



Swiss International
Institute Lausanne

STUDY PROGRAMME REVIEW PROCEDURES

Swiss International Institute Lausanne - SIIL

Approved by:	Academic Council
Date of Approval:	03.10.2022
Date of Next Review:	01.09.2025
Responsible Officer:	Academic Director
Contact:	t.zarubina@siil.ch

STUDY PROGRAMME REVIEW PROCEDURES

Swiss International Institute Lausanne - SIIL

Table of contents

I	CONTEXT	3
II	PURPOSE	3
III	BENEFITS	3
IV	PROCEDURE	4
1.	Development of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR), the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the review, and the Review Schedule	5
2.	Follow-up Processes	7
V	APPENDICES	8
1.	Appendix 1: General Terms of Reference for Programme Reviews	8
2.	Appendix 2: Approach to the Self-Assessment Report (SAR)	9
	Criteria for a good SAR:	9
	Chapter 1: Introduction:	9
	Chapter 2: Strategic context	10
	Chapter 3: Programme organisation and management	10
	Chapter 4: Programme structure	11
	Chapter 5: Curriculum	12
	Chapter 6: Student numbers	13
	Chapter 7: Quality Assurance	13
	Chapter 8: Student experience	15
	Chapter 9: Programme Administration	15
	Chapter 10: Finance and resources	16
3.	Appendix 3: Suggested data for inclusion in the SAR	17

I CONTEXT

SIIIL undertakes internal quality reviews of its study programmes according to its Quality Assurance Policy as well as to the 30T Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) Part 1.

The Study Programme Review Procedure enables SIIIL to meet the above requirements and to outline the specific elements of the quality review process for programmes at SIIIL.

This procedure should be read in conjunction with the [General Procedures for Quality Reviews](#).

II PURPOSE

These procedures set out broad guidelines for the preparation and conduct of study programme reviews in SIIIL.

The purpose of the review is

- to facilitate a critical self-assessment of the study programme by the Programme Director, management committee and Faculty involved in its delivery;
- to provide an opportunity for the overall evaluation of the study programme, with a range of inputs and analyses including feedback from students, employers, and professional bodies;
- to benefit from constructive commentary by external reviewers to SIIIL who are experts in their field at a senior academic level;
- to provide an opportunity to review the content, relevance, curriculum design and delivery of the study programme in the light of national and international comparators.

III BENEFITS

Study programmes reviews:

Allow for the periodic review of an academic programme's curriculum, teaching and learning to assess:

- alignment with SIIIL academic standards, curriculum principles, Assessment Framework;
- alignment with the policies, codes and guidelines and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015).

Assess whether students are attaining the range of knowledge, skills and competencies to prepare them for opportunities in further study; or in their career, whether that be in employment or as entrepreneurs.

Fulfil the SIIIL's commitment to the cyclical quality assurance of programmes of education and training.

IV PROCEDURE

The Quality Assurance Office will write to the Faculty Dean and/or the programme Lead, 18 months prior to the review, to notify them that the study programme is scheduled for review and to request nominations for reviewers.

The faculty/study programme is asked not to contact potential nominees to garner their interest in participating in a quality review, as this will be undertaken by the Quality Assurance Office. In considering nominees, it is important that no nominee has a close association with the Faculty or its staff in a personal or professional capacity within a timeframe of 5 years. This is to avoid the perception of or an actual conflict of interest.

The list of nominees is informed by the scope of the review and the Terms of Reference for the review ([Appendix 1](#)). Where relevant, nominees should comprise representatives from the business/professional sectors, e.g. employer representative, student/graduate representative.

If nominees' background information is not available on the internet or through other public information sources, candidates will be contacted by the Quality Assurance Office to request a curriculum vitae.

Prior to submitting the completed nomination forms to the Quality Assurance Office, the list of potential nominees should be reviewed by the Faculty Dean for shortlisting. On receipt of shortlisted nominees, the Quality Assurance Office will select three to four reviewers and reserve candidates.

The Quality Assurance Office will liaise with selected candidates to confirm the composition of the review team, and liaise with the Faculty/programme and with the relevant SIIIL Officers to identify suitable dates and align these with the Reviewers' preferences.

Please refer to the [General Procedures for Quality Reviews](#) for representation of SIIIL Officers in Study Programme Reviews. Note that where the Faculty Dean is a member of the study programme under review, the nomination of a Pro-Dean will be sought from the Faculty Dean. The Pro-Dean cannot be a member of a Faculty with which the study programme is associated but may be from another Faculty. The nominated Pro-Dean must be approved by the Academic Director before the appointment is confirmed.

The Pro-Dean represents the role of the Dean at the meetings with SIIIL Officers and the review team but does not have a role in responding to or implementing the report. The

Faculty Dean is expected to meet with the Review Team with respect to study programme finances.

1. Development of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR), the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the review, and the Review Schedule

It is recommended that a coordinating group be established to plan and manage the activities leading up to the Review. The coordinating group should be chaired by the Programme Director and/or Faculty Dean and may include the Heads of Discipline (for multidiscipline programmes), senior administrative, technical /support staff.

Elements of a programme review that need to be addressed by the coordinating group include:

- a student evaluation survey;
- a staff evaluation survey for academic staff teaching on the programme, including seminar tutors;
- focus groups with academics, administrators, students, graduates and employers to conduct a SWOT analysis of the programme;
- data analysis, collation and reporting over a five-year period of key programme, finance and student performance metrics;
- a Self-Assessment Report (SAR) to be provided to the External Review team six weeks prior to the online visit (refer [Appendix 2](#));
- invitations to students, staff, internal and external stakeholders to participate in meetings with the external review team;
- an entry presentation by the Programme Director to the panel of External Reviewers.

Agree on the content of the student evaluation survey and the cohorts of students to participate. The Quality Assurance Office will work with Faculty and programme directors to agree dates and times for administration of the survey and administer the survey to students. The survey is to be administered manually in order to optimise response rates. The Quality Assurance Office will also arrange for the statistical analysis of the survey.

Agree on the content of the staff survey and the staff cohorts to participate, e.g. staff from the Faculty, graduate teaching assistants, tutors etc. The Quality Assurance Office will work with Faculty and programme directors to agree dates and times for administration of the survey and will lead the administration effort. The Quality Assurance Office will also arrange for the statistical analysis of the survey.

The coordinating group nominates representatives to participate in focus groups to conduct the SWOT analysis of the programme and provide contact details of graduates and employers that may be appropriate participants.

The coordinating group will confirm contact details for external examiners active on the programme. The Quality Assurance Office will write to external examiners to notify them of the planned programme review in advance of the examining period preceding the review with a request for the timely return of the Annual Report.

The requirements for data analysis and collation of student and programme data for the previous five-year period is outlined in [Appendix 3](#):

- (i) the Faculty Dean and Finance Department must sign off on programme finance data for inclusion in the Self-Assessment Report (SAR);
- (ii) student number data should be based on HEA returns. Approved figures can be found in the Annual Reports;
- (iii) staff data must be based on data verified and provided by Human Resources e.g. junior/senior staff ratios, student/staff ratios etc.

A SWOT analysis should be conducted with various internal audiences including student and staff groupings, relevant partners. The purpose of the SWOT is to facilitate a critical assessment and self-review of the programme and its relevance to the Faculty and SII strategy.

The outcomes of the SWOT analysis and analysis of data on the various programme activities inform the development of the SAR. This may include outcomes of professional and accreditation reviews, international recruitment, student module evaluation, etc.

The SAR forms the principal source of information for the External Review team prior to their arrival on site. It situates the programme within the Faculty and broader SII strategic environs. It should therefore have a strategic focus, be forward looking, and provide a critical appraisal of the programme and the quality assurance processes that support the programme. Responsibility for the development of the SAR and engagement of internal and external inputs rests with the co-ordinating group.

The main body of the SAR should be between 30-60 pages, excluding the appendices. The SAR is organised under the following chapter headings (for detailed guidance refer to [Appendix 3](#)):

- Introduction
- Strategic context
- Programme governance and management
- Programme structure
- Curriculum
- Student numbers
- Quality Assurance
- The student experience

- Programme administration
- Finance and resources

The Quality Assurance Office will work with the Programme Director and the Faculty Dean to agree a draft Terms of Reference (TOR) for the review. A generic Terms of Reference for programme reviews can be found in [Appendix 1](#). The review team will respond to the TOR in the Review Report.

The Quality Assurance Office will lead the process for development of the schedule in agreement with the Programme Director and Programme Administrative Manager. The principles to be followed in the development of the schedule of meetings can be found in the [General Procedures for Quality Reviews](#). There is an expectation that stakeholders discussed/referred to in the SAR will be invited to participate in the schedule of meetings for the site online visit.

The final draft of the SAR with appendices and the schedule are to be submitted to the Quality Assurance Office six weeks prior to the review date. The Quality Assurance Office will arrange for proofreading of the final draft prior to its dissemination to the review team.

The Programme staff must not make any arrangement to meet with individual members of the review team during their time in SII for the purpose of the review.

2. [Follow-up Processes](#)

Detail on post review processes can be found in the [General Procedures for Quality Reviews](#). In summary:

- The draft review report is due to be submitted within three weeks of the site online visit. Feedback on factual accuracy is provided by the Programme and the Faculty Dean and is made available to the review team for submission of a final report within a further three weeks.
- The Programme Director and the Faculty Dean are invited to formally respond to the final report and review recommendations. The report, along with formal responses from the Programme Director and the Faculty Dean, are considered by the Quality Assurance Office and then by the Academic Council.
- An Implementation Plan is then prepared and submitted to the Quality Assurance Office and to the Academic Council.
- Within twelve months of Council approval of the Implementation Plan a Progress Report is submitted to the Quality Assurance Office, and then to Council.

V APPENDICES

1. Appendix 1: General Terms of Reference for Programme Reviews

The Terms of Reference outlined below are generic to any programme and may be further specified prior to a quality review in agreement with the Programme Director/Faculty Dean.

The review team is invited to assess and make recommendations to the SIIL under the following categories:

- (i) to provide assurance to the Academic Council, students and other external stakeholders that the academic standards on the programme align with the ESG criteria;
- (ii) to assess the strategic direction of the programme in the context of Faculty and SIIL strategy, internal and external developments and, when necessary, to facilitate large-scale changes or discontinuation.
- (iii) to review the effectiveness of the programme's governance, management and administration structures in delivering and supporting the achievement of its strategy and mission;
- (iv) to assess the quality of the programme's teaching and learning provision, learning resources and learning environment, that underpin the delivery of the curriculum and the attainment of the SIIL graduate attributes;
- (v) to review the resources available to the programme to deliver on its academic mission such as financial, facilities, human.

2. Appendix 2: Approach to the Self-Assessment Report (SAR)



The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) provides the opportunity for the programme management to reflect on the internal quality assurance and improvement approaches that support the programme, and its contribution to Faculty and SIIIL strategy, to students and stakeholders, and to the public.

The content of the SAR and appendices will be shaped by the scope of the review and the Terms of Reference as agreed by the Programme Director and Faculty Dean. Options for the focus of the review include:

- a **standard** review: this looks at the quality assurance processes that support all aspects of a programme's governance, management, teaching, operations, administration and resourcing;
- a **strategic** review: this provides an opportunity to focus on a specific strategy or challenge that is impacting on the programme. The differentiating feature of this type of review is that it sets a specific action for the review team and context for the recommendations arising from the review report.

Criteria for a good SAR:

- fulfils the purpose as the principal source of information for the External Review Team;
- it responds to the agreed Terms of Reference for the review;
- locates the programme within the relevant school(s), Faculty and broader University strategic environs;
- has a strategic focus, is forward looking, and provide a critical appraisal of the programme and the quality assurance processes that support the programme.

Chapter 1: Introduction:

The introductory chapter should set the context of the programme at the time of the review. It should address the following and act in part as an executive summary to the report:

- a short introduction to SIII, the history and evolution of the programme, the internal and external environment in which the programme is operating and the impact of same;
- a brief overview of the consultative/evaluation process undertaken to complete the SAR;
- the key areas the Faculty/ Programme would like the review team to focus on in the review, as identified for example using a SWOT analysis by focus groups, survey outcomes and linking to the Terms of Reference;
- a concise update on the implementation of recommendations arising from any previous reviews of the programme, as per table 1 below, and comment on whether these recommendations continue to impact on the programme.
- If the programme has been subject to external review by e.g. an accreditation body, reference to the cycle of reviews should be made in the introductory chapter.

Table 1: Update on recommendations arising from previous reviews

Recommendation	Status C-I-NP	Comment by Faculty

Key: C-completed; I-incomplete; NP-not progressed/did not agree with recommendation

Appendices for the introductory chapter should include the following student data and numbers: student profile, to include gender; admission/enrollment statistics.

Chapter 2: Strategic context

This chapter should outline how the programme supports the Faculty/SIII strategic development, links to the SIII Strategic Plan (ESG 1.2).

Of interest to the review team are:

- an assessment of whether the programme is achieving its objectives;
- alignment of the programme with the Faculty and SIII strategic direction;
- identification of risks or trends (national and international) such as the emergence of competitor programmes, difficulties attaining placements, risks associated with partnerships;
- action plans responding to external reviews, external examiner reports;
- any strategic proposals on which reviewer opinion is to be sought.

Chapter 3: Programme organisation and management

This chapter should outline the quality assurance processes that support the leadership, management and operations of the programme. Key inclusions in the Appendices are an organisational chart indicating staff holding key accountabilities

for the programme e.g. Programme Director, module coordinators, year convenors, instructional designer if blended or on-line programme and the various faculties from which teaching staff are drawn; the Terms of Reference for and membership of programme-level decision-making structures/committees, including a gender and diversity profile of membership, and how these structures are linked to Faculty and Institute-level decision making structures.

Of interest to the review team is:

- the effectiveness of the programme's organisational, management and decision-making structures/committees;
- the effectiveness of the relationships among faculties who deliver the programme and, for multidiscipline programmes, across faculties and with collaborative partners;
- any perceived or potential risks to the programme and how these are being managed;
- how teaching is managed on the programme: staff composition within the Faculty and across partner schools (if any), those providing 'service teaching' into the programme and staff in teaching support roles, graduate teaching assistants etc;
- if the programme has blended elements, how the design and delivery of these elements are quality assured;
- how staff are kept informed of changes in regulations, policies and procedures and how the outcome of key programme, Faculty and Institute-level decision-making processes relating to the programme are disseminated within the Faculty;
- the extent to which students and external stakeholders e.g. employers/industry, collaborative partners are involved in programme decision-making e.g. student representation on programme committees, partnerships' governance structures.

Chapter 4: Programme structure

This chapter should outline how the programme is structured, and provide an analysis of its effectiveness. The Programme Handbook should be included in the Appendices.

Of interest to the review team is:

- an evaluation of the programme structure (*ESG Std 1.4*). For undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, provide an outline of entry and exit pathways, progression and awards requirements and programme learning outcomes, the balance of face to face, blended or online delivery. Does the programme structure provide opportunities for placements, internships, field study and study abroad.
- What, if any, impact has Professional and/or Accreditation Bodies had in respect of the programme structure?

- an assessment of the programme recruitment and admissions process (*ESG Std 1.4*). Outline the programme entry requirements, including any specific programme pre-requisites, access routes for widening participation, recognition of prior formal, informal and non-formal learning, recognition of foreign qualifications (*ESG Std 1.4*), and the recruitment processes used to secure international students.

Chapter 5: Curriculum

This chapter should evaluate the curriculum and assess whether it is fit-for-purpose in terms of the relevant level, the programme learning outcomes and the requirements of the relevant professional body.

Of interest to the review team is:

- an outline of the syllabus for the duration of the programme by year, semester, module and credit and an evaluation of its effectiveness and comparison to similar programmes nationally and internationally.
- how the learning experience on the programme is enhanced through pedagogically-informed teaching methods, use of appropriate teaching strategies, incorporation of generic or transferable skills and integrative and reflective learning into assignments (*ESG Std 1.2 & 1.3*). Include reference to, for example, the use of different modes of curriculum delivery and pedagogical approaches, the incorporation of transferable skills, new technologies and student-led teaching into the curriculum, the facilitation of small group learning, the use of polling apps, e-portfolios, blended and on-line learning resources.
- whether there are opportunities to incorporate research-led teaching into the curriculum?
- what is the approach to assessment and examination used on the Programme (*ESG 1.3*) e.g. assessment of, for and as Learning?
- what is the assessment and examination workload on the Programme? Outline by year the balance of summative, formative and continuous assessment methods used, the use of projects including capstone projects, internships/placements/study abroad, etc.
- how is feedback on assessed work provided to students on the Programme (*ESG 1.3*). Does the Faculty have a standard feedback procedure and how is adherence to this procedure and the above policy monitored?
- what internal processes are in place to support the integrity of the Programme assessment and examination process including:
 - internal processes around the development and security of examination questions e.g. encryption, secure storage and transfer, the provision of model answers and rubrics and the process for incorporation of feedback from external examiners regarding examination questions and other forms of assessment;
 - measures to reduce the predictability of exam questions by students;
 - adherence by programme staff to internal guidelines and criteria for marking to include grade descriptors, consistency and transparency of marks, use of

marking sheets, the process for resolution of internal marks, moderation of grades, annotation of scripts, anonymity of exam scripts, access by students to exam scripts;

- practices regarding assessment and marking of individual and group projects;
- the maintenance of records e.g. external examiners, exam scripts;
- the publication of results.

(Note: the review team will review samples of examination questions/scripts and marking criteria/guidelines during the online visit).

- does the curriculum provide for off SIIIL learning e.g. opportunities to study abroad, to undertake internships and professional placements? Outline the quality assurance frameworks that govern these opportunities;
- challenges in relation to the curriculum and the impact of same e.g. costs/overheads associated with 'wet' projects; supervision models for capstone projects; staff/student ratio or number of practical hours prescribed by professional and/or accreditation bodies or associations etc;
- how is the curriculum reviewed? (*ESG Std 1.9*). Outline the frequency, key individuals or commissions with overall responsibility for the conduct of programme approvals or reviews, including professional bodies, and how student and external stake-holders views are incorporated into the process;
- how does the Faculty address plagiarism? Does the Programme handbook contain SIIIL specified section on plagiarism? Are students required to complete a signed declaration to be submitted with all assessed coursework, declaring that they have completed the online tutorial and that the assignment/ coursework submitted by them is their own work?

3.

Chapter 6: Student numbers

Include data on the following:

- student quotas;
- enrollment numbers and statistics: types of previous diploma, Recognition of Prior learning, international students;
- progression figures by year;
- student retention;
- moderatorship subject preferences and numbers (if applicable);
- final year project numbers;
- examination results by year;
- mobility statistics: student exchanges, study abroad, placements, internships, articulation agreements, dual/joint awards, other forms of partnership.

Chapter 7: Quality Assurance

This chapter should outline the process for assuring the quality of the programme. Of interest to the review team is:

- the process for the initial approval of the programme, the trigger for its development e.g. competitive tender; any substantive changes to the programme since its approval and the process for the approval of same;

- where does responsibility for quality assurance of the programme lie? Where does responsibility lie for responding to and taking action on External Examiners recommendations, accreditation body reports, feedback from advisory bodies and employer representatives (e.g. Programme Director and/or Committee)?
- the processes in place to assure the quality of teaching on the programme (ESG Std 1.5), such as staff induction programmes, peer mentoring and opportunities for continuous professional development, recognition through different types of Awards, etc.
- what supports are in place to build capacity and competence of staff involved in the assessment of learners e.g. to ensure consistent practice and protect the standard of Awards? If students engage in projects off-campus e.g. internships/placements, what steps are taken to communicate to non-SIIL staff, the expected standard of marking and assessments e.g. grade descriptors and guides for the allocation of marks for projects conducted overseas as recommended by External Examiners.
- what supports are in place to manage and quality assure external contributions to teaching and learning on the programme e.g. Adjuncts, Guest Speakers?
- what supports are in place to develop the teaching practice of Graduate Teaching Assistants acting in the role of Teaching Assistants/Demonstrators /Seminar Tutors?
- the extent to which the SIIL's Academic Policies and tools are embedded in the management of the programme and adhered to by staff, students, and other relevant stakeholders:
 - Is feedback to students provided to students within SIIL recommend timeframe 20 days (UG) and 30 days (PG).
 - Is the programme compliant with the SIIL requirements to evaluate 100% of UG modules once a year and/or evaluate PG programmes. Is feedback provided to students on the outcomes /actions taken in response to their feedback.
 - If plagiarism or breaches of academic integrity are detected e.g. data falsification, is action taken?
 - If the Faculty or Programme engage the services of Education Recruitment Agents, does the quality assurance and monitoring of such Agents comply with the SIIL quality requirements?
 - Does the Programme Handbook meet the minimum core content? Is the Programme Handbook available to students prior to the start of the academic year? Are students aware of where the Programme Handbook is published/ where it can be accessed (Programme websites etc)?
 - Is the minimum content specification for taught modules available on SIIL website?
 - Do arrangements for the exchange of student personal data to third parties comply with the requirements of EU-GDPR regulation (May 2018). In particular when students' assessed work is transferred to External Examiner.

Chapter 8: Student experience

Opportunities are provided to enhance the student experience (ESG Std 1.6) through:

- provision of student supports e.g. student induction processes for international students; student services; provision of student facilities/amenities; referring students to teaching and learning supports, etc.
- provision of opportunities to be involved in the research activity of the SIIIL e.g. through attendance at seminars, conferences and by undertaking projects and internships.
- provision of SIIIL-level teaching and learning supports, including IT and e-libraries, and student services;
- student complaints process, frequency of, analyses of and resolution timeframes for student complaints;
- relevant programme level outcomes;
- monitoring of particular cohorts of students in respect of programme experience e.g. students entering via alternate access routes, advanced entry, articulation arrangements, dual diploma or degrees, students returning from study abroad, internships or professional placements;

Chapter 9: Programme Administration

This section should outline the quality assurance processes that support the effectiveness of the administration of the programme including key systems and processes employed by staff to deliver its operations and respond to user, stakeholder and SIIIL needs.

Of interest to the review team is:

- administrative structures, systems and resources (administrative, technical and support staff) that support the operation and management of the programme e.g. Processes to support assessment and examinations including the Appeals Commission, support for external review cycles, systems to manage the administration of cross-discipline programmes, provision of advice on module selection, exit pathways to Awards etc.
- documents that support the efficient and effective administration of the programme (ESG Std 1.2) e.g. handbooks, module descriptors, policies, procedures, standard operating procedures/protocols, academic cycle of programme administration, recruitment activities and events e.g. open days, education fairs.
- information management and compliance (ESG Std 1.7) protocols on providing information to students/staff in accessible formats e.g. programme handbooks on managing data (storage, security and disposal) in accordance with the SIIIL information compliance requirements.
- attendance requirements if the programme has mandatory student attendance requirements – how are these monitored and reported upon?
- maintenance and review of service-level agreements for specialist equipment, facilities necessary for attainment of skills and competencies by students on the programme; or with education partners providing field-study opportunities or professional placement opportunities to students on the programme?

- an assessment of the main challenges facing the administration of the programme and how these challenges are being addressed.

Chapter 10: Finance and resources

This section should outline the resources (financial, human and physical) available to run the programme and outline future funding requirements (ESG 1.6).

Of interest to the review team is:

- the income/funding source and operating budget for the programme: include an assessment of its sustainability in light of the current funding envelope, future growth targets and professional statutory body requirements that apply (if applicable);
- the staffing levels associated with the programme and an assessment of whether they are adequate to support for example dissertations or final year (capstone) projects; postgraduate supervision, instructional design of online or blended learning resources, include the current and projected staff/student ratios and junior/senior ratio for the programme;
- profile of academic staff teaching on the programme: highest level of qualification achieved, publications/research grant income, workload in respect of project supervision/research supervision;
- the facilities and equipment provided for students in order to support their learning;
- e.g. fitness-for-purpose of formal and informal teaching spaces, laboratory spaces, specialist equipment, clinical facilities, PGR student workspace, library collections etc.

3. Appendix 3: Suggested data for inclusion in the SAR

Data Requirements	Source
<p>Chapter 1-Introduction</p> <p>Organisational chart including reporting lines for the programme</p> <p>Student Profile (including gender breakdown):</p> <p>Programme quotas, admission/enrollment statistics, progression, retention and completion rates, exam results and attainment of Award by Class.</p>	<p>Programme director, Academic Registry</p>
<p>Chapter 2 – Strategic context</p> <p>SIIIL Strategic Plan, Teaching & Learning Strategy showing alignment with, contribution to and impact of SIIIL strategies.</p>	<p>Programme director, Academic Registry</p>
<p>Chapter 3 - Organisation/management</p> <p>Terms of Reference for programme decision making/Commission structure and links to principal commissions of SIIIL</p> <p>Profile of management, leadership and commission members (internal/external, gender/diversity) organisation chart/ organogram</p> <p>Name and title of position holders such as module coordinators, and those providing 'service teaching' into the programme and in teaching support roles or as instructional design of blended/online programmes.</p>	<p>Programme director</p>
<p>Chapter 4 – Programme structure</p> <p>Handbooks providing details of the programme structure, programme learning outcomes, module descriptors, progression paths and award routes, Capstone Projects blended/online, internships, professional placements, study abroad;</p> <p>Entry requirements, recruitment process.</p>	<p>Programme director</p>
<p>Chapter 5 - Curriculum</p> <p>Outline of syllabus by year, semester, modules and credits;</p> <p>Profile of programme delivery methods i.e. proportion of modules/programmes having an on-line/blended learning component;</p> <p>Providers of placements/internships etc;</p> <p>Programme handbook, module descriptors, learning outcomes, reading list.</p>	<p>Annual Reports, Admission Office/Academic Registry</p>
<p>Chapter 6 – Student numbers</p> <p>Quotas;</p> <p>Enrollment;</p> <p>Progression by year;</p> <p>Retention;</p> <p>Moderatorship subject preferences and numbers (if applicable);</p> <p>Final year project numbers;</p> <p>Examination results by year;</p> <p>Direct entry numbers versus omnibus entry numbers – class sizes;</p> <p>Other entry modes;</p> <p>Recognition of prior learning, international students.</p>	<p>Programme director, Quality Assurance Office</p>

<p>Chapter 7- Quality Assurance Module and programme evaluations by students; Survey data; Data from other student feedback mechanisms; Student evaluation of off-SIIL learning e.g. placements, internships; Feedback from advisory bodies and employer representatives; External examiner reports/recommendations; External Review Reports (if applicable); Disciplinary (Plagiarism) and Appeal data (Progression); Outcome of Faculty's internal mapping of curriculum, assessment and workload undertaken; Progression and retention data; Degree attainment by grade, degree classification.</p>	<p>Programme director, Quality Assurance Office, Careers Coordinator, Annual Report, Academic Registry</p>
<p>Chapter 8 – Student Experience Detail of student induction processes for international students; Information provided in handbooks directing students to support services, facilities/amenities; List of opportunities for students to attend seminars, conferences; List of opportunities for students to undertake projects and internships; An outline of student complaints and appeals processes, and where they are published.</p>	<p>Programme director</p>
<p>Chapter 9 – Programme Administration: Copies of processes and procedures supporting the Appeal commission, publishing marks, entering marks, supplemental examinations etc., standard operating procedures/protocols, academic cycle of programme administration, recruitment activities and events; Copies of certification against quality standards such as ISO/EDUQUA or Accreditation or requirements of professional and/or regulatory bodies.</p>	<p>Faculty Dean</p>
<p>Chapter 10 – Finance & resources (Finance/funding information) Summary financial statement (income and expenditure) outlining the programme's source of income, funding streams, budget and expenditure; Prizes/awards received.</p>	<p>Programme Director, Faculty Dean, Finance Department</p>
<p>Chapter 10 – Finance & resources (Staffing on the programme) Staff category by Gender (Academic, Admin, Technical, Support); Within staff category, analysis by grade level and gender (Academic Staff by Professor, Associate Professor and Lecturer) Contract type by gender (Fulltime/Part time, fixed term, permanent and indefinite duration staff); Staff breakdown by Age bracket, nationality, junior vs senior.</p>	<p>Breakdown from HR: -Gender -Faculty -Payscale -Employee status either contract or Permanent/Indefinite and Full/Part time</p>

<p>Other staffing data; Staff/Student Ratio; Staff development opportunities and profile of uptake; Profile of staff applying for and achieving promotion by gender, grade, age-band and contract type (full-time/part-time status); Profile of staff availing of flexible work arrangements; Staff qualifications, publications, grant income, workload, project supervision, research supervision, consulting projects, patents in last 5 yrs.</p>	<p>-Age bracket -Nationality HR Staff Office</p>
<p>Chapter 10 – Finance and funding (Programme Infrastructure) Maps showing facilities and space allocation for programme delivery; Available resources/equipment/facilities; Maintenance and replacement schedule; Service level agreements with KPI's and reviews of attainment.</p>	<p>Programme director</p>

Approved by: Academic Council
Date of Approval: 03.10.2022
Date of Next Review: 01.09.2025
Responsible Officer: Academic Director
Contact: t.zarubina@siil.ch