover specialist areas of work or because of the large number of students involved. MPhil candidates will normally be assigned one External Examiner, although more than one may be appointed in special circumstances. There shall be two External Examiners for candidates undertaking the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, at least one of whom shall hold a doctoral qualification, the other being of doctoral standing.

External Examiners are appointed by the Senate on the recommendation of the Academic Standards Committee following nomination by the Head of Programme responsible for the students to be examined. External Examiners for research awards should also be approved by the Director of Research.

Nominations for External Examiners on Masters programmes are required by the beginning of December in the year prior to their first involvement in the assessment process. The Head of Programme should ask the proposed External Examiner to complete sections 2, 3 and 4 of the proposal form. The Head of Programme should complete sections 1 and 5 of the proposal should be counter-signed by the Dean of School and

forwarded to the Academic Development Office.

Some sections of the form may not be relevant to Examiners from industry or professional practice. However, the proposal must include sufficient information to indicate whether the proposed External Examiner has the appropriate standing, expertise and experience to assess the students' work and the academic coherence and standards of the programme.

There is a separate appointment form for Research Degree External Examiners. The nominee should complete section 2, and the completed form should, in the first instance, be sent to the Director of Research for approval. It is important that the nomination form is received well in advance of the proposed viva, as it will need to progress through the College's approval channels before the candidate's thesis or by project work can be sent to the Examiner.

All External Examiners are required to verify their right to work in the UK, and those from outside the European Economic Area (EEA) who do not already possess a visa or other documentation granting the right to work in the UK should apply for a visa as a 'permitted paid engagement visitor' at the earliest possible opportunity. Further information can be found on the Gov.UK website:

<https://www.gov.uk/permitted-paid-engagement-visa>

CONFIRMATION OF THE APPOINTMENT

Once the appointment has been approved by the Academic Standards Committee and the Senate, the External Examiner will receive a letter of appointment indicating the length of their term of office (for Master of Arts External Examiners), confirmation of the fee of £150 per day (payable on submission of their report), an annual report pro forma and an example of a 'model' report.

They will also receive a copy of the Regulations, the Research Handbook (if applicable), a guidance document on their role and the conduct of Final Examination Boards, and a Visiting Lecturer Contract of Employment Pack (including a timesheet).

Heads of Programme should contact the External Examiner directly to confirm the dates of the Final Examination and to provide details of the

method and criteria for assessment. They are expected to provide External Examiners with:

- a timetable for the examination process, including dates of the Examination Board's meetings;
- suggested dates for their preliminary visit;
- details about the programme and the examination, including the current MA programme handbook and specification;
- copies of recent External Examiners' reports, together with the Head of Programme's responses.

TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENTS

The appointment of an External Examiner may be terminated by the Senate if it judges that the responsibilities of the appointment have not been or cannot be fulfilled in the manner or to the standard which the College requires.

Reasons for termination could include:

- provision of false information;
- failure to provide reports on the examination process required by the College;
- a change in the External Examiner's circumstances which brings about potential conflicts of interest which might jeopardise objectivity;
- persistent refusal to work within the College's Academic Regulations.

PAYMENT OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

External Examiners are paid £150 per day of attendance. The number of days that an External Examiner is asked to attend will vary from programme to programme, although it is normal for MA External Examiners to attend the College for four days each year, two for the preliminary visit and two for final examination, although larger programmes may require further attendance.

The College will also pay for reasonable travel, accommodation and related expenses. Hotel accommodation should be arranged through the relevant School administrator. All claims for expenses must be accompanied by the relevant receipts. Claims for fees and expenses should be signed by the Chair of the Exam Board and sent to the

Academic Development Office for payment.

For the final examination visit, payment is dependent on receipt of the annual report.

INTERNAL MODERATORS – MASTER OF ARTS

An Internal Moderator is appointed by the Senate on the recommendation of the Academic Standards Committee following nomination by the Head of Programme. The Internal Moderator must be a member of the academic staff of a School other than that within which the programme is located, and must be contracted to the College for a minimum of 15 days per year. Internal Moderators must not have taught on the programme of study for which they are appointed as Moderator.

The Internal Moderator is not required to make a judgment on the quality of the students' work. The role of the Moderator is to ensure that there are appropriate mechanisms in place for the objective and impartial assessment of students' work and to ensure comparability of examination practices between Schools within the College.

Internal Moderators are required to report by the end of the first week of the summer vacation, commenting on:

- the assessment process: was the assessment process fair, consistent and appropriate?
- were the assessment criteria applied as described in the programme handbook?
- examples of good practice
- any other comments

Moderators are appointed for one year, and the appointment is renewable for one further year; Heads of Programme who wish to extend their Internal Moderator's appointment by one year should confirm with the member of staff that they are available, and then notify the Academic Development Office.

Staff may not normally act as Internal Moderators on more than one MA programme in any one year: this is to enable a broad spread of staff to gain experience in the role.

A fee of £150 per day can be paid to Internal Moderators on one or two day per week contracts if they are required to attend the College on a day when they would not normally work. Claims for fees should be signed by the Chair of the Exam Board and sent to the Academic Development Office for payment.



Royal College of Art

Postgraduate Art and Design

ROYAL COLLEGE OF ART
KENSINGTON GORE
LONDON
SW7 2EU

T: +44 (0)20 7590 4444
F: +44 (0)20 7590 4500
E: info@rca.ac.uk
W: www.rca.ac.uk