



## **Procedural Guidelines for the Review of an Accredited Programme leading to a Major Award**

Approved September 2013; Revised April 2016

## Document Control Sheet

Version	Status	Author	Origin	Reviewed by	Approved by	Issue date
1.0	Draft	Paul Gallagher	QAAET (Bahrain); CAA (UAE)	David Croke		08/04/2013
1.1	Draft	Paul Gallagher		Hannah McGee; Judith Gilroy		22/04/2013
1.2	Draft				RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee	25/06/2013
1.2	Draft				RCSI Academic Council	11/09/2013
1.3	Approved				RCSI Medicine and Health Sciences Board	26/09/2013
2.0	Draft				RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee	23/02/2016
2.0	Draft				RCSI Academic Council	09/03/2016
2.0	Approved				RCSI Medicine and Health Sciences Board	07/04/2016

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	5
Introduction .....	6
Abbreviations.....	8
1. Overview of Programmatic Reviews.....	9
1.1. Purpose of the Procedural Guidelines and how to use them.....	9
1.2. Definition of education programmes at RCSI, Programme Review processes, and Programme Review scope .....	9
1.3. Purposes and Intended Outcomes of Programme Reviews .....	10
1.4. Main features of the Programme Review process and its relationship to Higher Education Quality Reviews.....	10
1.5. Sampling Methodology .....	11
Table 1- Programme Review Strata .....	12
Table 2- Programme Review year and corresponding Strata .....	12
1.6. The Framework for Evaluation.....	12
2. The Programmatic Review Process.....	14
2.1. The Self-Evaluation Report and Supporting Documentation.....	14
2.2. Programme Specification .....	15
2.3. Business Case Review .....	15
2.4. Preparation by the A&QC for the Site Visit.....	15
2.5. Preparation by the Academic Unit for the Site Visit .....	15
2.6. Preparation by the Peer Review Panel for the Site Visit.....	17
2.7. Reporting outcomes.....	17
Table 3 – Overall judgment on Programmes .....	17
2.8. Oral Feedback .....	17
2.9. The Programme Review Report.....	18
2.10. After the Site Visit: Programmes evaluated with Confidence .....	18
2.11. After the Site Visit: Improvement Planning and Follow-up for Programmes evaluated with Limited Confidence .....	18
Table 4 – Follow-up Review Process.....	19
2.12. After the Site Visit: Discontinuation for Programmes evaluated with No Confidence.	19

Appendices.....	20
Appendix 1 – Guidelines on Self Evaluation and Self-Evaluation Report Templates.....	20
Appendix 2 – Programme Specification Template.....	35
Appendix 3 – Business Case Review Templates.....	39
Appendix 4 – Sample site visit schedule .....	55
Appendix 5 – Framework for Evaluation of Research Programmes .....	57
Appendix 6 – Site Visit Feedback Templates .....	59
Appendix 7 – Programmatic Review Report Templates .....	69
Appendix 8 – Follow-up Report Guidelines and Report Template .....	86



## Acknowledgements

These Procedural Guidelines have been adapted with permission from “The Programme Review Handbook” (2009) of the Higher Education Review Unit of the National Authority for Qualifications and Quality Assurance for Education and Training in the Kingdom of Bahrain.

## Introduction

The main objectives of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI) Awards and Qualifications Committee (A&QC) are to:

- Oversee the end to end processes for Programme Accreditation at RCSI from application through to approval by the RCSI Medicine and Health Sciences Board (MHSB) and National University of Ireland (NUI) Senate, and final communication to Programme Proposer(s);
- Oversee a rolling cycle of reaccreditation for all RCSI programmes that offer qualifications or awards on the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) with appropriate alignment to local qualification frameworks relevant to international sites, and that fall under the governance of the MHSB;
- Set standards for programme accreditation in accordance with best practice and in collaboration with NUI, the RCSI Quality Enhancement Office (QEO) and other relevant stakeholders;
- Define application procedures for Programme accreditation and ensure necessary regulatory approval is obtained by Programme Proposer(s) from the relevant professional bodies;
- Liaise with NUI, through the RCSI-NUI Working Group Executive (WGE) on all matters relating to programme accreditation;
- Provide input into the NUI-RCSI Working Group Executive (WGE);
- Facilitate the dissemination of information to support Programme Proposer(s) and other stakeholders during the programme accreditation process;
- Support related matters or extenuating circumstances that may arise from time to time as determined by MHSB.

These eight objectives were determined with regard to:

- The Universities Act (1997);
- Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, 2009);
- National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 (Department of Education and Skills, 2011);
- National Guidelines of Good Practice for the Approval, Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programmes (Irish Universities Quality Board, 2012);
- Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act (2012)

In line with its mandate, the A&QC has begun reviews of programmes offered at RCSI. The purpose is to ensure that graduates enter the workplace with the skills and knowledge required. A Programmatic Review is a specialised exercise that focuses on the quality assurance arrangement for existing programmes in a particular discipline or subject area. The Reviews are carried out using specific indicators benchmarked to international best practice. The Programmatic Review report will

make judgements about whether the programme meets minimum standards as well as recommend improvements.

The purpose of these Procedural Guidelines is twofold. First, it gives Programme Sponsors an overview of the process and the indicators against which the Programme will be measured. Second, it offers Review Panel Members details of the review process to assist them as they carry out the review.

These Guidelines are effective from the date they were approved by Medicine & Health Sciences Board (MHSB), 26th September 2013 to 31st December 2018 unless they are updated earlier at the decision of MHSB. These Guidelines were updated in February 2016 to include the Framework for Evaluation of Research Awards and additional reporting procedures and templates.

### Abbreviations

<b>A&amp;QC</b>	Awards and Qualifications Committee (RCSI)
<b>CAA</b>	Commission for Academic Accreditation (United Arab Emirates)
<b>EHEA</b>	European Higher Education Area
<b>ENQA</b>	European Network for Quality Assurance
<b>HERU</b>	Higher Education Review Unit (Kingdom of Bahrain)
<b>ILO</b>	Intended Learning Outcomes
<b>MHSB</b>	Medicine and Health Sciences Board (RCSI)
<b>MQA</b>	Malaysian Qualifications Agency
<b>NFQ</b>	National Framework of Qualifications (Ireland)
<b>NUI</b>	National University of Ireland
<b>NAQAET</b>	National Authority for Qualifications and Quality Assurance for Education & Training (Kingdom of Bahrain)
<b>QEO</b>	Quality Enhancement Office (RCSI)
<b>QQI</b>	Quality & Qualifications Ireland



## 1. Overview of Programmatic Reviews

### 1.1. Purpose of the Procedural Guidelines and how to use them

These Procedural Guidelines offer a comprehensive description of the programme review process together with guidance notes and templates. They are mainly intended for use by programme sponsors subject to review by the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI). The Procedural Guidelines draw on good practice in quality assurance and review processes in the European Higher Education Area (Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2nd Edition), ENQA, 2009) and in particular are benchmarked against National Guidelines (Good Practice for the Approval, Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programmes (2012); Irish Universities Quality Board), the Programme Review Processes in the Kingdom of Bahrain (The Programme Review Handbook of the Higher Education Review Unit (2009); National Authority for Qualification and Quality Assurance for Education and Training) and Programme Review Processes in the United Arab Emirates (Procedural Guidelines for Renewal of Accreditation (2011); Commission for Academic Accreditation).

Part 1 deals with the scope and principles of Programme Reviews. Those directly engaged in the review process and contributing to the development of those processes will wish to consult Part 2 which outlines the programme review process. The appendices offer supplementary information, guidance and templates that support the Programme Review process.

### 1.2. Definition of education programmes at RCSI, Programme Review processes, and Programme Review scope

For the purpose of this document, an education programme is defined as one that admits students in any campus of the RCSI (Ireland or international) who, on successful completion, receive a major award from the National University of Ireland (NUI) as provided for in Schedule 9 of The Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act (2012).

A key feature of this Programme Review process is to combine internal and external reviews. This provides a number of benefits including: the economy of data and qualitative information for both internal and external purposes; supporting the development of internal quality assurance processes and avoiding inspectorial approaches to external assessment of quality; and strengthening the links between Review Reports and improvements to programmes through planning and follow-up processes.

Other features of this Programme Review method include its benchmarking to Programme Review methods in the Kingdom of Bahrain (NAQQAET) and the United Arab Emirates (CAA), so that the Programme Review processes of the QAAET and CAA in RCSI campuses located in these respective jurisdictions can be submitted to the RCSI for the purposes of its Programme Review Process as set out in Section 1.5.

### **1.3. Purposes and Intended Outcomes of Programme Reviews**

The Programme Review has three objectives:

1. To provide decision makers (RCSI, NUI, QQI, NAQQAET, CAA, national competent authorities for professional accreditation of our programmes, students and their families, sponsors of students, prospective employers of our graduates and other stakeholders) with evidence-based judgments on the quality of our learning programmes leading to educational awards.
2. To support the development of internal quality assurance processes with information on emerging good practice and challenges, evaluative comment and continuing improvement.
3. To enhance the global reputation of RCSI

The outcomes of each of the Programme Reviews will be:

1. A written report submitted to Academic Council (AC) and Medicine & Health Sciences Board (MHSB)
2. Programme revalidation for a period of five years where indicated
3. An improvement plan and follow-up visit, when required, prepared by the Academic Unit based on the outcomes of the Programmatic Review
4. Programme discontinuation when required

### **1.4. Main features of the Programme Review process and its relationship to Higher Education Quality Reviews**

The review method is designed to reflect best international practice and is benchmarked to the Programme Review Process of the Higher Education Review Unit of the National Authority for Qualifications and Quality Assurance for Education & Training (NAQQAET; Kingdom of Bahrain).

The key elements of the Programmatic Review method are:

1. All RCSI programmes leading to a major award (including all associated minor awards) are in scope as set out in Section 1.5 of this document; the A&QC will externally review a sample on a stratified random sampling methodology over a five-year cycle as further outlined in section 1.5
2. The Head of the Academic Unit will have responsibility to prepare a self-evaluation report (Appendix 1: Template 1) and submit it to the A&QC at least six weeks before the scheduled site visit
3. The Head of the Academic Unit will nominate a Review Coordinator (Section 2.4) who will guide the programme team and peer reviewers through the programme self-evaluation and supporting documentation
4. A site visit will be conducted by an external review panel, led by a review chairperson, at dates agreed in advance between the A&QC and the Academic Unit, and normally lasting two days

5. The peer review panel will reach conclusions based on the available evidence in line with the published method
6. Each review will lead to a written report prepared by the review chairperson, agreed by the peer reviewers and submitted to the A&QC; it will be tested in the A&QC for compliance to the published method and forwarded to the Academic Unit with an invitation to check it for factual accuracy. The final report will be submitted to the MHSB for approval. The Academic Unit, A&QC and NUI will receive copies upon approval by the MHSB
7. The Academic Unit will prepare, if required as detailed in Section 2.11., an improvement plan based on the outcomes of the Programme Review
8. The Academic Unit will arrange for the discontinuation of the programme, if required as detailed in Section 2.12.

## **1.5. Sampling Methodology**

### **1.5.1. Programmes delivered in the Kingdom of Bahrain**

Programmes delivered by RCSI-Bahrain that lead to a NUI/RCSI award will be satisfied by the Programme Review Process conducted by the Higher Education Review Unit of the NAQQAET. It is the responsibility of the Office of Quality Enhancement at RCSI-Bahrain to submit all such documentation to A&QC who, on that basis and on the basis of additional information the A&QC may request, will report outcomes following the processes set out in Sections 2.10.-2.12 of these Guidelines.

### **1.5.2. Programmes delivered in Ireland**

Each year the A&QC will review, over a five-year cycle, two programmes leading to major awards (including all exit awards where relevant) along (where relevant) with follow up procedures for those programmes that were evaluated in the previous year to have Limited Confidence (Section 2.11.). This process will ensure that at least 25% of all major awards are subject to programme review in a five-year cycle.

The selection of the two programmes each year over the five-year cycle will be by a stratified random sampling methodology. All major awards are stratified for programme reviews across the four strata denoted in Table 1. The sequence from which major awards will be selected by stratum is outlined in Table 2 for years 2014 to 2018. The specific programme within each stratum to be reviewed will be identified by a process of random selection except for Stratum 4 where the Dean of Medicine & Health Sciences, having regard to the timetable of statutory accreditation visits will decide which omnibus programme is to be selected.

**Table 1- Programme Review Strata**

Stratum	Discipline	Ownership of Programme Review
1	Leadership	Institute of Leadership
2	Nursing & Midwifery	School of Nursing & Midwifery
3	Postgraduate awards (other than Leadership and Nursing & Midwifery) including all Level 10 NFQ awards	School of Postgraduate Studies
4	Awards to first registration (Omnibus awards)	School of Medicine, School of Pharmacy or School of Physiotherapy

**Table 2- Programme Review year and corresponding Strata**

Year of Programme Review	Strata from which awards to be reviewed will be selected
2014	1, 3
2015	2, 4
2016	1, 3
2017	2, 4
2018	1, 3

### **1.5.3. Programmes delivered in Malaysia**

Programme delivered by RCSI in the federal constitutional monarchy of Malaysia that lead to an NUI award may generally be satisfied by the external Programme Review Process conducted by the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA). It is the responsibility of the Office of Quality Enhancement at RCSI-Dublin to submit all such documentation to the A&QC who on that basis will request additional information if required and report outcomes following the processes set out in Sections 2.10.-2.12 of these guidelines.

### **1.5.4. Programmes delivered in the United Arab Emirates**

Programmes delivered by RCSI-Dubai that lead to a NUI award may be satisfied by the Programme Review Process conducted by the Procedural Guidelines for Renewal of Accreditation of the Commission for Academic Accreditation of the United Arab Emirates. It is the responsibility of the Office of Quality Enhancement at RCSI-Dublin to submit all such documentation to the A&QC who on that basis will request additional information if required and report outcomes follow the processes set out in Sections 2.10-2.12 of these guidelines.

## **1.6. The Framework for Evaluation<sup>1</sup>**

The Framework for Evaluation forms the basis for Self-Evaluation, the Site Visit by the Peer Review Panel and the Programmatic Review Report.

<sup>1</sup> The Framework for Evaluation for the review of Research Programmes is outlined in Appendix 5

### *Indicator 1 – Curriculum*

The programme complies with best practice in terms of the curriculum, the teaching modalities & delivery and the assessment of students' achievements; the curriculum demonstrates fitness for purpose.

1. The programme has clear aims (that is, the broad purposes of providing the programme) that relate to the mission of RCSI.
2. Intended learning outcomes of the educational award are expressed and aligned to the relevant qualification frameworks.
3. The syllabus (curricular content) is accurately documented in terms of breadth, depth, relevance, and appropriate references to current and recent professional practice and published research findings.
4. The curriculum is organised to provide academic progression year-on-year, suitable workloads for students, and balances between knowledge and skills, and between theory and practice.
5. Teaching and learning approaches are adopted which support the attainment of aims and intended learning outcomes; these approaches relate to the range of methods, participation in learning by students, exposure to professional practice or applications of theory, encouragement of personal responsibility for learning and the development of the habit of self-learning or independent learning after graduation.
6. Suitable arrangements are in place, and known to all faculty and students, to assess students' achievements; these arrangements cover formative and summative functions. There are clear criteria for marking, appropriate mechanisms for students to get prompt feedback on their progress and performance that assists further learning; clear links between what is assessed and the programme aims and intended learning outcomes, and mechanisms for ranking students' achievements fairly and rigorously.

### *Indicator 2 – Efficiency of the programme*

The programme is efficient in terms of the use of available resources, the admitted students and the ratio of admitted students to successful graduates.

1. The profile of admitted students matches the programme aims and available resources.
2. Faculty members and others who contribute to the programme are adequate in quantity and in the range of academic qualifications and professional experience they offer. The profile of recent and current academic research and teaching or educational development matches the programme aims and curricular content.
3. Physical and material resources are adequate in number, space, style and equipment; these include classrooms, teaching halls, laboratories and other study spaces; IT facilities-including online enabling technologies, library.
4. The students make appropriate use of the available resources.

5. Arrangements are in place for orienting newly admitted students (including those transferring from other institutions with direct entry after Year 1) and for ensuring that all students receive appropriate guidance and support.
6. The ratio of admitted students to successful graduates are sound, including rates of progression, retention, year-on year progression, length of study and first destination of graduates.

### *Indicator 3 – Academic Standards of the Graduates*

The graduates of the programmes meet acceptable academic standards in comparison with equivalent programmes in the home jurisdiction and worldwide.

1. Academic standards are clearly stated in terms of aims and intended learning outcomes for the programme and for each module.
2. Benchmarks and internal and external reference points are used to determine and verify the equivalence of academic standards with other similar programmes.
3. The achievements of graduates meet the programme aims and intended learning outcomes, as expressed in final results, grade distribution and confirmation by internal and external independent scrutiny.
4. The achievements as seen in samples of students/assessed work are equivalent to similar programmes.

### *Indicator 4 – Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance*

The arrangements in place for managing the programme, including quality assurance, give confidence in the programme.

1. The policies, procedures and regulations of RCSI are applied effectively.
2. There are arrangements for regular internal review and reporting.
3. The structured comments collected from, for example, student and other stakeholder surveys are analysed and the outcomes are used to inform decisions and made available to stakeholders.
4. Improvement planning and other mechanisms for continuing improvement are demonstrated.
5. There are adequate records of the development and management of the programme including the impact of the most recent improvement plan(s).

## **2. The Programmatic Review Process**

### **2.1. The Self-Evaluation Report and Supporting Documentation**

Self-evaluation is a central element in Programme Review. The A&QC requires a programme Self-Evaluation Report be prepared as a basis for the external Programme Review (see Appendix 1:

Template 1 and Appendix 1: Template 2 or Appendix 1: Template 3). This report is strictly confidential to the sponsoring Academic Unit, the Peer Review Panel and the A&QC.

## **2.2. Programme Specification**

Each programme leading to an educational award must be specified using the template in Appendix 2: Template 3. It includes a concise summary of the programme's main features and the learning outcomes that a typical student might reasonably be expected to achieve if he/she takes full advantage of the learning opportunities provided.

## **2.3. Business Case Review**

The Business Case for each programme leading to an educational award must be specified using the Business Case Review (Appendix 3: Template 4) and Financial Model spreadsheet (Appendix 3: Template 5).

## **2.4. Preparation by the A&QC for the Site Visit**

Site visits are scheduled in phases by the A&QC according to a forward rolling programme of external reviews. The A&QC will take into consideration other internal and external quality reviews of the Academic Unit, and statutory accreditation processes, in deciding the timing of a site visit. The Academic Unit will be invited to nominate a senior member of the institution, from a School other than the sponsoring School, as Review Coordinator to facilitate the process of Programme Review.

The Chair of the A&QC, or nominee, will meet with the Head of the Academic Unit. The purpose of this appointment is to:

- Confirm the scope of the Programme Review;
- Confirm the arrangements for the Programme Review and Site visit;
- Confirm the supporting documentation to be made available for the Site visit including the sample of students assessed work;
- Consider the suitability of the typical schedule for a Site visit (Appendix 4);
- Agree logistics;
- Ensure that the Review Coordinator understands the method and brief him/her on the role
- Appoint a Rapporteur<sup>2</sup>

## **2.5. Preparation by the Academic Unit for the Site Visit**

The Academic Unit's first step is to prepare a programme Self-Evaluation Report (Template Appendix 1). The Academic Unit's preparation will also cover:

---

<sup>2</sup> The appointment of a Rapporteur to the Programme Review was recommended on receipt of feedback in relation to the "extensive nature of the tasks involved" in the role and responsibilities of the Programme Review Panel Chair. The role of the Rapporteur is to capture all relevant information obtained during the site visit and to draft the Programme Review report for the Review Panel.

- Appointing a Review Coordinator;
- Outlining a strategic approach to developing internal systems for continuing quality assurance, review, reporting and improvement to follow the first A&QC Programme Review;
- Briefing all faculty members, students and other stakeholders directly involved in the programme and its review on the arrangements for the review and Site visit;
- Developing a specification for the programme and business case review using the templates in Appendices 2 and 3;
- Organising an evidence-base and supporting documentation for the Programme Review;
- Adapting the typical site visit schedule (Appendix 4) to fit the circumstances;
- Organising those site visit activities that should be pre-arranged, notably meetings with a representative group of students and with graduates and employers of graduates

Supporting documentation will consist of information that should normally be available in a programme that has quality assurance mechanisms in place. It should be accessible to those engaged in programme management and review. The following items marked with an asterisk (\*) are those that should be sent to the peer review panel members before the site visit:

- Any update to the programme self-evaluation report with, for example, progress on the current improvement plan\*
- An organisation chart or equivalent presentation of the programmes lines of responsibility and accountability\*
- The Programme Specification\*
- The Business Case Review\*
- Programme Handbooks, or website references if available on the internet\*
- Student handbooks
- Examples of learner support material such as authorised texts and other course material
- Any annual course reports (e.g. quality improvement plans)
- Records of committees for the most recent year
- Regulations for the assessment of students
- Assessment criteria together with guidance and rules of marking or equivalent
- Samples of students assessed work representing all levels and a sample of programmes/courses
- Records for at least three years of the programme's Examination Board or equivalent
- Data including examination results and grades
- External examiners' names and their reports for the last three years if applicable
- Student feedback summaries with analyses
- Outcomes of consultations, surveys and other engagements with students and other stakeholders



- Data on graduates destinations in employment and/or further academic studies where applicable
- Summary staff curricula vitae (not greater than three pages in length) including summary lists of teaching, programme management responsibilities, academic research output, professional development programme, conference papers and publications
- Professional, accreditation, and regulatory body reports if relevant

### 2.6. Preparation by the Peer Review Panel for the Site Visit

The Review Chairperson, who will be appointed from amongst the External Reviewers by the Chair of the A&QC, is responsible for contacting the reviewers. This will normally be approximately six weeks before the scheduled Site visit. The Peer Review Panel must read the Programme Review self-evaluation report and supporting documentation in line with the guidance provided in these Procedural Guidelines. The Peer Review Panel will normally correspond by email and meet before the site visit.

### 2.7. Reporting outcomes

The Peer Review Panel states in the Review Report whether the programmes satisfies each Indicator. The overall judgement criteria for Programme Reviews are outlined in Table 3.

**Table 3 – Overall judgment on Programmes<sup>3</sup>**

Criteria	Overall Judgment
Confidence in all four Indicators	Confidence (with minor changes/recommendations)
Confidence in Indicator 1 and Limited or No Confidence in one or more of the other Indicators	Limited Confidence
Limited Confidence in Indicator 1 and Confidence in other	Limited Confidence
Limited Confidence in Indicator 1 and Limited or No Confidence in one or more of the other Indicators	No Confidence
No Confidence in Indicator 1	No Confidence

### 2.8. Oral Feedback

The Site Visit ends with an oral feedback meeting chaired by the Review Chairperson, the Review Coordinator, and the Head of the Academic Unit and the Chair of the A&QC. The oral feedback (Appendix 6: Template 6 or Appendix 6: Template 7) is structured to offer immediate qualitative information to the Academic Unit in line with good practice worldwide.

<sup>3</sup> The Overall judgement criteria for Programme Reviews was reviewed and amended following the completion of the first two Programmatic Reviews in March and April 2015. The revised criteria outlined in Table 3 were approved at the RCSI Awards and Qualifications Committee meeting on 24th November 2015.

### **2.9. The Programme Review Report**

The written Programme Review Report (Appendix 7: Template 8 or Appendix 7: Template 9) will be completed by the Review Chairperson and be endorsed by the Peer Review Panel. It will be sent to the Chair of the A&QC who will check it for compliance with the published method. If necessary the review chairperson or other peer reviewers may be asked to clarify or justify statements in the draft report. A draft report will be adopted if the A&QC is satisfied that:

- The report is endorsed by all members of the review panel
- The structure of the report is in line with the template
- The scope of the report is appropriate to the programme being reviewed
- The report offers evaluations and conclusions that are evidence based
- There is consistency between the evaluations in the main text and conclusions.

At this point, the draft report becomes a report of the A&QC. A copy of the draft report will be sent to the Academic Unit inviting it to check it for factual accuracy. In addition, the Academic Unit may also submit a response to the content of the report but this is not an opportunity for the Academic Unit to ask for changes to the evaluations and conclusions. The Academic Unit will return the draft report to the A&QC with any written comments within four weeks. After the A&QC has considered the comments of the Academic Unit and made any appropriate changes relating to factual accuracy only, the report goes to Academic Council for recommendation to the MHSB and NUI. If changes to report made by A&QC following comments from Academic Unit the report should go to the Review Panel for final approval, prior to submission to AC and MHSB.

### **2.10. After the Site Visit: Programmes evaluated with Confidence**

When a programme has been evaluated as having confidence the A&QC will submit a recommendation to the AC and the MHSB for the continuation of the programme for a period of five years. If the decision of the MHSB is for the programme to continue on that basis the A&QC will communicate the decision to the NUI pursuant to Schedule 9 of the Qualification and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012.

### **2.11. After the Site Visit: Improvement Planning and Follow-up for Programmes evaluated with Limited Confidence**

When a programme has been evaluated as having Limited Confidence the A&QC will arrange with the Academic Unit to follow up the external part of Programme review. The purposes of the follow-up review are to assess the progress made since the Programme review report.

The follow-up process is designed to deliver evidence-based reports (Appendix 8: Template 10) that capture the impact of recent developments in the education programme and progress made since the Programme review. The outcome of a follow-up report will not overturn the outcomes of the previous Programme review, but may lead to a further review of the programme. At that stage, the

conclusions reached in the first Programme review may be changed. There will be three phases to the follow-up:

**Table 4 – Follow-up Review Process**

<b>Phase 1</b>	Desk analysis of evidence by the A&QC within one year of completion of the first Programme review. The evidence base will comprise the Programme review report and the Programme improvement Plan submitted by the Academic Unit. The Academic Unit will be informed of the details, procedures and timing of follow-up
<b>Phase 2</b>	A follow-up site visit to the programme, normally for one day, leading to a brief written report. The Chair or nominee of the A&QC and the Chairperson of the panel will usually conduct the site visit. The Academic Unit is expected to use the report to support continuing improvement in the programme. The A&QC will use the report, together with other evidence, to decide if a further external Programme review is needed. In the case of a ‘no confidence’ judgment, there will be another full review.
<b>Phase 3</b>	A report is then sent to the MHSB within 6 weeks of the completion of Phase 2. Copies of this report if approved by the MHSB will be sent to the NUI pursuant to Schedule 9 of the Qualification and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012.

**2.12. After the Site Visit: Discontinuation for Programmes evaluated with No Confidence**

When a programme has been evaluated as having No Confidence the A&QC will submit a recommendation to the AC and the MHSB for the discontinuation of the programme. If the decision of the MHSB is for the programme to be discontinued the A&QC will communicate the decision to the NUI pursuant to Schedule 9 of the Qualification and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1 – Guidelines on Self Evaluation and Self-Evaluation Report Templates

#### Guidance on the Self Evaluation Report

Self-evaluation is a central part of the Programme Review. It should be regarded as a sustainable process rather than a one-off project for the A&QC. It offers benefits to the programme and the Faculty, as well as the visiting Peer Review Panel, if it is approached as a team effort. These benefits include the clarification of programme aims; the sharing of insights into the programme and how it achieves its aims; enhanced engagement with a range of stakeholders and more effective organisation of information, including the development of data and indicators in step with institutional review. If the self-evaluation process generates a plan for improvement, this can be included as an appendix.

The report should be at least 40% analytical and, by extension, 60 % descriptive at most and highlight good practice and any identified challenges or weaknesses that are being, or need to be, addressed. The structure should be in line with Template 2. As a general guide, the main report that accompanies Template 1 should not exceed 5000 words.

*Appendix 1: Template 1 – Programme Summary*

**Part 1: Administrative Information**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Programme title:</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Award/degree:</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Department(s) responsible:</b>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Programme Coordinator(s):</b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>External Examiner(s):</b>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Year of operation being reported:</b>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Date this report is submitted:</b>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Date this report is approved:</b>	

**Part 2: Statistical Information**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Number of students registered to the Programme in the year being reported:</b>	
1.1.	Admitted in Year 1:	
1.2.	Admitted direct entry to Year 2:	
1.3.	Admitted direct entry to Year 3:	
1.4.	All years part-time:	
1.5.	All years full-time:	

<b>2.</b>	<b>Origin of students admitted in the year being reported:</b>	
2.1.	Irish:	
2.2.	International:	
2.3.	HEA funded:	
2.4.	Private paying:	
2.5.	Sponsored:	

<b>3.</b>	<b>Gender balance of admitted students:</b>	
3.1.	Female:	
3.2.	Male:	

<b>4.</b>	<b>Range of admitted students:</b>	
4.1.	Straight from school:	
4.2.	From third level education:	
4.3.	Professional experiences	

<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of graduates in the most recent year:</b>	
5.1.	Number:	

<b>6.</b>	<b>Number of students completing the programme this year:</b>	
6.1.	Number:	

<b>7.</b>	<b>Grading:</b>	
7.1.	<40%:	
7.2.	40%-44%:	
7.3.	45%-49%:	
7.4.	50%-59%:	
7.5.	60%-69%:	
7.6.	70%+	

<b>8.</b>	<b>Length of study period for this year's graduates:</b>	
8.1.	Mean:	
8.2.	Distribution:	
8.3.	Discussion of statistical information:	

<b>9.</b>	<b>Final destination of graduates – give percentage of the graduates of the most recent year who have:</b>	
9.1.	Proceeded to employment:	
9.2.	Undertaken postgraduate study:	
9.3.	Engaged in other types of activity:	
9.4.	Unknown first destination:	

**Part 3: Programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes** (*this information may be attached as an programme specification, see Appendix 2: Template 3*)

<b>1.</b>	<b>Programme Aims:</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Specific intended learning outcomes grouped by knowledge and skills:</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>List of modules which contribute to this programme:</b>	

**Part 4: Staff contributing directly to the programme**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Number of academic staff contributing to the programme:</b>	
1.1.	In the faculty, for their entire teaching load:	
1.2.	In the faculty, for part of their teaching load:	
1.3.	From another faculty:	
1.4.	Part-time from another organisation:	



# RCSI

---

<b>2.</b>	<b>Number of teaching staff e.g. teaching assistants, demonstrators:</b>	
2.1.	Number:	

<b>3.</b>	<b>Clerical and administrative staff:</b>	
3.1.	Number:	

<b>4.</b>	<b>Other (<i>please specify</i>):</b>	
4.1.	Number:	
4.2.	Details:	

*Appendix 1: Template 2 – Self- Evaluation Report*

**Outline of the Self-Evaluation Report**

The template for self-evaluation follows the Framework for Evaluation. The Self-Evaluation Report may attach appendices to provide greater detail about the Programme and its modules and on the infrastructure that supports the Programme. It may also be accompanied by an Improvement Plan. The structure set out below is:

- Background
- Evaluation
- Conclusion
- Improvement Plan

**Background**

This section should include a brief summary of how long the programme has been offered, any substantial revisions, the context in which the programmes is offered (labour market, collaboration with other organisations and the outcomes of any recent review and/or accreditation). The mission statement of the Institution and Faculty should be included here.

<b>1.</b>	<b>How long has the programme been offered?</b>

<b>2.</b>	<b>Substantial revisions:</b>

<b>3.</b>	<b>The context in which the programme is offered (<i>labour market, collaboration with other organisations and the outcomes of any recent reviews and/or accreditation</i>):</b>

<b>4.</b>	<b>The mission statements of the Institution and Faculty:</b>	
4.1.	RCSI:	
4.2.	Faculty:	



**Evaluation**

This section should include a summary of the value of each of the characteristics as set out in the Framework for Evaluation. Highlight good practice, current developments and any gaps, weaknesses and other matters being addressed or requiring improvement. Give evidence, examples and references to supporting documentation where appropriate.

**Indicator 1 – Curriculum**

The Programme complies with best practice in terms of the curriculum, the teaching modalities & delivery and the assessment of students’ achievements; the curriculum demonstrates fitness for purpose

<b>1.</b>	<b>The programme has clear aims (that is, the broad purposes of providing the programme) that relate to the mission of RCSI.</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Intended learning outcomes of the educational award are expressed and aligned to the relevant qualification frameworks.</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>The syllabus (curricular content) is accurately documented in terms of breadth, depth, relevance, and appropriate references to current and recent professional practice and published research findings.</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>The curriculum is organised to provide academic progression year-on-year, suitable workloads for students, and balances between knowledge and skills, and between theory and practice.</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Teaching and learning approaches are adopted which support the attainment of aims and intended learning outcomes; these approaches relate to the range of methods, participation in learning by students, exposure to professional practice or applications of theory, encouragement of personal responsibility for learning and the development of the habit of self-learning or independent learning after graduation.</b>

<b>6.</b>	<b>Suitable arrangements are in place, and known to all faculty and students, to assess students' achievements; these arrangements cover formative and summative functions. There are clear criteria for marking, appropriate mechanisms for students to get prompt feedback on their progress and performance that assists further learning; clear links between what is assessed and the programme aims and intended learning outcomes, and mechanisms for ranking students' achievements fairly and rigorously.</b>

**Indicator 2 – Efficiency of the programme**

The Programme is efficient in terms of the use of available resources, the admitted students and the ratio of admitted students to successful graduates.

<b>1.</b>	<b>The profile of admitted students matches the programme aims and available resources.</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Faculty members and others who contribute to the programme are adequate in quantity and in the range of academic qualifications and professional experience they offer. The profile of recent and current academic research and teaching or educational development matches the programme aims and curricular content.</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Physical and material resources are adequate in number, space, style and equipment; these include classrooms, teaching halls, laboratories, on-line resources and other study spaces; IT facilities, library.</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>The students make appropriate use of the available resources.</b>

5.	<b>Arrangements are in place for orienting newly admitted students (including those transferring from other institutions with direct entry after year one) and for ensuring that all students receive appropriate continuing guidance and support.</b>
6.	<b>The ratios of admitted students to successful graduates – including rates of progression, retention, year-on-year progression, length of study and first destinations of graduates – are sound.</b>

**Indicator 3 – Academic standards of graduates**

The graduates of the programme meet acceptable academic standards as compared to equivalent programmes in Ireland and worldwide.

1.	<b>Academics standards are clearly stated in terms of aims and intended learning outcomes for the programme and for each module.</b>
2.	<b>Benchmarks and internal and external reference points are used to determine and verify the equivalence of academic standards with other similar programmes in Ireland and worldwide.</b>
3.	<b>The achievements of graduates meet programme aims and intended learning outcomes, as expressed in final results, grade distribution and confirmation by internal and external independent scrutiny.</b>
4.	<b>The achievements as seen in samples of students’ assessed work are equivalent to similar programmes in Ireland and worldwide.</b>

--	--

**Indicator 4 – Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance**

The arrangements in place for managing the programme, including quality assurance, give confidence in the programme.

<b>1.</b>	<b>The institution’s policies, procedures and regulations are applied effectively.</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>There are arrangements for regular internal review and reporting.</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>The structured comments collected from, for example, students’ and other stakeholder’s surveys are analysed and the outcomes are used to inform decisions, which are made available to stakeholders.</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Improvement planning and other mechanisms for continuing improvement are demonstrated.</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>The arrangements for identifying continuing professional (staff) development needs and meeting them are effective.</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>There are adequate records of the development and management of the programme, including the impact of the most recent improvement plan(s).</b>

**Conclusion**

1.	Identified good practice:

2.	Gaps and matters to be addressed:

**Improvement plan** (*Attach a current improvement plan and indicate its status (e.g. draft for further discussion, adopted by Academic Council, implemented, etc.)*)

*Appendix 1: Template 2a – Self Evaluation Report for Research Programmes*

**Outline of the Self-Evaluation Report**

The template for self-evaluation follows the Framework for Evaluation. The Self-Evaluation Report may attach appendices to provide greater detail about the Programme and its modules and on the infrastructure that supports the Programme. It may also be accompanied by an Improvement Plan. The structure set out below is:

- Background
- Evaluation
- Conclusion
- Improvement Plan

**Background**

This section should include a brief summary of how long the programme has been offered, any substantial revisions, the context in which the programmes is offered (labour market, collaboration with other organisations and the outcomes of any recent review and/or accreditation). The mission statement of the Institution and Faculty should be included here.

<b>1.</b>	<b>How long has the programme been offered?</b>

<b>2.</b>	<b>Substantial revisions:</b>

<b>3.</b>	<b>The context in which the programme is offered (<i>labour market, collaboration with other organisations and the outcomes of any recent reviews and/or accreditation</i>):</b>

<b>4.</b>	<b>The mission statements of the Institution and Faculty:</b>	
4.1.	RCSI:	
4.2.	Faculty:	

**Evaluation**

This section should include a summary of the value of each of the characteristics as set out in the Framework for Evaluation. Highlight good practice, current developments and any gaps, weaknesses and other matters being addressed or requiring improvement. Give evidence, examples and references to supporting documentation where appropriate.

**Indicator 1 – Programme**

The Programme complies with best practice in terms of student progression, supervision and assessment procedures.

<b>1.</b>	<b>There are clearly defined mechanisms for monitoring and supporting research student progress, including formal and explicit reviews of progress at different stages in place. Research students, supervisors and other relevant staff are made aware of progress monitoring mechanisms, including the importance of keeping appropriate records of the outcomes of meetings and related activities.</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Research students have appropriate opportunities for developing research, personal and professional skills. Each research student's development needs are identified and agreed jointly by the student and appropriate staff at the start of the degree; these are regularly reviewed and updated as appropriate.</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Research degree final assessment procedures are clear and are operated rigorously, fairly, and consistently. They include input from an external examiner and are carried out to a reasonable timescale. Assessment procedures are communicated clearly to research students, supervisors and examiners.</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Supervisors with the appropriate skills and subject knowledge are appointed to support and encourage research students, and to monitor their progress effectively.</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Each research student has a supervisory team containing a main supervisor who is the clearly identified point of contact.</b>

<b>6.</b>	<b>The responsibilities of research student supervisors are readily available and clearly communicated to supervisors and students.</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Individual supervisors have sufficient time to carry out their responsibilities effectively.</b>

**Indicator 2 – Efficiency of the programme**

The Programme is efficient in terms of the use of available resources, the admitted students and the ratio of admitted students to successful graduates.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Admissions procedures for research degrees are clear, consistently applied and demonstrate equality of opportunity.</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Only appropriately qualified and prepared applicants are admitted to research degree programmes. Admissions decisions involve at least two members of the higher education provider's staff who have received training and guidance for the selection and admission of research degree students. The decision-making process enables the higher education provider to assure it that balanced and independent admissions decisions have been made in accordance with its admissions policy.</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Higher education providers accept research students only into an environment that provides support for doing and learning about research, and where excellent research, recognised by the relevant subject community, is occurring.</b>



4.	<b>Responsibilities and entitlements are clearly defined and communicated to students undertaking research degree programmes.</b>
5.	<b>Research students are provided with sufficient information to enable them to begin their studies with an understanding of the environment in which they will be working.</b>

**Indicator 3 – Academic standards of graduates**

The graduates of the programme meet acceptable academic standards as compared to equivalent programmes in Ireland and worldwide.

1.	<b>Research degree provision is monitored against internal and external indicators and targets that reflect the context in which research degrees are being offered.</b>
2.	<b>Criteria for assessing research degrees enable the Academic Unit to define their academic standards and the achievements of their graduates. The criteria used to assess research degrees are clear and readily available to research students, staff and examiners.</b>

**Indicator 4 – Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance**

The arrangements in place for managing the programme, including quality assurance, give confidence in the programme.

1.	<b>Regulations for research degrees are clear and readily available to research students and staff, including examiners. Where appropriate, regulations are supplemented by similarly accessible, subject-specific guidance at the level of the faculty, school, department, research centre, or research institute.</b>

2.	<b>Codes of practice for research degrees are widely applicable, readily available to all students and staff involved in research degrees, and written in clear language understood by all users.</b>
3.	<b>Mechanisms are in place to collect, review and respond as appropriate to evaluations from those concerned with research degrees, including individual research students and groups of research students or their representatives. Evaluations are considered openly and constructively and the results are communicated appropriately.</b>
4.	<b>There are independent and formal procedures for dealing with complaints and appeals that are fair, clear to all concerned, robust, and applied consistently. The acceptable grounds for complaints and appeals are clearly defined.</b>

**Conclusion**

1.	<b>Identified good practice:</b>

2.	<b>Gaps and matters to be addressed:</b>

**Improvement plan** (*Attach a current improvement plan and indicate its status (e.g. draft for further discussion, adopted by Academic Council, implemented, etc.)*)

## Appendix 2 – Programme Specification Template

### Appendix 2: Template 3 – Programme Specification

This Programme Specification provides a concise summary of the main features of the programme and the learning outcomes that a typical student might reasonably be expected to achieve and demonstrate if he/she take full advantage of the learning opportunities that are provided. It is supported by a specification of each module that contributes to the programme.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Teaching institution:</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Academic unit:</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Programme title:</b>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Title of final award:</b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Mode(s) of attendance offered:</b>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Accreditation (<i>where applicable</i>):</b>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Other external influences:</b>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Date of production/revision of this specification:</b>	

<b>9.</b>	<b>Aims of the programme:</b>

<b>10.</b>	<b>Learning outcomes, teaching, learning and assessment methods:</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>1.</b>	
<b>2.</b>	
<b>3.</b>	
<b>4.</b>	

<b>Teaching and learning methods:</b>
<b>Assessment methods:</b>

<b>B.</b>	<b>Subject specific skills:</b>
<b>1.</b>	
<b>2.</b>	
<b>3.</b>	

4.	
----	--

<b>Teaching and learning methods:</b>
<b>Assessment methods:</b>

<b>C.</b>	<b>Thinking skills:</b>
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

<b>Teaching and learning methods:</b>
<b>Assessment methods:</b>

<b>D.</b>	<b>General and transferrable skills (<i>other skills relevant to employability and personal development</i>):</b>
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

<b>Teaching and learning methods:</b>
<b>Assessment methods:</b>

<b>11.</b>	<b>Programme structures:</b>			
	<b>Level/Year</b>	<b>Module code</b>	<b>Module title</b>	<b>Credits</b>



**RCSI**

---

<b>12.</b>	<b>Awards and Credits:</b>
	<i>e.g. Master's degree requires x credits; Bachelor's degree requires x credits</i>

<b>13.</b>	<b>Personal Development Planning:</b>

<b>14.</b>	<b>Admissions criteria (<i>clearly state any regulations concerning direct entry to years after Year 1</i>):</b>

<b>15.</b>	<b>Key sources of information about the programme:</b>

16.		Curriculum skills map:																	
Please tick the relevant boxes where individual programme learning outcomes are being assessed																			
				Programme Learning Outcomes															
Year/Level	Module code	Module title	Core (C) or Option (O)	Knowledge & Understanding				Subject Specific Skills				Thinking Skills				General & Transferrable Skills (or) Other skills relevant to employability and & personal development			
				A1	A2	A3	A4	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	D1	D2	D3	D4

## Appendix 3 – Business Case Review Templates

### Appendix 3: Template 4 – Business Case Review

**Please note** – Mentorship and advice for completion of the Business Case Review is available, subject to appointment, as follows:

- Student Support & Wellness – Dr Orna Tighe – [otighe@rcsi.ie](mailto:otighe@rcsi.ie)
- Human Resources – Ms Eilis Kernan – [eiliskernan@rcsi.ie](mailto:eiliskernan@rcsi.ie)
- Information Technology – Mr Enda Kyne – [endakyne@rcsi.ie](mailto:endakyne@rcsi.ie)
- Library – Ms Kate Kelly – [katekelly@rcsi.ie](mailto:katekelly@rcsi.ie)
- Finance – Mr Ruairi O’Regan – [ruairioregan@rcsi.ie](mailto:ruairioregan@rcsi.ie)
- General Queries – A&QC Secretariat – [awardsqualifications@rcsi.ie](mailto:awardsqualifications@rcsi.ie)

#### 1. Programme Director(s):

1.	<b>Name:</b>	
2.	<b>Title:</b>	
3.	<b>Department:</b>	
4.	<b>Address:</b>	
5.	<b>Landline:</b>	
6.	<b>Mobile:</b>	
7.	<b>Email:</b>	
8.	<b>Declaration of Conflict of interest:</b>	
	Do you wish to declare a Conflict of interest?	
	If yes, please provide details	
	How can this Conflict be managed?	
9.	<b>Signature:</b>	
10.	<b>Date:</b>	

#### 2. Business Sponsor(s):

1.	<b>Name:</b>	
2.	<b>Title:</b>	
3.	<b>Department:</b>	
4.	<b>Address:</b>	
5.	<b>Landline:</b>	

6.	Mobile:	
7.	Email:	
8.	Signature:	
9.	Date:	

**3. Programme Overview:**

1.	Title:				
2.	School/Department:				
3.	External Collaborative Institution(s):	Yes		No	
4.	If Yes, please list the Collaborative Institution(s) and Coordinator(s)				
5.	If Yes, please outline any operational or financial considerations				
6.	Award*				
7.	Award type (Major, Minor, Supplemental, Special Purpose)				
8.	National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) (IRL) level*				
9.	European Framework of Qualifications (EFQ) level*				
10.	Bologna Framework Cycle*				
11.	Overall programme volume (ECTS credits)				
12.	Advertising date				
13.	Start date				
14.	Entry requirements				
15.	Student progression and transfer				
16.	Professional/Regulatory considerations**	Yes		No	
	If Yes, name the Regulatory Body (Please append verification status of accreditation with relevant external Regulatory Bodies i.e. communication, supporting documentation, etc.)				
17.	Course Outline				

\*Please see the A&QC page on the RCSI Staff Portal

\*\*Please note that whilst Professional/Regulatory requirements will be considered by the A&QC the mapping of awards (type and level) to the NFQ will be decided by RCSI, the degree awarding body, in consultation with NUI during the A&QC accreditation process

**4. Strategic Relevance (250 words max.)**

Please describe the strategic relevance of this Award for RCSI. Outline how the proposed award relates to the RCSI Strategy. Key areas to consider include alignment to RCSI Strategic Objectives, Mission, Vision and Values:



**5. Risk Analysis**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Please outline the benefits of running this programme</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Please outline the risks of running this programme, e.g. low intake, competition, etc.</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Please outline the risks of not running this programme, e.g. market competition, opportunity costs, etc.</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Are there any similar programmes already delivered by RCSI? Is there any risk of internal conflict /competition?</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Please outline standard or special indemnity requirements</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Please outline any legal considerations</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>How will the success/failure of the programme be measured?</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>What contingencies are in place if numbers fall below the threshold?</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Can the course be scaled back if the numbers do not materialise?</b>

**6. Academic Relevance and Context (250 words max.)**

Please describe the Academic Rationale for this Award. Are there any overlaps (e.g. modules, lectures, assessments) with any existing RCSI programmes? What is the contribution to health services, research and/or patient care?

**7. Market Research (500 words max.)**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Target Market:</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Competitors</b>

**8. Programme Format**

Please provide quantitative information regarding the scale of the programme

<b>1.</b>	<b>Mode of study:</b>	<b>Full time</b>		<b>Part time</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Academic year (e.g. September/October or other):</b>				
<b>3.</b>	<b>Duration (years):</b>				



4.	Estimated contact hours on RCSI campus per annum:					
5.	Number of participants per annum:		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
		Intake1				
		Intake2				
6.	Delivery mode(s) e.g. classroom, online, blended learning					

**9. Student Support & Wellness**

Please provide an overview of any student support and wellness needs proposed for your programme.

1.	Student Career Guidance:	
2.	Academic Support/Personal Tutors:	
3.	Please describe the student demographic for the programme:	
4.	Language support required:	
5.	IELTS requirement for entry to the programme ( <i>for students for whom English is not their first language</i> ):	
6.	Medical Support:	
	Vaccines	
	GP Services	

**10. Human Resources**

What are the staffing implications for the programme? Indicate if the course is resourced by new or existing staff/FTE as well as qualifications and competencies. Please note that staff costs are reflected in Section 14 of the Finance Model and should align with this section.

1.	Total number of Resources required:		
	Existing FTE (Name)	New FTE (Y/N)	Qualifications/Competencies

2.	Breakdown of resources required:
a.	Programme Director(s)



	Existing FTE (Name)	New FTE (Y/N)	Qualifications/Competencies
<b>b.</b>	<b><u>Professor(s)/Associate Professor(s)</u></b>		
	Existing FTE (Name)	New FTE (Y/N)	Qualifications/Competencies
<b>c.</b>	<b><u>Lecturer(s)/Senior Lecturer(s)</u></b>		
	Existing FTE (Name)	New FTE (Y/N)	Qualifications/Competencies
<b>d.</b>	<b><u>Administrator(s)</u></b>		
	Existing FTE (Name)	New FTE (Y/N)	Qualifications/Competencies
<b>e.</b>	<b><u>Examiner(s)</u></b>		
	Existing FTE (Name)	New FTE (Y/N)	Qualifications/Competencies
<b>f.</b>	<b><u>Invigilator(s)</u></b>		
	Existing FTE (Name)	New FTE (Y/N)	Qualifications/Competencies
<b>g.</b>	<b><u>External Examiner(s)</u></b>		
	Existing FTE (Name)	New FTE (Y/N)	Qualifications/Competencies
<b>h.</b>	<b><u>Other</u></b>		
	Existing FTE (Name)	New FTE (Y/N)	Qualifications/Competencies

3. Please outline any staff training requirements/skills gaps in order to deliver the programme, e.g. Information Systems, Specialist Equipment, etc.

--

<b>4.</b>	<b>Additional FTE requirements</b>

**11. Location & Spatial Needs**

Where will teaching, learning, and assessment take place? Where will administration take place? Please indicate the physical facilities you envisage using, including frequency; capacity and a description of the space e.g. lecture theatres, tutorial rooms, laboratories, specialist space etc. Please note that spatial costs are reflected in section 14 Financial Model and should align with this section.

	Teaching & Learning (include room types)	Assessments (include room types)	Administration
RCSI Main College, 123 St. Stephen's Green			
RCSI House, 121 St. Stephen's Green			
RCSI Reservoir House, Sandyford			
RCSI Education & Resource Centre, Beaumont Hospital			
RCSI Education Centre, Connolly Hospital			
York House, York Street			
Other			

**12. Teaching – Equipment**

What resources and equipment will you use? Are these new or existing and are there any resource implications e.g. storage space? Please note that equipment costs are reflected in Section 14 Financial Model and should align with this section?

Equipment	New	Existing	Other notes


**13. Library** *(Select students/trainees as appropriate and cross out the term that doesn't apply)*

<b>1.</b>	<b>What current library provided resources support this programme?</b> <i>(Please list)</i>				
<b>2.</b>	<b>What additional library resources are required to support this programme?</b> <i>(Please provide a list n.b. default purchase is electronic where available)</i>				
<b>3.</b>	<b>Are information skills training and orientation to library resources required?</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Which libraries will students/trainees require access to?</b> <i>(Check all that apply)</i>				
<b>a.</b>	<b>Mercer Library</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
<b>b.</b>	<b>Beaumont Hospital Library</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
<b>c.</b>	<b>Bahrain LRC</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
<b>d.</b>	<b>Other</b> <i>(please specify)</i>				
<b>5.</b>	<b>Which institution will your students/trainees be registered with?</b> <i>(This is information is needed to determine access to e-resources and to comply with copyright law and contract law provisions in licenses for e-resources)</i>				
<b>a.</b>	<b>RCSI</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
<b>b.</b>	<b>Joint registration with another Irish institution</b>				
	<b>Please specify which institution</b>				
<b>c.</b>	<b>RCSI overseas location</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
	<b>Please specify which campus</b>				
<b>d.</b>	<b>Other</b> <i>(please specify)</i>				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Where will your students/trainees be based?</b> <i>(This is information is needed to determine access to e-resources and to comply with copyright law and contract law provisions in licenses for e-resources)</i>				
<b>a.</b>	<b>Ireland</b>				
<b>b.</b>	<b>Bahrain</b>				
<b>c.</b>	<b>Dubai</b>				
<b>d.</b>	<b>Jordan</b>				
<b>e.</b>	<b>Malaysia</b> <i>(please specify)</i>				
<b>f.</b>	<b>Other</b> <i>(please specify)</i>				

**14. Information Technology/Information Systems**

1.	Do learners require an RCSI email address?	Yes		No	
2.	Do learners require access to course space on Moodle?	Yes		No	
	If Yes, please confirm the version used and why				
3.	Do learners require access to an e-portfolio?	Yes		No	
4.	Do learners require an RCSI ID?	Yes		No	
5.	Do learners require storage space on the RCSI network	Yes		No	
	If Yes, please specify requirements				
6.	Quercus must be used to manage registration and records – please describe any other methods/systems for managing student records				
7.	Other IT/IS requirements				
8.	Please outline IT/IS training requirements				
a.	Staff				
b.	Students				
9.	How the course is delivered (classroom, distance, blended)?				
10.	Is e-learning development required?	Yes		No	
	If Yes, please specify what resources (staff, tools, external providers, IT staff, etc.) are required?				
11.	Are any new IT resources (hardware, software, etc.) required to deliver the course?	Yes		No	
	If Yes, please specify				

**14. Financial & Budgetary Information**

Please complete and append all sections of the A&QC Financial Model (appendix 1, 1b, 1c, 1d). Please follow instructions contained in the Financial Model.

1.	Which Department will this budget fall under? (Please provide the relevant code)	
----	--	--

**15. Governance**

All educational awards governed by the Medicine & Health Sciences Board and Academic Council, accredited by RCSI and NUI must be governed through one of the Schools of the Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Please indicate which School your programme is governed through:</b>	
<b>a.</b>	<b>School of Medicine</b>	
<b>b.</b>	<b>School of Physiotherapy</b>	
<b>c.</b>	<b>School of Pharmacy</b>	
<b>d.</b>	<b>School of Nursing &amp; Midwifery</b>	
<b>e.</b>	<b>School of Postgraduate Studies</b>	
<b>f.</b>	<b>Institute of Leadership</b>	

<b>2.</b>	<b>Please provide an overview of how the programme is governed:</b>	
	<b>Examination Board</b>	
	<b>External Examiner(s)</b>	
	<b>Reporting</b>	

**Signatures**

<b>Programme Director(s)</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

<b>Business Sponsor(s)</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>



*Appendix 3: Template 5 – Finance Model*

Awards and Qualifications Committee Business Case Proposal Financial Model - Appendix 1

**RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee - Programmatic Review**

**Business Case Review - Finance Model**

*Note: All grey cells must be completed on each sheet of the form (Appendix 1, 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d)*

Programme Title				
Programme Proposer				
Date:				
<b><u>Income</u></b>				
	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Comment/Instruction</b>
<b><u>Student Fees</u></b>				
<b>Fee Rates:</b>				
- EU students				Fill in grey cells (insert rates as positive amounts)
- Non EU students				Fill in grey cells (insert rates as positive amounts)
- Other Fee Categories				
<b>Student Numbers:</b>				
1st Years - EU				Fill in grey cells
1st Years - Non EU				Fill in grey cells
1st Years - Other Fee Categories				Fill in grey cells
2nd Years - EU				Fill in grey cells
2nd Years - Non EU				Fill in grey cells
2nd Years - Other Fee Categories				Fill in grey cells
<b>Total Students</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
Student Fees	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0	
NUJ Fees	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0	€43 per student
Less Provision for Discontinued/LOA				Fill in grey cells (insert as negative amount)
<b>Net Student Fees Income</b>	<b>€ 0</b>	<b>€ 0</b>	<b>€ 0</b>	
External Additional Funding				Fill in grey cells (insert as positive amounts)
Grants (if applicable)				Fill in grey cells (insert as positive amounts)
Other (if applicable)				Fill in grey cells (insert as positive amounts)
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>€ 0</b>	<b>€ 0</b>	<b>€ 0</b>	

RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee - Programmatic Review

Business Case Review - Pay Summary

Breakdown of Resource Requirements by Year:

		Year 1						
	FTE	Basic Salary EUR	Allocation to Course EUR	10.75% Employer PRSI EUR	Defined Contribution DC Pension EUR	Life Cover EUR	Total Cost EUR	
<b>Additional Staff</b>								
Staff 1			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 2			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 3			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 4			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
	-	€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
<b>Relief Staff</b>								
Staff 1			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 2			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 3			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 4			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
	-	€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
<b>Occasional Staff (classified as Non Pay)</b>								
	Hours	Hourly Rate EUR	Cost (ex PRSI) EUR	10.75% Employer PRSI EUR			Total Cost EUR	
Examiners		25.39	0	0			€0	
Invigilators (Oral)		12.16	0	0			€0	
Invigilators (Clinical)		15.237	0	0			€0	
Other (please specify)			0	0			€0	
			€0	€0			€0	

		Year 2						
	FTE	Basic Salary EUR	Allocation to Course EUR	10.75% Employer PRSI EUR	Defined Contribution DC Pension EUR	Life Cover EUR	Total Cost EUR	
<b>Additional Staff</b>								
Staff 1			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 2			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 3			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 4			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
	-	€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
<b>Relief Staff</b>								
Staff 1			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 2			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 3			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
Staff 4			€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
	-	€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	€0	
<b>Occasional Staff (classified as Non Pay)</b>								
	Hours	Hourly Rate EUR	Cost (ex PRSI) EUR	10.75% Employer PRSI EUR			Total Cost EUR	
Examiners		25.39	0	0			€0	
Invigilators (Oral)		12.16	0	0			€0	
Invigilators (Clinical)		15.237	0	0			€0	
Other (please specify)			0	0			€0	
			€0	€0			€0	

RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee - Programmatic Review

Business Case Review - Consumables Breakdown

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
	EUR	EUR	EUR
Consumable 1	€0	€0	€0
Consumable 2	€0	€0	€0
Consumable 3	€0	€0	€0
Consumable 4	€0	€0	€0
Consumable 5	€0	€0	€0
Consumable 6	€0	€0	€0
Consumable 7	€0	€0	€0
Consumable 8	€0	€0	€0
Consumable 9	€0	€0	€0
Consumable 10	€0	€0	€0

<b>Total Consumables</b>	<b>€0</b>	<b>€0</b>	<b>€0</b>
--------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Detailed Breakdown:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
<b>Consumable 1</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

<b>Consumable 2</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

<b>Consumable 3</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

<b>Consumable 4</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

<b>Consumable 5</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

<b>Consumable 6</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

<b>Consumable 7</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

<b>Consumable 8</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

<b>Consumable 9</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

<b>Consumable 10</b>			
Number of Units			
Rate per Unit			
Cost (EUR)	€0	€0	€0

Example:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
<b>Travel</b>			
Number of Taxi Fares	5	4	5
Rate per fare (average)	€20	€20	€25
Cost (EUR)	€100	€80	€125

Awards and Qualifications Committee Business Case Proposal Financial Model - 1c Central Shared Services Detail

RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee - Programmatic Review

Business Case Review - Central Shared Services Detail

	Year 1 EUR	Year 2 EUR	Year 3 EUR
<b><u>Staff Overhead:</u></b>			
Staff Overhead Rate per FTE Staff	€ 20,000	€ 20,000	€ 20,000
FTE Staff	-	-	-
Staff Overhead Cost (EUR)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0
<b><u>Space Overhead:</u></b>			
Space Overhead per Square Foot	€ 25	€ 25	€ 25
Square Feet Requirement			
Space Overhead Cost (EUR)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0
<b><u>Student Overhead:</u></b>			
Student Overhead per FTE Student	€ 750	€ 750	€ 750
Number of Contact Hours			
Number of Students	0	0	0
Student Overhead (EUR)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0
<b><u>Library Access/Support</u></b>			
Library Access Cost per FTE Student	€550	€550	€550
Number of Contact Hours			
Number of Students	0	0	0
Student Overhead (EUR)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0
<b><u>Student Services</u></b>			
Student Services Cost per FTE Student	€500	€500	€500
Number of Contact Hours			
Number of Students	0	0	0
Student Overhead (EUR)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0
<b><u>Faculty Support</u></b>			
Student Services Cost per FTE Student	€600	€600	€600
Number of Contact Hours			
Number of Students	0	0	0
Student Overhead (EUR)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0

**Note:**

For student overhead, library access/support, student services and faculty support, the central shared services costs are determined based on the number of students, the rate per full time equivalent (ie FTE) student and the number of contact hours for the Programme. It is assumed that on average, an FTE student requires 600 contact teaching hours. A rate of 0.1FTE per student is applied where contact hours are below 60 per year.

RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee - Programmatic Review

Business Case Review - Depreciation of Capital

	Year 1 EUR	Year 2 EUR	Year 3 EUR
<u>Depreciation</u>			
Depreciation of Capital (IT)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0
Depreciation of Capital (Fixtures and Fittings)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0
	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0

<u>Capital (IT) Breakdown</u>	Year 1 EUR	Year 2 EUR	Year 3 EUR	Comment/Instruction
PCs /Laptops				Fill in grey cells as positive amounts
Printers/Scanners				Fill in grey cells as positive amounts
Specialist IT equipment				Fill in grey cells as positive amounts
Other				Fill in grey cells as positive amounts
	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0	

	Year 1 EUR	Year 2 EUR	Year 3 EUR
Depreciation (IT)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0

<u>Capital (Fixtures and Fittings) Breakdown</u>	Year 1 EUR	Year 2 EUR	Year 3 EUR	Comment/Instruction
Specialist Equipment				Fill in grey cells as positive amounts
Office Furniture				Fill in grey cells as positive amounts
Other				Fill in grey cells as positive amounts
	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0	

	Year 1 EUR	Year 2 EUR	Year 3 EUR
Depreciation (Fixtures & Fittings)	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0

- 1) List all new items of Capital IT Required for Course (current College policy is to depreciate these costs over 3 years). IT is capitalised if the total spend per item exceeds €1,000. Formula assumes full year depreciation in year of purchase. If equipment is not purchased at commencement of each academic year, formula will need to be adjusted to reflect this (as depreciation is only booked in month subsequent to purchase).
- 2) List all new items of Capital Fixtures and Fittings Required for Course (current College policy is to depreciate these costs are depreciated over 10 years). Fixtures and Fittings are capitalised if the total spend exceeds €2,000. Formula assumes full year depreciation in year of purchase. If equipment is not purchased at commencement of each academic year, formula will need to be adjusted to reflect this (as depreciation is only booked in month subsequent to purchase).

RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee - Programmatic Review

Historical Financial Summary & Current Year forecast

	Actual YYYY/YY EUR	Actual YYYY/YY EUR	Actual YYYY/YY EUR	Forecast YYYY/YY EUR	Actual YYYY/YYYY EUR	Actual YYYY/YY EUR
Income						
Expenses						
Pay						
Non Pay						
Total Costs excluding Central Shared Services Costs and Depreciation						
Central Shared Services Costs						
Depreciation						
Surplus/(Deficit)						
Contribution Margin						

#### Appendix 4 – Sample site visit schedule

The typical site visit schedule is designed for two days. It includes pre-arranged meetings. The responsibility for arranging these meetings and fitting the template to the circumstances rests with A&QC, who will agree the arrangements with the review coordinator before the site visit. According to emerging information and discussions during the Programme Review, the Review Chairperson may wish to organise additional meetings and other activities.

Site visits will normally commence at 9:00am on Day 1. Pre-arranged meetings should not normally last more than one hour. The schedule should not completely fill all times with meetings, but leave space for additional activities by peer reviewers including preparing for meetings, updating notes and records and drafting paragraphs for the draft Programme Review report.

<b>Day 1</b>		
<b>Session</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>
1	9:00am	Welcome and introductions; brief introduction to the review (purposes, intended outcomes, use of evidence and self-evaluation report) – Programme Team
2	9:30am	Curriculum: discussion with faculty members
3	11:00am	Meeting with a group of students
4	12:30pm	Efficiency: tour of resources
5	2:00pm	Review panel meeting: scrutiny of additional documentation including sample of students’ assessed work
6	3:00pm	Efficiency: meeting with faculty members
7	4:00pm	Review panel meeting: review of the evidence and any gaps or matters to follow-up
8	5:00pm	Meeting with external stakeholders (sample of graduates, employers, other partners)

<b>Day 2</b>		
<b>Session</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>
1	8:45am	Review meeting with review chairperson, review coordinator, programme coordinator: summary of day 1 findings, addressing any gaps, adjust the schedule for day 2 if required
2	9:00am	Academic standards: meeting with faculty members
3	10:30am	Effectiveness of quality management and assurance: meeting with faculty members
4	12:00pm	Review panel meeting: review of evidence and any matters still to be addressed
5	2:00pm	Flexible time to pursue any matters arising
6	2:30pm	Review panel final meeting: decisions on outcomes and drafting oral feedback



**RCSI**

---

7	4:30pm	Oral feedback by review chairperson to review coordinator and faculty members
8	5:00pm	Close



## Appendix 5 – Framework for Evaluation of Research Programmes

### Indicator 1 – Programme

The programme complies with best practice in terms of student progression, supervision and assessment procedures

1. There are clearly defined mechanisms for monitoring and supporting research student progress, including formal and explicit reviews of progress at different stages in place. Research students, supervisors and other relevant staff are made aware of progress monitoring mechanisms, including the importance of keeping appropriate records of the outcomes of meetings and related activities.
2. Research students have appropriate opportunities for developing research, personal and professional skills. Each research student's development needs are identified and agreed jointly by the student and appropriate staff at the start of the degree; these are regularly reviewed and updated as appropriate.
3. Research degree final assessment procedures are clear and are operated rigorously, fairly and consistently. They include input from an external examiner and are carried out to a reasonable timescale. Assessment procedures are communicated clearly to research students, supervisors and examiners.
4. Supervisors with the appropriate skills and subject knowledge are appointed to support and encourage research students, and to monitor their progress effectively.
5. Each research student has a supervisory team containing a main supervisor who is the clearly identified point of contact.
6. The responsibilities of research student supervisors are readily available and clearly communicated to supervisors and students.
7. Individual supervisors have sufficient time to carry out their responsibilities effectively.

### Indicator 2 – Efficiency of the programme

The programme is efficient in terms of the use of available resources, the admitted students and the ratio of admitted students to successful graduates.

1. Admissions procedures for research degrees are clear, consistently applied and demonstrate equality of opportunity.
2. Only appropriately qualified and prepared applicants are admitted to research degree programmes. Admissions decisions involve at least two members of the higher education provider's staff who have received training and guidance for the selection and admission of research degree students. The decision-making process enables the higher education provider to assure it that balanced and independent admissions decisions have been made in accordance with its admissions policy.

3. Higher education providers accept research students only into an environment that provides support for doing and learning about research, and where excellent research, recognised by the relevant subject community, is occurring.
4. Responsibilities and entitlements are clearly defined and communicated to students undertaking research degree programmes.
5. Research students are provided with sufficient information to enable them to begin their studies with an understanding of the environment in which they will be working.

### **Indicator 3 – Academic standards of graduates**

The graduates of the programmes meet acceptable academic standards in comparison with equivalent programmes in the home jurisdiction and worldwide.

1. Research degree provision is monitored against internal and external indicators and targets that reflect the context in which research degrees are being offered.
2. Criteria for assessing research degrees enable the Academic Unit to define their academic standards and the achievements of their graduates. The criteria used to assess research degrees are clear and readily available to research students, staff and examiners.

### **Indicator 4 – Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance**

The arrangements in place for managing the programme, including quality assurance, give confidence in the programme.

1. Regulations for research degrees are clear and readily available to research students and staff, including examiners. Where appropriate, regulations are supplemented by similarly accessible, subject-specific guidance at the level of the faculty, school, department, research centre, or research institute.
2. Codes of practice for research degrees are widely applicable, readily available to all students and staff involved in research degrees, and written in clear language understood by all users.
3. Mechanisms are in place to collect, review and respond as appropriate to evaluations from those concerned with research degrees, including individual research students and groups of research students or their representatives. Evaluations are considered openly and constructively and the results are communicated appropriately.
4. There are independent and formal procedures for dealing with complaints and appeals that are fair, clear to all concerned, robust, and applied consistently. The acceptable grounds for complaints and appeals are clearly defined.

**Appendix 6 – Site Visit Feedback Templates**

*Appendix 6: Template 6 – Site Visit Feedback*

**Indicator 1 – Curriculum**

**Commendations**

--

**Recommendations**

--

**General Comments**

--

**Indicator 2 – Efficiency of the programme**

<b>Commendations</b>

<b>Recommendations</b>

<b>General Comments</b>

**Indicator 3 – Academic Standards of the Graduates**

<b>Commendations</b>

<b>Recommendations</b>

<b>General Comments</b>

**Indicator 4 – Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance**

<b>Commendations</b>

<b>Recommendations</b>

<b>General Comments</b>



**RCSI**

---

**Programme review outcomes**

<b>Overall feedback</b>

<b>Review outcome</b>

*Appendix 6: Template 6a – Site Visit Feedback for Research Programmes*

**Indicator 1 – Programme**

**Commendations**

--

**Recommendations**

--

**General Comments**

--



**Indicator 2 – Efficiency of the programme**

<b>Commendations</b>

<b>Recommendations</b>

<b>General Comments</b>

**Indicator 3 – Academic Standards of the Graduates**

<b>Commendations</b>

<b>Recommendations</b>

<b>General Comments</b>

**Indicator 4 – Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance**

<b>Commendations</b>

<b>Recommendations</b>

<b>General Comments</b>



**Appendix 7 – Programmatic Review Report Templates**

*Appendix 7: Template 7 – Programmatic Review Report*

**Programme Details**

<b>Programme title:</b>	
<b>Programme Director(s):</b>	
<b>Review date(s)</b>	

**Context for Review**

<b>Review Panel Members (“the Reviewers”):</b>	
<b>Chair &amp; Independent Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Independent Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Internal Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Rapporteur:</b>	

**Terms of Reference**

- Review, clarify and verify the information included in the Self-Evaluation Report and supporting documentation submitted by the Academic Unit
- Conduct a two day Site Visit meeting with staff and students as well as other internal and external stakeholders and provide the Academic Unit with oral feedback at the conclusion of the Visit.
- Prepare a Programmatic Review Report indicating if the Programme satisfies the criteria outlined in the RCSI Programmatic Review Guidelines thereby concluding there is “Confidence”, “Limited Confidence” or “No Confidence” in the Programme.

<b>Brief outline of the review method/process:</b>

**Indicator 1 – Curriculum**

The programme complies with best practice in terms of the curriculum, the teaching modalities & delivery and the assessment of students’ achievements; the curriculum demonstrates fitness for purpose.

1. The programme has clear aims (that is, the broad purposes of providing the programme) that relate to the mission of RCSI.
2. Intended learning outcomes of the educational award are expressed and aligned to the relevant qualification frameworks.
3. The syllabus (curricular content) is accurately documented in terms of breadth, depth, relevance, and appropriate references to current and recent professional practice and published research findings.
4. The curriculum is organised to provide academic progression year-on-year, suitable workloads for students, and balances between knowledge and skills, and between theory and practice.
5. Teaching and learning approaches are adopted which support the attainment of aims and intended learning outcomes; these approaches relate to the range of methods, participation in learning by students, exposure to professional practice or applications of theory, encouragement of personal responsibility for learning and the development of the habit of self-learning or independent learning after graduation.
6. Suitable arrangements are in place, and known to all faculty and students, to assess students’ achievements; these arrangements cover formative and summative functions. There are clear criteria for marking, appropriate mechanisms for students to get prompt feedback on their progress and performance that assists further learning; clear links between what is assessed and the programme aims and intended learning outcomes, and mechanisms for ranking students’ achievements fairly and rigorously.

<b>Recommendations:</b>
<b>Supporting rationale:</b>



**RCSI**

---

<b>Judgement:</b>				
<b>Confidence:</b>		<b>Limited Confidence:</b>		<b>No Confidence:</b>

**Indicator 2 – Efficiency of the programme**

The programme is efficient in terms of the use of available resources, the admitted students and the ratio of admitted students to successful graduates.

1. The profile of admitted students matches the programme aims and available resources.
2. Faculty members and others who contribute to the programme are adequate in quantity and in the range of academic qualifications and professional experience they offer. The profile of recent and current academic research and teaching or educational development matches the programme aims and curricular content.
3. Physical and material resources are adequate in number, space, style and equipment; these include classrooms, teaching halls, laboratories and other study spaces; IT facilities-including online enabling technologies, library.
4. The students make appropriate use of the available resources.
5. Arrangements are in place for orienting newly admitted students (including those transferring from other institutions with direct entry after Year 1) and for ensuring that all students receive appropriate guidance and support.
6. The ratio of admitted students to successful graduates are sound, including rates of progression, retention, year-on year progression, length of study and first destination of graduates.

<b>Recommendations:</b>					
<b>Supporting rationale:</b>					
<b>Judgement:</b>					
<b>Confidence:</b>		<b>Limited Confidence:</b>		<b>No Confidence:</b>	





**RCSI**

---

**Indicator 3 – Academic Standards of the Graduates**

The graduates of the programmes meet acceptable academic standards in comparison with equivalent programmes in the home jurisdiction and worldwide.

1. Academic standards are clearly stated in terms of aims and intended learning outcomes for the programme and for each module.
2. Benchmarks and internal and external reference points are used to determine and verify the equivalence of academic standards with other similar programmes.
3. The achievements of graduates meet the programme aims and intended learning outcomes, as expressed in final results, grade distribution and confirmation by internal and external independent scrutiny.
4. The achievements as seen in samples of students/assessed work are equivalent to similar programmes.

<b>Recommendations:</b>			
<b>Supporting rationale:</b>			
<b>Judgement:</b>			
<b>Confidence:</b>		<b>Limited Confidence:</b>	

**Indicator 4 – Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance**

The arrangements in place for managing the programme, including quality assurance, give confidence in the programme.

1. The policies, procedures and regulations of RCSI are applied effectively.
2. There are arrangements for regular internal review and reporting.
3. The structured comments collected from, for example, student and other stakeholder surveys are analysed and the outcomes are used to inform decisions and made available to stakeholders.
4. Improvement planning and other mechanisms for continuing improvement are demonstrated.
5. There are adequate records of the development and management of the programme including the impact of the most recent improvement plan(s).

<b>Recommendations:</b>			
<b>Supporting rationale:</b>			
<b>Judgement:</b>			
<b>Confidence:</b>		<b>Limited Confidence:</b>	

**Summary of Review Panel Conclusions**

The Review Panel states whether the Programme satisfies each Indicator. If the Programme satisfies all four Indicators the concluding statement will be that there is “Confidence” in the Programme.

<b>Review Outcome:</b>		
	<b>Judgement</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>Indicator 1</b>		
<b>Indicator 2</b>		
<b>Indicator 3</b>		
<b>Indicator 4</b>		
<b>Given that x, the Reviewer’s overall judgment is x.</b>		

<b>Actions:</b>

<b>Concluding remarks:</b>

**Signed**

<b>Chair &amp; Independent Reviewer:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Independent Reviewer:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Internal Reviewer:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature</b>

**Please return to:**

Chair, RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee  
 RCSI Registry  
 SARA Office  
 123 St Stephen's Green  
 Dublin 2

*Appendix 7: Template 7a – Programmatic Review Report for Research Programmes*

**Programme Details**

<b>Programme title:</b>	
<b>Programme Director(s):</b>	
<b>Review date(s)</b>	

**Context for Review**

<b>Review Panel Members (“the Reviewers”):</b>	
<b>Chair &amp; Independent Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Independent Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Internal Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Rapporteur:</b>	

**Terms of Reference**

- Review, clarify and verify the information included in the Self-Evaluation Report and supporting documentation submitted by the Academic Unit
- Conduct a two day Site Visit meeting with staff and students as well as other internal and external stakeholders and provide the Academic Unit with oral feedback at the conclusion of the Visit.
- Prepare a Programmatic Review Report indicating if the Programme satisfies the criteria outlined in the RCSI Programmatic Review Guidelines thereby concluding there is “Confidence”, “Limited Confidence” or “No Confidence” in the Programme.

**Brief outline of the review method/process:**

--

**Indicator 1 – Programme**

The programme complies with best practice in terms of student progression, supervision and assessment procedures

1. There are clearly defined mechanisms for monitoring and supporting research student progress, including formal and explicit reviews of progress at different stages in place. Research students, supervisors and other relevant staff are made aware of progress monitoring mechanisms, including the importance of keeping appropriate records of the outcomes of meetings and related activities.
2. Research students have appropriate opportunities for developing research, personal and professional skills. Each research student's development needs are identified and agreed jointly by the student and appropriate staff at the start of the degree; these are regularly reviewed and updated as appropriate.
3. Research degree final assessment procedures are clear and are operated rigorously, fairly and consistently. They include input from an external examiner and are carried out to a reasonable timescale. Assessment procedures are communicated clearly to research students, supervisors and examiners.
4. Supervisors with the appropriate skills and subject knowledge are appointed to support and encourage research students, and to monitor their progress effectively.
5. Each research student has a supervisory team containing a main supervisor who is the clearly identified point of contact.
6. The responsibilities of research student supervisors are readily available and clearly communicated to supervisors and students.
7. Individual supervisors have sufficient time to carry out their responsibilities effectively.

**Recommendations:**

**Supporting rationale:**



**RCSI**

---

<b>Judgement:</b>					
<b>Confidence:</b>		<b>Limited Confidence:</b>		<b>No Confidence:</b>	



**Indicator 2 – Efficiency of the programme**

The programme is efficient in terms of the use of available resources, the admitted students and the ratio of admitted students to successful graduates.

1. Admissions procedures for research degrees are clear, consistently applied and demonstrate equality of opportunity.
2. Only appropriately qualified and prepared applicants are admitted to research degree programmes. Admissions decisions involve at least two members of the higher education provider's staff who have received training and guidance for the selection and admission of research degree students. The decision-making process enables the higher education provider to assure it that balanced and independent admissions decisions have been made in accordance with its admissions policy.
3. Higher education providers accept research students only into an environment that provides support for doing and learning about research, and where excellent research, recognised by the relevant subject community, is occurring.
4. Responsibilities and entitlements are clearly defined and communicated to students undertaking research degree programmes.
5. Research students are provided with sufficient information to enable them to begin their studies with an understanding of the environment in which they will be working.

<b>Recommendations:</b>			
<b>Supporting rationale:</b>			
<b>Judgement:</b>			
<b>Confidence:</b>		<b>Limited Confidence:</b>	<b>No Confidence:</b>

**Indicator 3 – Academic standards of graduates**

The graduates of the programmes meet acceptable academic standards in comparison with equivalent programmes in the home jurisdiction and worldwide.

1. Research degree provision is monitored against internal and external indicators and targets that reflect the context in which research degrees are being offered.
2. Criteria for assessing research degrees enable the Academic Unit to define their academic standards and the achievements of their graduates. The criteria used to assess research degrees are clear and readily available to research students, staff and examiners.

<b>Recommendations:</b>					
<b>Supporting rationale:</b>					
<b>Judgement:</b>					
<b>Confidence:</b>		<b>Limited Confidence:</b>		<b>No Confidence:</b>	

**Indicator 4 – Effectiveness of Quality Management and Assurance**

The arrangements in place for managing the programme, including quality assurance, give confidence in the programme.

1. Regulations for research degrees are clear and readily available to research students and staff, including examiners. Where appropriate, regulations are supplemented by similarly accessible, subject-specific guidance at the level of the faculty, school, department, research centre, or research institute.
2. Codes of practice for research degrees are widely applicable, readily available to all students and staff involved in research degrees, and written in clear language understood by all users.
3. Mechanisms are in place to collect, review and respond as appropriate to evaluations from those concerned with research degrees, including individual research students and groups of research students or their representatives. Evaluations are considered openly and constructively and the results are communicated appropriately.
4. There are independent and formal procedures for dealing with complaints and appeals that are fair, clear to all concerned, robust, and applied consistently. The acceptable grounds for complaints and appeals are clearly defined.

<b>Recommendations:</b>			
<b>Supporting rationale:</b>			
<b>Judgement:</b>			
<b>Confidence:</b>		<b>Limited Confidence:</b>	
			<b>No Confidence:</b>

**Summary of Review Panel Conclusions**

The Review Panel states whether the Programme satisfies each Indicator. If the Programme satisfies all four Indicators the concluding statement will be that there is “Confidence” in the Programme.

<b>Review Outcome:</b>		
	<b>Judgement</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>Indicator 1</b>		
<b>Indicator 2</b>		
<b>Indicator 3</b>		
<b>Indicator 4</b>		
<b>Given that x, the Reviewer’s overall judgment is x.</b>		

<b>Actions:</b>

<b>Concluding remarks:</b>

**Signed**

<b>Chair &amp; Independent Reviewer:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Independent Reviewer:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Internal Reviewer:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature</b>

**Please return to:**

Chair, RCSI Awards & Qualifications Committee  
 RCSI Registry  
 SARA Office  
 123 St Stephen's Green  
 Dublin 2

## Appendix 8 – Follow-up Report Guidelines and Report Template

### Appendix 8: Template 8 – Follow-up Report

This report presents the findings of the follow-up visit that took place on **DATE**.

This is part of the A&QC's arrangements to provide continuing support for the development of internal quality assurance processes and continuing improvement following the Programme Review site visit held on **DATE**. The purpose of the follow up review is to assess the progress made in the programme since the Programme Review Report and to provide further information and support for the continuing improvement of academic standards and quality of higher education in RCSI.

The evidence base used in this follow-up review and report includes:

1. The Self-Evaluation Report for the programme together with supporting documentation
2. The Improvement Plan prepared and implemented since the Programme Review Report
3. The Programme Review Report
4. The Higher Education Quality Review Report and Institutional Strategic Plan (if any)
5. Additional evidence presented during the Follow-up visit

The overall conclusion reached as the outcome of the follow-up review is as follows:

1. The **PROGRAMME** at RCSI has OR has not successfully implemented an Improvement Plan
2. Good practice in the indicators demonstrated since the Programme Review site visit include:
3. Matters of particular importance that should be addressed by the Institution in its continuing improvement of the programme are (insert and indicate if they are, or as yet are not, addressed by the Improvement Plan):

**Programme details**

<b>Programme title:</b>	
<b>Programme Director(s):</b>	
<b>Initial Programme Review site visit date(s):</b>	
<b>Follow up site visit date(s):</b>	

**Context for Review**

<b>Review Panel Members (“the Reviewers”):</b>	
<b>Chair &amp; Independent Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Independent Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Internal Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Rapporteur:</b>	

**Part 1: Internal Quality Assurance System is operation**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Further action required?</b>
<b>Is the programme Self-Evaluation Report complete?</b>		
<b>Does the most recent Self-Evaluation Report indicate the extent to which the criteria in the Framework for Evaluation are met and/or are being addressed?</b>		
<b>Is there an Improvement Plan in place, informed by external and internal review?</b>		
<b>Are there any major gaps that appear not to be addressed?</b>		
<b>Is progress with the Improvement Plan monitored?</b>		
<b>Are there any major obstacles to the expected achievement of the Improvement Plan?</b>		
<b>What is the Institution’s estimate of the time needed to complete improvements to the Programme?</b>		
<b>What is the Reviewers’ assessment of the time needed to complete the improvements to the Programme that would</b>		



demonstrate the Indicators?		
-----------------------------	--	--

**Part 2: Progress demonstrated with the Indicators**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Improvement Plan points (<i>comment on how these points map to the Programme Review Report recommendations</i>)</b>	<b>New information from the Follow up site visit</b>
<b>Indicator 1</b>		
<b>Indicator 2</b>		
<b>Indicator 3</b>		
<b>Indicator 4</b>		