



**Interim Proposal for 2016/17 (extended to 2017/18 and 2018/19):
Delegation of authority for new programme / programme change approval**

For review and recommendation to Academic Council

RECOMMENDATION

Academic Council is asked to approve the following:

- 1) The interim proposal for 2016/2017, set out in this paper, to delegate authority to Programme Boards / Graduate School Boards to approve certain new programmes, programme changes, and derogation requests.
- 2) Consequent revision of terms of reference and governance documents as a result of this proposal (see appendix 2).

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Academic Council (AC), at its meeting of 11 December 2014, approved the recommendation of the AC Review Working Group (Working Group) that UPB should review its functions:

- Recommendation 4: Reconstitute the UUPB and UGPB into a single body, UPB, and review the composition and terms of reference (ToR) of the Board to realign the strategic role of the committee in programme related work.

The Working Group noted that the consolidation of UUPB and UGPB was supported by the Chairs of both committees following a successful 18-month pilot of running the two committees as a joint programmes board.

In a further document submitted to UPB for its 19 March 2015 meeting, the Working Group suggested that the amalgamated ToR be drafted so as to better define the active and potential roles/responsibilities of the UPB. Of particular importance was the perception that the UPB as currently constituted does not have the capacity to fulfil all the stated functions of its ToR. The Working Group questioned whether the newly constituted body should have these responsibilities removed from its ToR, or whether mechanisms should be put in place so as to facilitate these hitherto under-realised responsibilities. It concluded that the proposed ToR should reflect the oversight by UPB across all institutional academic provision, echoing the recommendation to AC in December 2014 that there would be value in freeing UPB from high volume routine matters to allow greater focus on strategic programme matters.

To date UPB has only conducted a review of its ToR in order to support the merger of UUPB and UGPB into a single board. As a result, some of the functions set out in its current ToR seem to be outdated and remain associated with modularisation and previous strategic initiatives¹. Similarly, the Working Group's recommendation that UPB should identify any functions, in particular high volume routine business, that might appropriately be delegated to free UPB to allow for greater focus on

¹ For example: reference to credit frameworks and encouraging the development of thematic doctoral programmes.

strategic programme matters² has not been carried out. Instead, UPB has recently regained some business that had been previously delegated to a number of subcommittees, arising from the establishment of three new Boards of Studies.

INTERIM PROPOSAL FOR 2016/17

During 2016/17, UCD Registry will review the programme development, approval and review process (PDARF). While this review is underway, in line with the recommendations of the Working Group to refocus UPB towards greater engagement with strategic objectives, particularly within the context of Strategic Initiative 2 and the Curriculum Review, the following modus operandi is proposed for semester 2 of 2016/17.

It is important to note that UPB retains its role in relation to:

- All strategic programme developments, e.g. international programmes, programmes fundamentally changing structure by introducing an additional year, changes in the BA and BSocSci;
- All proposals for new collaborative programmes;
- Specified changes to existing programmes;
- All programme derogations and specified module derogations;
- All student-related matters currently under its remit;³
- Other routine matters, including approval of School CPD Frameworks.

Where possible, these matters will be dealt with under part 2 of the agenda and taken as read unless the Chair or any member wishes to raise an issue, provide peer to peer advice or seek clarification. UPB members are encouraged to continue to bring programme development matters to UPB for discussion or advice.

A. NEW PROGRAMME PROPOSALS: interim process for 2016/17

Once UMT has approved the strategic and financial case of new programmes (as captured in PDARF 1 and 2), delegate the authority to approve the academic case to the relevant governing board i.e. Programme Board/Graduate School Board (hereafter referred to as the programme board).⁴ The programme board is responsible for also ensuring the proposed programme is compliant with UCD Academic Regulations. This delegation of authority excludes those categories listed below.

- All strategic programme developments, e.g. international programmes, programmes fundamentally changing structure by introducing an additional year, changes in the BA and BSocSci;
- All proposals for new collaborative programmes;
- All proposals from Recognised College Joint Academic Programme Boards
- All proposals from University level Boards of Study
- proposals resulting in the creation of additional CAO entry routes (i.e. DN Codes)

² The types of decisions taken by UPB are set out in Appendix 1.

³ Such student-related matters include: RPL where more than the allowed maximum amount of credit is to be awarded; Dual registration requests; Approval of adjunct staff as principal supervisors; Co-tutelle agreements/inter-institutional co-supervisory arrangements (for noting); PhD registration period where the period is less than the required minimum

⁴ As previously mentioned, this excludes proposals for new collaborative programmes.

B. PROGRAMME CHANGE PROPOSALS: interim process for 2016/17

Delegate the authority to approve programme changes, excluding those categories listed below, to the relevant programme board. The programme board is responsible for ensuring that all changes are compliant with UCD Academic Regulations and, where they impact on existing students, that those students have been consulted in advance and agree to the change proposed.

Programme changes that continue to require UPB approval:

- Retrospective programme changes
- Changes to total elective credits (also captured under derogation requests)
- Entry/admission requirements changes
- Changes to the governance of programmes
- Changes relating to collaborative programmes, including the introduction of a collaboration into an existing programme
- Changes that require Academic Council approval, e.g. proposals to change programme matriculation requirements or programme subject requirements.

C. DEROGATION REQUESTS: interim process for 2016/17

Derogation approval retained by UPB		Derogation approval delegated to Programme Boards / Graduate School Boards /	
Type of Derogation	Regulation	Type of Derogation	Regulation
Delivery outside of autumn or spring semester - e.g. module delivery across 2 or more semesters, module outside semester, UG or GT taught module in summer term	2.1	Module Size – irregular credit value	1.3
Assessment – irregular length	4.3	Assessment – irregular timing	2.1, 4.1, 5.9
Must pass components	4.7	No elective places on UG modules	3.9.4
Assessment – no resit offered	5.9		
UG Programme to have restricted or no elective places	3.9.4		
GT Programme is longer than 1 stage	1.5		

PROPOSED PROCESS

1. The programme board communicates required information to UCD Registry to enable curriculum build. Updated PDARF forms that capture required information, including the date of programme board approval, to be used. All such forms will be saved by UCD Registry in a central repository.
2. UCD Registry will ensure the forms are legitimately approved and in line with regulations and, excepting errors, send any anomalies up to UPB, notifying the relevant programme board of same.

3. Curriculum Build will occur in line with UPB and programme board dates with an expected turnaround of 5 working days from approved forms submission to UCD Registry. There will be a blackout period with regards to new Programme build for the month of August.
4. Programme boards will submit an annual report to UPB for the first meeting in 2017/18 providing a commentary on how new programmes/programme changes they have approved enhance the portfolio of offerings, identify any good practice and/or regulatory issues arising. UCD Registry will submit a consolidated complementary report. The anticipated value of the joint reporting model is to identify good practice, allow peer to peer sharing of experiences, identify any regulatory issues encountered by PBs that may need to be written into the regulations, and manage any unanticipated risks.

It should be noted however that where a programme board is found to be consistently out of line with academic regulations, UPB will have authority to revoke the programme board's delegated authority, in order to manage any risks arising.

DECISION REQUIRED OF UPB

UPB is asked to consider this proposal, its advantages and risks and, as regulatory change is required to delegate this authority to programme boards, to make final recommendations to Academic Council.

Appendix 1
TYPES OF DECISIONS CURRENTLY TAKEN BY UPB

Category	Submission	UPB decision-making at present
Programme related matters	New programme proposals	Approval
	Proposals to make changes to existing programmes (excluding changes to matriculation requirements, subject requirements)	Approval
	Requests for programme/module derogations	Approval
	CPD School Frameworks	Approval
	MOUs/MOAs for collaborative programmes	Noting
	Proposals to change programme matriculation requirements, programme subject requirements	Review and recommendation to AC
Student related matters	Dual registration requests	Approval or noting
	RPL where more than the allowed maximum amount of credit is to be awarded	Approval
	Approval of adjunct staff as principal supervisors	Approval
	Co-tutelle agreements/inter-institutional co-supervisory arrangements	Noting
	PhD registration period where the period is less than the required minimum and maximum	Approval
Governance related matters	Policy proposals (new/changes)	Review and recommendation to AC
	Proposals to change Academic Regulations	Review and recommendation to AC
	Programme Board terms of reference	Review and recommendation to AC
	UPB subcommittee terms of reference and membership	Approval
	Annual continuation and re-admission report	Noting
	RPL annual report	Noting
	RLOA annual report	Noting
	CPD-activity annual report	Noting
	CPD School Framework review	Noting
Miscellaneous items, e.g. submission from Internship Steering Committee	For discussion/for noting/for review, and recommendation to AC, as appropriate	

Appendix 2

ADDITIONAL CHANGES NECESSITATED BY THIS PROPOSAL

In the context of the recommendations outlined in the *University Programme's Board (UPB) Interim Proposal for 2016/2017*, the issues itemised in appendix 2 are additional areas of concern not addressed in the proposal but that warrant the consideration of Academic Council. A recommendation is made in relation to each issue.

i) Change to terms of reference of UPB and global change to terms of reference for Programme Boards / Graduate School Boards

If approved by Academic Council, the *UPB Interim Proposal for 2016/2017* will necessitate:

- a) amendment to the terms of reference of UPB; and
- b) a global change to the terms of reference of all programme boards, graduate school boards.

The change to the terms of reference of UPB would include the following:

- Responsibility to approve new programmes, programme changes, and derogations (under delegated authority from Academic Council) would be limited to the excluded categories identified in the *UPB Interim Proposal for 2016/2017*.
- A requirement to review annual reports from local boards.
- An explicit role in auditing the activity of local boards and continued responsibility for academic governance.

The global change to the terms of reference of local boards would include the following:

- Delegated authority to approve new programmes, programme changes, and derogations – excepting the excluded categories listed in the *UPB Interim Proposal for 2016/2017* – would be located with local boards.
- The necessity to submit an annual report to UPB for the first meeting in the 2017/2018 academic session providing commentary on how new programmes and programme changes have enhanced the portfolio of the University's programmes, and identifying good practices and regulatory issues that arose during the year.

Recommendation 1:

- Academic Council to approve changes to the terms of reference of UPB and local programme boards, necessitated by the *UPB Interim Proposal for 2016/2017*.

ii) Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

At its meeting on 6 October 2016, UPB approved amendments to the *CPD Governance Framework and Procedure* and supporting documents. However, if approved, the *UPB Interim Proposal for 2016/2017* will impact these procedures and documents. They would need to be amended to include the following clarifications:

- Where CPD is delivered through modules or programmes, delegated authority to approve new programmes, programme changes, and derogations would be located with local boards, with the same excluded categories as listed in the *UPB Interim Proposal for 2016/2017*. That is, where CPD is delivered through modules or programmes, such modules and programmes are treated like any other module or programme in the University in terms of academic governance.
- Where CPD is not delivered through modules and programmes (i.e. non-credit-bearing CPD units) delegated authority to approve such offerings would be retained by UPB.
- UPB will be responsible for the review and approval of School CPD frameworks.

Recommendation 2:

- Academic Council to approve amendments to the *CPD Governance Framework and Procedure* to clarify:
 - that where CPD is delivered through modules and programmes, such modules and programmes are treated like any other module or programme in the University in terms of academic governance;
 - UPB will retain delegated authority to approve CPD that is not delivered through modules and programmes (i.e. non-credit-bearing CPD units) and responsibility for review and approval of School CPD frameworks.