



DUBLIN CITY UNIVERSITY

**VALIDATION AND ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMMES:
REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES**

OCTOBER 2016

**APPROVED BY EDUCATION COMMITTEE
28 SEPTEMBER 2016**

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
1.1	The purpose of this document: validation and accreditation	4
1.2	Procedures other than validation and accreditation	4
1.3	Re-accreditation	5
2.	Validation and accreditation: overview	5
2.1	Overview	5
2.2	Validation	5
2.3	Accreditation	6
3.	Consultation and timing	6
3.1	Consultation within the School and Faculty	6
3.2	Collaboration with an external organisation	7
3.3	Importance of timing	7
3.4	Discussions with the Office of the Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar)	8
3.5	Consultation with the range of other relevant offices	8
4.	Validation	9
4.1	Criteria for evaluation	9
4.2	Validation proposal: structure	9
4.3	Validation document: the detail	11
	Section 1 – Summary description of the background to and development of the proposal ..	11
	Section 2 – Strategic fit	12
	Section 3 – Likely demand, and proposed intake	13
	Section 4 – Entry requirements, and progression and exit routes	13
	4.1 Entry requirements: undergraduate programmes	13
	4.2 Progression and exit routes undergraduate programmes	13
	4.3 Entry requirements postgraduate taught programmes	13
	4.4 Progression and exit routes postgraduate taught programmes	14
	Section 5 – Purpose of the programme	14
	Section 6 – Programme learning outcomes	15
	Section 7 – Aptitudes and proficiencies	15
	Section 8 – Outline structure of programme	15
	Section 9 – Resources required (Financial and Space/Timetabling)	15
	9.1 Financial Resources	15
	9.2 Physical Space Requirements (Specialist Rooms/Timetabling)	16
	Section 10 – Implementation Plans	16

Section 11 – Membership of the proposed development team	16
Section 12 – Membership of the proposed Accreditation Board	17
Outline curriculum vitae for proposed members of the Accreditation Board.....	18
5. Accreditation	19
5.1 Accreditation proposal: criteria for evaluation	19
5.2 Accreditation proposal: structure.....	19
Section 1 – Summary description of the background to and development of the proposal ..	21
Section 2 – Entry, progression and exit routes.....	22
Section 3 – Purpose of the programme	22
Section 4 – Programme learning outcomes.....	22
Section 5 – Aptitudes and proficiencies	22
Section 6 – Outline structure of programme	22
Section 7 – Marks and Standards and programme-specific regulations	23
Section 8 – Alignment matrix	23
Section 9 – Quality assurance and programme evaluation	23
Section 10 – Module descriptors	24
Section 11– Curricula vitae of the members of the programme team.....	24
Curriculum vitae of the members of the programme team, for Accreditation	
Documentation (Template)	25
APPENDIX 1 Sign-off by the Executive Dean of Faculty (Form).....	27
APPENDIX 2: Flowchart outlining the validation and accreditation procedures	28

1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this document: validation and accreditation

This document is designed for those preparing proposals for new programmes of study which have to undergo University approval (validation and accreditation) processes. It should be read in conjunction with the following:

- Such Faculty-specific regulations, and/or Open Education regulations, and/or regulations in linked colleges, as may pertain with respect to validation and accreditation.¹ This is to ensure that all Faculty and Open Education and linked colleges' ² regulations and procedures are followed.
- *Information for Programme Proposers* at <http://www.dcu.ie/ovpaa/ac.shtml#ValAcc>. This document provides operational information on the management of the validation and accreditation processes.
- The University schedule of meetings 2016/17 at www.dcu.ie/sites/default/files/ovpaa/university_schedule_of_meetings_20162017.pdf as well as schedules of relevant Faculty meetings. It is **essential** that documentation be submitted in a timely manner; failure to take account of the need for this may result in a programme not gaining approval, and therefore not being offered, within the schedule originally envisaged by the proposers. (It should be noted that submission dates for documentation, for both University and Faculty meetings, are earlier than the dates of the meetings themselves.)³

A flowchart of the procedures is available as Appendix 2 to this document.

1.2 Procedures other than validation and accreditation

Where changes to programmes are made which do not require validation and accreditation, different procedures are followed. These are outlined at <http://www.dcu.ie/ovpaa/ac.shtml#approvalform> under 'Approval Form for Revised Academic Offerings: Faculties and Education Committee'. Refer to the schedule of types of changes on page 5 of the form, and the associated required actions.

Where programmes are to be reviewed on an ongoing basis, the procedures relating to Annual Programme Review (APR) and Periodic Programme Review (PPR) are used. Advice on these should be sought from the Faculty Office and the Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning/Education in the Faculty.⁴

¹ See also Section 3.1.

² All references to linked colleges in this document are to any current linked colleges and any institutions which may obtain this designation in future.

³ See also Section 3.3.

⁴ In the case of Open Education, advice should be sought from the Chair of the Open Education Teaching and Learning Committee.

1.3 Re-accreditation

In some cases, the outcome of the review of a programme within the University may involve a recommendation that it be re-accredited. Where such a need arises, standard accreditation procedures are normally used. In certain circumstances, the procedures may be carried out electronically. A recommendation on the desirability, or otherwise, of electronic accreditation may be made by the Faculty Teaching and Learning/Education Committee to the Office of the Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar). The final decision rests with the Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar).

A need for re-accreditation may also arise on the basis of recommendations from an external professional accrediting organisation (often following a review visit) and/or significant changes which such an organisation may make to its requirements in terms of recognising the programme.

It should be noted, however, that re-accreditations, especially electronic re-accreditations, are relatively rare.

2. Validation and accreditation: overview

2.1 Overview

When the University wishes to facilitate the establishment of new programmes, it uses procedures referred to as validation and accreditation. These procedures are defined below. The University is committed to ensuring, on the one hand, that all proposals have a clear strategic focus which relates to the University's strategic plan and component strategic plans and, on the other, that programme proposers have at their disposal a set of procedures designed to maintain the highest possible quality in terms of the preparation of proposals. Hence the processes of validation and accreditation are designed to ensure, *inter alia*, that:

- each proposal meets the requirements of Academic Council for the relevant award, and the standards and learning outcomes set are appropriate to that award
- individuals and groups are facilitated in creating new programmes of study within the University and its linked colleges and/or in partnership with other institutions or organisations as appropriate
- the necessary human, financial and physical resources are available.

2.2 Validation

Validation is the process which involves the Education Committee (see details at <http://www.dcu.ie/ovpaa/ac.shtml#ACandCommittees>) in assessing new programme proposals with a view to ascertaining both their relationship to strategy and their likely viability. The EC itself normally gives only outline consideration to new proposals and refers them, as appropriate, to the Education Committee Standing Committee for detailed consideration. The ECSC's recommendations must be endorsed by the EC, however.

Where the EC is of the view that a proposal should proceed to accreditation, it makes a recommendation to Academic Council to this effect. This recommendation incorporates sub-recommendations relating to the members of the Accreditation Board (see 2.3 below), and may also incorporate sub-recommendations to modify the programme proposal as initially submitted to it. Academic Council may accept or reject the recommendation from the EC, or accept it with modifications. In the event of rejection, Academic Council will advise on the appropriate next steps for the proposal. In all cases, the decision (and recommendations, if any) of Academic Council will be communicated to stakeholders by the Secretary of Academic Council.

Before a programme can proceed to accreditation, the Executive Dean of Faculty must confirm that all the recommendations of the ECSC/Education Committee, and any recommendations from Academic Council (in the context of its consideration of the validation recommendations) have been implemented. A form for signature by the Dean, to confirm this, is available as Appendix 1 to this document. This form must be signed, digitally, and e-mailed to the Office of Academic Affairs either before the accreditation documentation is made available to them (for circulation to the Accreditation Board) or at the same time as it is made available to them. The form itself is not made available to the Board but is retained by the OVPAA. The OVPAA will not make the accreditation documentation available to the Board unless and until this form is signed and submitted.

2.3 Accreditation

Accreditation is the process which involves the submission of a detailed programme proposal to an Accreditation Board. The Accreditation Board includes a group of academic and, as appropriate, other professional experts from outside the University with a request for a recommendation from it as to whether or not the programme meets the nationally and internationally accepted requirements for the award(s) to which it is designed to lead. Where the Accreditation Board is of the view that this is the case, it makes a recommendation to Academic Council to this effect. This recommendation may incorporate sub-recommendations to modify the programme proposal as initially submitted to it. Academic Council may accept or reject the recommendation from the Accreditation Board, or accept it with modifications. In the event of rejection, Academic Council will advise on the appropriate next steps for the proposal. In all cases, the decision (and recommendations, if any) of Academic Council will be communicated to stakeholders by the Secretary of Academic Council.

3. Consultation and timing

3.1 Consultation within the School and Faculty

A proposal may be submitted to the Education Committee only after it has gone through the appropriate discussion and consultation in the relevant School(s) and the appropriate approval procedures in the relevant Faculty or Faculties. The Head(s) of School must be satisfied that all relevant consultation takes place at School level. Where approval has not been given by all relevant Faculties, the EC will not consider a proposal. Advice on

approval procedures within a Faculty should be sought from the Faculty Office and the Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning.

3.2 Collaboration with an external organisation

Where it is proposed to offer a programme in conjunction with an external organisation (i.e. an organisation other than any linked college or and any other approved partner institution) reference must be made, as appropriate, to the University's policy on due diligence and the procedures for drawing up Memoranda of Understanding and related documentation. It is very important to be aware that engagement in due diligence must be undertaken before, rather than at same time as, the validation process (see also Section 3.3 below).

3.3 Importance of timing

It is **essential** that documentation be submitted in a timely manner; failure to take account of the need for this may result in a programme not gaining approval, and therefore not being offered, within the schedule originally envisaged by the proposers. It is necessary therefore, in this connection, to take cognisance of the University's schedule of meetings 2016/17 at

www.dcu.ie/sites/default/files/ovpaa/university_schedule_of_meetings_20162017.pdf.

Further information about this matter is available in *Information for Programme Proposers* (see 1.1 above). Cognisance should also be taken of the schedules of relevant Faculty meetings. (It should be noted that submission dates for documentation, for both University and Faculty meetings, are earlier than the dates of the meetings themselves.)

Where more than one Faculty is involved, care should be taken to ensure that all relevant staff members are aware of parallel timelines and in a position to meet parallel deadlines.

It is very important to note that, for programmes which it is intended to offer through the Central Applications Office, early planning is of particular relevance. A programme to be offered through the CAO for 2017 entry should be approved in 2015/16, not 2016/17. This is because information for intending applicants is submitted to the CAO a year in advance, typically in April, i.e. information on programmes to be available for 2017 entry is submitted in April 2016.

It is very important to be aware that engagement in due diligence with respect to a proposed external partner organisation must be undertaken before, rather than at same time as, the validation process (see also Section 3.2 above).

Consideration may also need to be given to the possibility that a derogation from Marks and Standards (to meet the requirements of external bodies only) may be needed and, if so, that a request will have to be submitted, in due course, to the University Standards Committee. (See Section 5.2 (Section 7) below)

3.4 Discussions with the Office of the Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar)

As early as possible in the process, to facilitate planning, discussions should take place between the Office of the Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) and the Faculty/Faculties about the likely timeline involved in the following processes:

- approval within Faculty/Faculties
- due diligence process, where appropriate
- validation (through the EC/ECSC)
- approval of validation recommendations by Academic Council
- accreditation
- approval of accreditation by Academic Council
- finalisation of accreditation documentation to take account of the recommendations of the Accreditation Board
- preparation for launch.

3.5 Consultation with the range of other relevant offices

Consultation must also take place, as appropriate, with relevant offices, which may include those listed below (the list is not exhaustive). Consultation must take place through the responsible committee or designated staff member in the relevant offices, where appropriate.

- Registry, with particular reference to:
 - application and admissions processes and timelines including the CAO and Postgraduate Applications Centre (PAC) processes and systems
 - the submission deadlines for academic structure information for the proposed new programme
 - academic structures for the proposed new programme which cannot be accommodated by means of the existing functionality of the ITS student records system
 - liaison between the Registry and school Guidance Counsellors, where relevant
- Finance Office
- Office of the Chief Operating Officer (Space requirements)
- Information Systems and Services
- Estates Office
- Library
- Communications and Marketing (especially Student Recruitment)
- International Office
- Student Support and Development (including the Careers Service and the INTRA Office – taking account of the fact that it is very important to plan well in advance for any proposed work placement)
- Heads of Schools from which service teaching will be requested
- Partner organisations in which it is proposed that students will spend time (e.g. on study abroad or clinical placements).

4. Validation

4.1 Criteria for evaluation

Each validation proposal will be assessed on a number of criteria, which include:

- evidence of alignment with the University strategic plan and its component strategies
- evidence of alignment with the strategic plans of the relevant Faculty/Faculties and School(s), as outlined in the validation proposal
- evidence of a place for the proposal within higher education in Ireland generally, taking into account programmes offered in other institutions
- evidence of the likely demand for the proposed programme, and the likelihood of achieving the appropriate student intake
- coherence of the statement of programme purpose and underpinning educational philosophy
- appropriateness of the programme learning outcomes, and coherence of their relationship to the purpose and educational philosophy
- reasonableness of the estimate of the resources needed to offer the programme
- reasonableness of the proposed launch date
- appropriateness of the proposed development team
- appropriateness of the proposed members of the Accreditation Board in light of the regulations for the appointment of such members. These regulations are available in *Information for Programme Proposers* (see 1.1 above). They are also detailed in Section 4.2 (Section 12) below.

4.2 Validation proposal: structure

The validation proposal document is an outline document aimed at making the business case for the proposal. Therefore it is normally much shorter than the accreditation proposal, which contains a detailed description of the proposed programme. However, certain sections of each of the two types of document may be broadly similar (see Section 5.2 below).

A typical validation proposal might run to 10 A4 pages or approximately 4,000 words exclusive of appendices. Appendices might include detail of matters such as the outcomes of surveys conducted to ascertain demand for the proposed programme, or possible competitor programmes. Appendices should, however, be kept to a minimum and should be included only where absolutely necessary – see line 13 of the table below.

In every instance where reference is made to a document which is available online, the appropriate web link should be included. Examples include the National Framework of Qualifications, strategic plans, and reports which indicate a need for provision of higher education in a particular discipline area.

A **validation proposal** should consist of the following:

<i>SECTION</i>	<i>CONTENT</i>
1	Summary description of the background to and development of the proposal (using the template provided)
2	Strategic fit
3	Likely demand, and proposed intake
4	Entry requirements, and progression and exit routes
5	Purpose of the programme
6	Programme learning outcomes
7	Aptitudes and proficiencies: (please see guidance in Section 7 notes).
8	Outline structure of programme
9	<p>9.1 Financial Resources requirements (using the template from the Finance Office)</p> <p>9.2 Physical Space requirements (contact the Office of Chief Operating Officer) with respect to the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specialist space e.g. computer lab, specialist classroom, 2. An indication if additional resources are required within existing timetable.
10	Implementation plans
11	Membership of the proposed development team
12	Membership of the proposed Accreditation Board
13	Any necessary appendices (but these should be kept to a minimum)

Resources at the following link may be of assistance to programme proposers:

<http://www.dcu.ie/teu/index.shtml>

4.3 Validation document: the detail

Section 1 - Summary description of the background to and development of the proposal

Background (1,000 words maximum)	
Proposed programme title **	<i>[e.g. BA in....., MA in.....]</i>
Proposed designatory letters⁵	<i>[e.g. BA, BSc, MSc]</i>
NFQ level	
Credits	
Part-time/full-time/continuous	
Duration	
Mode of delivery	<i>[e.g. traditional, distance, blended]</i>
In partnership with external organisation(s)	
Proposed launch date	
Approved by Faculty 1	[name of Faculty]
Date	[date of final approval] ⁶
Approved by Faculty 2	[name of Faculty]
Date	[date of final approval]
Approved by Faculty 3	[name of Faculty]
Date	[date of final approval]
Insert additional Faculty/Faculties as appropriate	
Insert additional approval date(s) as appropriate	
Submitted for EC approval	[date of EC meeting]

**Please note that the title of the programme should comply with the list of titles/designations set out in Marks and Standards version 2016.1, Award Titles, paragraph 1.2 and as listed on page

⁵ e.g. BA, Grad Dip, MSc, EdD.

⁶ The date of approval of the proposal by the final committee designated within the Faculty for approval of proposals.

The following is the list of agreed titles for undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes:

Undergraduate programmes

BA: Bachelor of Arts
BSc: Bachelor of Science
BBS: Bachelor of Business Studies
BEng: Bachelor of Engineering
BCL: Bachelor of Civil Law
BEd: Bachelor of Education

Certificate in...

Diploma in....

Taught Postgraduate Programmes:

LLM: Master of Laws
MA: Master of Arts
MBA: Master of Business Administration
MEd: Master of Education
MEng: Master of Engineering
MSc: Master of Science
PME: Professional Master of Education

Graduate Certificate in..

Graduate Diploma in..

Professional Diploma (e.g. Professional Diploma in Accounting)

Professional Certificate in..

Should the proposed title need to deviate from those listed above please provide a rationale for the selection of the proposed title.

Section 2 - Strategic fit

- International context
- National context
- Relationship with University strategic plan and component strategic plans
- Relationship with Faculty strategic plan(s)
- Relationship with School strategic plan(s)
- Relationship with existing cognate programmes in the University, including programmes in any linked college.
- Where a partner organisation is to be involved, rationale for, and status of, the relationship, with due reference to the policy on due diligence and the procedures for drawing up Memoranda of Understanding. Normally, this means that confirmation that the due diligence process has been completed should be indicated here, and the current state of development of the MoU should also be indicated.

Section 3 – Likely demand, and proposed intake

- Description of market research conducted
- Quantitative and qualitative outcomes of the market research
- Projected student numbers (these should be consistent with those in the financial template – See Section 9 below)
- Extent to which the programme is expected to run over a limited period of years, or on an open-ended basis (reference must be made here to standard programme review procedures – see Section 1.2 above).

Where market research does not apply, e.g. where a proposed programme has been commissioned by an external agency, ‘not applicable’ should be indicated.

Section 4 – Entry requirements, and progression and exit routes

4.1 *Entry requirements: undergraduate programmes*

- State that the university minimum entry requirements apply (and give brief details in terms of the Leaving Certificate, with a brief reference to the fact that equivalent requirements apply to applicants presenting other qualifications).
- If programme-specific entry requirements apply, state this (in terms of the Leaving Certificate, with a brief reference to the fact that equivalent requirements apply to applicants presenting other qualifications).
- If FETAC entry requirements apply, state this and give details.
- It is assumed that standard entry procedures for mature, access and international applicants and for applicants with disabilities apply. This should be stated. Details should not be given.
- Outline any Recognition of Prior Learning/transfer/exemption procedures that apply. These must be in line with standard DCU policies.

4.2 *Progression and exit routes undergraduate programmes*

- Normally, students will progress through to degree level. If it is planned to permit exit at Certificate and/or Diploma levels, state this and state the number of credits which must be obtained for such exit (these must be in accordance with Marks and Standards).

4.3 *Entry requirements postgraduate taught programmes*

Details should be given of the following:

- Minimum entry requirements (e.g. Level 8 qualification with, e.g. H2.2)
- Disciplinary stipulations in terms of prior qualifications (e.g. any discipline, a range of preferred disciplines, one or a number of specific disciplines)
- Whether the programme is a post-experience programme or not and, if the former, the nature and duration of the required experience

- The extent to which interviews, portfolios, written submissions or other procedures form part of the selection process
- Outline any Recognition of Prior Learning /transfer/exemption procedures that apply. These must be in line with standard DCU policies.

It is assumed that standard entry procedures for international applicants and for applicants with disabilities apply. This should be stated. Details should not be given. There should be no reference to ‘mature’ applicants, as this concept does not apply to postgraduate programmes.

4.4 *Progression and exit routes postgraduate taught programmes*

- Normally, students will progress through to degree level. If it is planned to permit exit at Graduate Certificate and/or Graduate Diploma levels, state this and state the number of credits which must be obtained for such exit (these must be in accordance with Marks and Standards).

Section 5 – Purpose of the programme

A student would register for this programme in order to:

Pursue an interest in ...	<i>[Give details]</i>
Acquire the [prerequisite] [advanced] knowledge and skills to seek employment in ...	<i>[Give details]</i>
Acquire the knowledge and skills to pursue [further] postgraduate studies in ...	<i>[Give details]</i>
Be eligible to obtain the professional designation of ... /obtain exemptions from professional examinations ...	<i>[Give details]</i>
Other ...	<i>[Give details]</i>

Where necessary and appropriate, further details should be given here about the underlying educational philosophy of the proposed programme.

Section 6 – Programme learning outcomes

On successful completion of this programme, the learner will be able to demonstrate:

PO1	Knowledge – Breadth	[100 words maximum]
PO2	Knowledge – Kind	[100 words maximum]
PO3	Skill – Range	[100 words maximum]
PO4	Skill – Selectivity	[100 words maximum]
PO5	Competence – Context	[100 words maximum]
PO6	Competence – Role	[100 words maximum]
PO7	Competence – Learning to Learn	[100 words maximum]
PO8	Competence – Insight	[100 words maximum]

It is assumed that the information in the above table will be identical with that submitted to Akari (subject to such modifications as may be required on the basis of recommendations at validation and, in particular, accreditation).

Section 7 – Aptitudes and proficiencies

Undergraduate Programmes

It is assumed that the information in the above table will be identical with that submitted to Akari (subject to such modifications as may be required on the basis of recommendations at validation and, in particular, accreditation).

Postgraduate Programmes

For proposed postgraduate programmes this section should be left in the document (i.e. should not be omitted, nor should the subsequent sections be renumbered). There should be a statement inserted to the effect that ‘The University’s initiative with respect to graduate attributes applies in particular to undergraduate programmes at present.’

Section 8 – Outline structure of programme

The standard Programme Academic Structure, Registration Schedule and Assessment Schedule should be completed and inserted here.

Section 9 – Resources required (Financial and Space/Timetabling)

9.1 *Financial Resources*

A template for outlining the resources required to run a programme is available from the Finance Office. This template must be used for validation. Advice on completing it is

available from Faculty Offices. Only the overview page is required by the Education Committee/ECSC, though the more detailed pages which provide the background information to this overview page may be required for School and Faculty approval and may also be requested at the discretion of the Education Committee/ECSC. (They should not, however, be submitted to the EC/ECSC as a matter of course.)

9.2 *Physical Space Requirements (Specialist Rooms/Timetabling)*

Please contact the Office of the Chief Operation Officer to provide the following information:

1. An indication if additional resources are required within the existing timetable.
2. Specialist space e.g. science lab, computer lab, specialist classroom.

Section 10 – Implementation Plans

To include:

- Liaison with CAO (via the Registry), if relevant, including timescales
- Advertising and marketing plans, including timescales.

Please refer to Sections 3.3 and 3.5 above, with particular reference to the indicative list of stakeholders in Section 3.5 and the importance of timely communication with them.

Section 11 – Membership of the proposed development team

It should be ensured in advance that all concerned have indicated their consent to being included.

Programme proposer (1)	Title	First Name	Surname	School
Programme proposer (2)⁷				
Member				
Member				
Member				
Member				
Member				
Member				

Insert as many additional lines as are necessary.

⁷ If applicable, i.e. if the leadership on proposing the programme is shared.

Section 12 – Membership of the proposed Accreditation Board

In the selection of nominees to the Accreditation Board, account must be taken of the following:

- The principal programme proposer and colleagues should ensure that there is appropriate professional distance between all nominated Board members and the University. No individual employed by the University, or a student of the University, in the previous five years may be considered. Nomination of individuals with a personal connection with the University should also be avoided, as appropriate. Reference should be made to the University’s Conflict of Interest Policy and Guidelines at http://www4.dcu.ie/sites/default/files/president/pdfs/conflict_guidelines.pdf. It should be ensured that the Board includes senior academic and professional experts as appropriate. There should normally be a minimum of one individual of professorial rank.
- It can be desirable, even necessary, for an individual to be appointed to a Board because he/she represents a professional accrediting body. In no circumstances, however, should an individual be appointed who is a member of an organisation which has commissioned a programme.
- Every effort should be made to ensure an appropriate gender balance and an appropriate balance between national and international expertise.
- An Accreditation Board should include no more than one representative from any one institution.
- Reciprocal arrangements between the University and other institutions should be avoided.
- In no circumstances may a staff member from DCU act as a member of an Accreditation Board in a linked college, or *vice versa*. Nor may a staff member of a linked college act as a member of an Accreditation Board in another linked college.

Summary list of all nominees

Title	First Name	Surname	Institutional affiliation	Position in institution

Outline curriculum vitae for proposed members of the Accreditation Board

(To be completed by the principal programme proposer in respect of each nominee to the Accreditation Board)

Title	
First name	
Surname	
Current position in home institution	
Contact details	
Home institution	
Contact address	<i>Please provide complete postal address for correspondence purposes.</i>
Telephone number(s)	
E-mail address	
Web page	
Academic and/or professional qualifications	
Principal research and/or professional interests	
Five publications of particular relevance to the proposed programme <i>(full citation required) If nominee is a practitioner as distinct from an academic and does not have publications, please indicate as such.</i>	
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Case for nomination to the Accreditation Board (250 words max.) (to be completed by the principal programme proposer, note this is not part of the CV)

5. Accreditation

5.1 Accreditation proposal: criteria for evaluation

Each accreditation proposal will be assessed on a number of criteria, which include:

- the likelihood that the proposed programme will meet the needs which the proposal indicates it is intended to meet
- the appropriateness of the entry requirements and exit routes
- the validity of the purpose and underpinning educational philosophy of the proposed programme
- the linkage of the programme learning outcomes with the purpose and the underpinning educational philosophy
- the consistency and coherence of the proposed modules in the context of the underpinning educational philosophy and the programme learning outcomes
- the reasonableness of achieving the programme learning outcomes, in the time specified, by the majority of students
- the appropriateness and mix of learning and assessment methodologies
- the coherence between assessment methodologies, per module, and the module learning outcomes
- the coherence of the group of skills and competencies that the student would be expected to have at the end of the programme
- the appropriateness of the quality assurance procedures to be used in relation to the programme
- the qualifications and experience of the programme team and the module co-ordinators.

5.2 Accreditation proposal: structure

The accreditation proposal document is a detailed document aimed at describing the proposed programme fully. It also includes module descriptors and a *curriculum vitae* for each programme proposer. Therefore it is normally longer than the validation proposal. Certain sections of each of the two types of document can, in principle, be the same as, or similar to, each other, and where this is the case it is indicated below. However, where recommendations have been made at the validation stage, these must be incorporated into the accreditation proposal, with concomitant changes as necessary. In addition, the information in the accreditation proposal may sometimes need to be more detailed than that in the validation proposal.

An accreditation document is divided into three parts:

1. The description of the proposed programme (Sections 1-9 below)
2. The module descriptors (using the approved template in Akari) (Section 10 below)
3. The *curricula vitae* of the members of the programme team (using the template provided) (Section 11 below).

A typical accreditation proposal might run to 15-20 A4 pages or approximately 6,000-8,000 words in terms of 1. above, with the length of 2. and 3. being determined by the number of modules and the size of the programme team.

In every instance where reference is made to a document which is available on line, the appropriate web link should be included. Examples include the National Framework of Qualifications, strategic plans, and reports which indicate a need for provision of higher education in a particular discipline area. If the online access is internal to DCU only, consideration should be given to providing a hard copy of the relevant document as an appendix to the proposal (but these should be kept to a minimum – see line 12 of the table below).

A table of contents should be provided. It should include a list of all the modules and a list of all the members of the programme team, for whom *curricula vitae* are provided (though these two lists may directly precede Sections 10 and 11 of the document rather than being in the table of contents, if this is considered more appropriate). If possible, for ease of reading, hard copies should be colour-coded – i.e. white for Sections 1-9 inclusive, a second colour for Section 10 and a third colour for Section 11. It should be ensured that the document forms a coherent and readable whole and that appropriate cross-referencing is in place.

It is important to note that, where a proposed new programme incorporates both new and existing modules, the latter are not of themselves deemed due for accreditation (as they have already been accredited in a previous context). What is due for accreditation is: (a) the new modules, and (b) the programme as a whole, including the appropriateness of the relationship between the new and the existing modules. The members of the Accreditation Board need not necessarily comment on existing modules *per se*, though it is open to them to make suggestions for amendments to them where they consider it appropriate to do this as well as to consider the appropriateness of the relationship between the existing modules and the proposed new modules. Module descriptors should be provided in all cases. It should be made clear which modules are new and which already exist.

An **accreditation** proposal should consist of the following:

<i>Section</i>	<i>Content</i>
1	Summary description of the background to and development of the proposal (using the template provided)
2	Entry, progression and exit routes
3	Purpose of the programme
4	Programme learning outcomes
5	Aptitudes and proficiencies
6	Outline structure of programme

7	Marks and Standards and programme-specific regulations
8	Alignment matrix
9	Quality assurance and programme evaluation
10	Module descriptors
11	<i>Curricula vitae</i> of the members of the programme team The CVs should normally be omitted from any additional copies of the documentation which are made available to the programme team
12	Any necessary appendices (but these should be kept to a minimum)

Resources at the following link may be of assistance to programme proposers:
<http://www.dcu.ie/teu/index.shtml>.

Section 1 – Summary description of the background to and development of the proposal

The structure of this section is the same as that for the validation proposal except that a section on implementation plans is included. The information will need to be updated from the time of validation.

Background (1,000 words maximum)	
Proposed programme title **	<i>[e.g. BA in....., MA in.....]</i>
Proposed designatory letters	<i>[e.g. BA, BSc, MSc]</i>
NFQ level	
Credits	
Part-time/full-time/continuous	
Duration	
Mode of delivery⁸	<i>[e.g. traditional, distance, blended]</i>
In partnership with external organisation(s)	
Proposed launch date	
Implementation plans (500 words maximum)	

⁸ e.g. traditional, distance, blended.

Validation proposal approved by Education Committee Standing Committee	<i>[date of ECSC meeting]</i>
Validation recommendations approved by Education Committee	<i>[date of EC meeting – consult the Office of the Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) about this, if necessary]</i>
Validation recommendations approved by Academic Council	<i>[date of Academic Council meeting]</i>
Accreditation proposal submitted for forwarding to the Accreditation Board	<i>[date of submission to the Office of the Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar)]</i>
Accreditation proposal considered by the Accreditation Board	<i>[date of meeting of Accreditation Board]</i>

**Please note that the title of the programme should comply with the list of titles/designations set out in Marks and Standards version 2016.1, Award Titles, paragraph 1.2 and as listed on page 12 of this document.

Section 2 – Entry, progression and exit routes

This section may be based on the validation proposal, with changes/updates if necessary.

Section 3 – Purpose of the programme

This section may be based on the validation proposal, though this section in particular may need to be more detailed than at the validation stage.

Section 4 – Programme learning outcomes

This section may be based on the validation proposal, with changes/updates if necessary.

Section 5 – Aptitudes and proficiencies

This section may be based on the validation proposal, with changes/updates if necessary.

Section 6 – Outline structure of programme

This section may be based on the validation proposal, with changes/updates if necessary (and it is likely that this section in particular may need to be more detailed than at the validation stage).

Section 7 – Marks and Standards and programme-specific regulations

Specify that the programme adheres to DCU Marks and Standards. A web link to Marks and Standards as below should be provided--

https://www4.dcu.ie/sites/default/files/registry/marks_standards_2016.1_approved.pdf

In certain cases, the possibility of requesting a derogation from Marks and Standards may need to be factored into discussions. As outlined in Marks and Standards (page 2): ‘*only derogations required by professional bodies will be considered for approval*’. Such derogations, where approved by the Faculty, should be outlined here but flagged as provisional pending approval by the University Standards Committee (which must consider all requests for derogations) and ultimate approval by Academic Council. In all cases the following statement must be included: ‘The derogation(s) is/are being requested within the parameters permitted by DCU Marks and Standards.’

The proposed programme-specific regulations (using the approved template, available at <http://www.dcu.ie/ovpaa/usc/index.shtml>) should be included here. The following statement must be included here also:

‘These programme-specific regulations are in addition, and complementary, to DCU Marks and Standards. They are proposed for the initial years of implementation and will be reviewed annually to ensure ongoing fitness for purpose.’

Section 8 – Alignment matrix

The alignment matrix should provide a clear demonstration that each programme learning outcome can be achieved and assessed by the discrete modules that make up the programme. It should indicate the extent and strength of the contribution of each module to each of the programme learning outcomes.

This section should be copied and pasted from the section in Akari called ‘PO Delivery’ which indicates how each module on the programme contributes to the programme learning outcomes.

Further examples of alignment matrices can be found on Akari.

Section 9 – Quality assurance and programme evaluation

Reference must be made here to:

- use of external examiners in accordance with University procedures (with links to relevant parts of University website, especially http://www4.dcu.ie/sites/default/files/ovpaa/regulations_and_guidelines_for_external_examiners_app_ac_12_october_2016.pdf)
- use of programme review procedures (see Section 1.2 above)

- use of student feedback procedures (with references to national and University procedures; the advice of the Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning/Education should be sought about this)
- periodic review by external professional bodies, where relevant
- any other quality assurance mechanism that may apply.

In all cases, it should be stipulated that standard procedures will be adhered to. Where additional detail is necessary, e.g. with regard to reviews by external professional bodies, this should be provided.

Section 10 – Module descriptors

As in Akari. Please note the table of contents should include a list of all the modules and a list of all the members of the programme team, for whom *curricula vitae* are provided (though these two lists may directly precede Sections 10 and 11 of the document rather than being in the table of contents, if this is considered more appropriate).

Section 11– Curricula vitae of the members of the programme team

These should be made available in alphabetical order by surname using the template below. See note above under Section 10.

*Curriculum vitae of the members of the programme team, for Accreditation
Documentation (Template)*

Dublin City University

Name _____

Position _____

School (or other group) _____

ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

Institution	From	To	Award

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

EMPLOYMENT RECORD

Organisation	From	To

PUBLICATIONS AND PAPERS PRESENTED

(Please include details of last 3 refereed publications and an indication of numbers of publications by category)

RESEARCH INTERESTS

TEACHING INTERESTS

OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

APPENDIX 1 Sign-off by the Executive Dean of Faculty (Form)

Confirmation by the Executive Dean of Faculty that all validation recommendations, and any recommendations from Academic Council in the context of consideration of the validation recommendations, have been carried out

I the undersigned confirm that, following the validation process, all the validation recommendations in respect of the proposed programme named below have been implemented and/or any recommendations that are not for immediate implementation but are aspirational or future-oriented have been fully considered and discussed by the relevant Faculty committees with a view to action as appropriate.⁹

Title of proposed programme:

Role	Name	Signature¹⁰	Date
Executive Dean of Faculty			

⁹ Where more than one Faculty is involved, please copy and paste the table.

¹⁰ Please provide a digital signature here.

APPENDIX 2: Flowchart outlining the validation and accreditation procedures

