# Institutional Approval/Review Agenda, Membership List and Briefing Note

**Collaborative Partner Name:** *Enter Collaborative Partner’s full name*

**Date:** *Enter Event date*

**Location:** *Enter location of where event is taking place*

## Agenda

Please note agenda items and timings are indicative and may be changed by the Panel on the day.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Item No** | **Item Title** |
|  | 0 | Arrival |
|  | 1 | Pre-meeting of the panel to finalise the agenda  |
|  | 2 | Welcome and apologies |
|  | 3 | Presentation from Collaborative Partner and London Met School(s) – Overview of the Institution and the partnership |
|  | 4 | Organisation Structure, Strategy and Development of Provision |
|  | 5 | Quality Assurance and Enhancement, Governance and Policies and Procedures  |
|  | 6 | Student Support (Academic and pastoral) |
|  | 7 | Student Engagement, Partnership and Feedback |
|  | 8 | Student Employability and Enterprise |
|  | 9 | Tour of teaching sites and resources |
|  | 10 | Student panel meeting |
|  | 11 | Private panel deliberations |
|  | 12 | Panel to communicate outcomes of the Institutional Approval/Review:Commendations and recommendations Conditions - Actions, person(s) responsible and completion dates |
|  | 13 | End of panel visit |

## Membership List

University Panel Members

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Enter name* | **Chair***Enter job title*  |
| *Enter name* | **Secretary to Panel***Enter job title*  |
| *Enter name* | **Internal Panel Member***Enter job title*  |
| *Enter name* | **External Advisor***Enter job title*  |
| *Enter name* | **External Advisor** *Enter job title*  |

Collaborative Academic Partner Representatives

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Enter name* | *Enter job title*  |
| *Enter name* | *Enter job title*  |
| *Enter name* | *Enter job title*  |

In Attendance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Enter name* | *Enter job title*  |
| *Enter name* | *Enter job title*  |

## Briefing Note

Briefing note for the Panel and attendees of the Institutional approval/review event, taking place on *enter event* *date* at *enter collaborative academic partner name*.

1. **Purpose of the event**
2. **Background Information**
3. **Overview of the Institutional Approval/ Review Event**
4. **Scope of the Meeting**
5. **Externality**
6. **Collaborative Provision**
7. **Outcome of the Institutional Approval/ Review event**
8. At the end of the Institutional Approval/ Review event, the panel will agree on one of three outcomes for the course:
9. the partnership is approved/ re-approved;
10. the partnership is approved/ re-approved subject to one or more conditions;
11. the partnership is not approved/ re-approved.
12. Where conditions are set, the panel must specify the date by which they must be met and the Institution must respond to the conditions by this date.
13. **Point of contact**

If you have any questions in relation to the Institutional Approval/ Review event please email the Panel Secretary/ Quality Manager (Partnerships) - r.kailla@londonmet.ac.uk or aqdpartnerships@londonmet.ac.uk.Briefing Note for the meeti

ng to review the institutional partnership between London

Metropolitan University and MARCH, Moscow School of Architecture, and to review the BA

Architecture and Urbanism and MA Architecture and Urbanism courses for delivery at MARCH,

Moscow School of Architecture, to be held on Wednesday, 18

th

and Thursday, 19

th

July 2018 in

Moscow.

Th

e purpose of this event is to review the partnership of London Metropolitan University and

MARCH, Moscow School of Architecture

; and the continuing delivery of the

Architec

ture and

Urbanism and MA Architecture and Urbanism courses by MARCH, Moscow School of Architecture

.

Bac

kground to MARCH, Moscow School of Architecture

1.

MARCH, Moscow School of Architecture was founded in 2012 in order to offer the

opportunity to study a

n international architecture curriculum.

2.

Originally only the MA Architecture and Urbanism course was offered. When this course

was due for its first revalidation in 2015, the School added the BA

(Hons)

Architecture and

Urbanism course. In order to synchr

onise the institutional and course review cycle the

institutional revalidation and the validation of the MA course were again limited to three

years. As a result both courses and the institutional review are now due.

Higher Education context in Russian F

ederation

3.

Some

54 percent

of 25- to 64-

year

-old Russians held tertiary degrees as of 2015,

making the country one of the most educated in the world. However, birth rates have

dropped dramatically, leading to a steep fall in applications for higher education

studies. The decline, expected to cut tertiary enrolments by as much as 56 percent

between 2008 and 2021, has also played a role in the proposed closure and merger of

many universities.

4.

All

higher education institutions

in

Russia, public or private,

must

have a state

license to deliver education programs. To award nationally recognized degrees,

institutions must also obtain state accreditation. The accreditation process is

overseen by the Federal Service for Supervision in Education and Science

Page

7 of 362

(Rosobrnadzor), and is based on institutional self-assessments, peer review, and site

visits certify

ing compliance with standards set by Russia’s

National Accreditation

Agency

(subordinated to Rosobrnadzor).

5.

In 2015 MARCH was awarded a license by the Moscow government

(

https://march.ru/en/about/licenses/4572/

).

6.

Accreditation is granted for six-year periods, and entitles institutions to award state-

recognized diplomas in a set number of disciplines, and to apply for funding by the

government. Both the

National Accreditation

Agency and Rosobrnadzor

maintain

online databases of accredited institutions and the degree programs they are

authorized to offer. Accordingly MARCH will be due for Russian reaccreditation in

2021.

(source:

https://wenr.wes.org/2017/

06/education-

in-the -russian

-

federation

)

Event

7.

T

he programme is set out over two days and combines the Institutional Review and the two

course review events. The visit will begin with a presentation by the Partner’s senior

management, followed by a tour of MARCH premises, followed by a meeting with the

management team who will brief the panel on the institutional context and strategic

direction. There will be opportunity to discuss the rationale behind the link with the

University and how this fits into the strategic ambitions of the College and the University’s

Sir John Cass School of Art, Architecture and Design.

8.

These sessions will be followed by designated sessions for the consideration of the

undergraduate and postgraduate courses respectively.

Scop

e of Meeting

9.

At the meetings the panel is asked to consider the following:

•

Governance and management

•

Policies and procedures

•

Operation of partnership

•

Rationale and anticipated demand

•

Course and staff management

•

Necessary staff development and interactio

n with the University

•

the design principles underpinning the programme

•

the definition and appropriateness of standards in accordance with the level and title of

the award

•

the necessary resources to support the programme given the number of anticipated

stud

ents and any predicted growth

•

anticipated demand for the programme
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•

the contents of the course specification

•

the nature of the learning opportunities offered by the programme

•

the relationship between the programme's curriculum and current research and

profe

ssional standards in this subject area

Exte

rnality

10.

The use of appropriate externality in processes for programme design, approval and review

allows an institution to avail itself of opportunities for enhancement, as well as for

assurance.

11.

External participation is important too for ensuring that programmes are designed,

developed, approved and reviewed in the light of independent advice and for ensuring both

transparency of process and confirmation of standards. Such external participation provides

assur

ance at various levels: to the team delivering the programme and to the University in

monitoring the independence and objectivity of decisions taken under its procedures; to its

students; and to any reviewers who may carry out reviews/audits that are exter

nal to the

University’s own processes.

12.

The external member of the panel is therefore asked to consider the documentation in light

of her subject knowledge and to provide assurance that:

•

th

e programme meets level descriptors according to the Framework for Higher

Education

•

the course is will help develop student employability

•

the staff at Partner are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver the

programme

•

the resources available to staff and students are suitable

•

the delivery of the course to date h

as met UK standards for Higher Education courses

•

the proposed curriculum will continue to meet expectations of professional standards in

this subject area

Co

llaborative Provision

13.

In addition, the Quality Assurance Agency advises panels that are quality as

suring

collaborative provision that the awarding institution should:

•

en

sure that the academic standards of all its programmes, however delivered, are

clearly expressed and communicated to all involved with, and studying on, a

programme, for example by the

preparation and dissemination of a programme

specification;

•

review regularly the extent to which programmes have achieved their intended

objectives;

•

provide evidence of the comparability between student attainment on programmes

provided under the collabo

rative arrangement and student attainment on any

equivalent programmes delivered by the Awarding Institution;
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•

provide evidence of the extent to which student attainment matches any applicable

subject benchmark standards and/or level descriptors in the UK qualifications

frameworks (when these are implemented).

14.

The panel should assure itself that the partner is fully cognisant of the University’s policies,

procedures and mission and that differing cultural expectations are taken into account. In

addition,

the panel should be satisfied of the following:

•

qu

ality assurance mechanisms are in place at course and organisational level

•

sound management procedures and administrative support are in place

•

facilities and services are in place and adequately support s

tudents

•

staff selection, induction and development at institutional and course level meet the

requirements of the University

15.

Pa

nel members are invited to submit initial comments on the draft documentation to the

Secretary prior to the meeting.

16.

The m

ee

ting has been convened in the spirit of peer review and the panel is expected to

offer advice and guidance on the delivery of the course. In keeping with the spirit of

partnership, the panel is requested to share with partners good practice procedures in terms

of collaboration and quality assurance.

17.

At the end of the meeting, the panel will agree on one of three outcomes for both aspects of

the event: The Panel recommends to the University that the partnership continues;

continues subject to one of more co

nditions; or that the partnership should be discontinued.

18.

Regarding the courses, the Panel decides for each course, if the course is approved; the

course is not approved or that the course is approved subject to one or more conditions.

Where conditions a

re set, the panel must specify the date by which they must be met and

the course team must respond to the conditions by this date.

19.

Finally, if you have any issues you would like to raise before the meeting, please email me at

tsmwils1@staff.londonmet.ac.uk

. In the meantime, may I take this opportunity to thank

you for agreeing to sit on the panel. I hope you will find the experience both interesting and

useful.