A: Definitions

**Programme**: The set of modules studied for a named award (this may include modules (core or optional) from outside the main department). These are set out in the Programme Specifications (and from 2016/17 Programme Design Documents, PDD) and approved by University Teaching Committee. The *Programme Specification/PDD* governs a programme of study as an approved pathway leading to a particular named award of the University (for example, BA in Archaeology, BSc in Biology, BA in English and Philosophy). They consist of a defined combination of modules, at an appropriate level, and set out the learning outcomes. These specifications are developed and maintained by Boards of Studies/Combined Boards of Studies/Graduate School Boards and approved by University Teaching Committee. For further information on programme specifications, please see: [http://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/programme-development/programmes/programme-specifications/](http://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/programme-development/programmes/programme-specifications/)

**Modification**: a change or changes made to a particular programme or programmes (as defined above). This encompasses, for example, the addition or withdrawal of modules, and changes to teaching, learning and assessment methods. A modification does not include changes made to accommodate individual students (see section below on *Changes to Accommodate Individual Students*).

**Core module**: a module required for a programme.

**Option module**: a module chosen by a student from a prescribed list of modules within a programme.

**Module catalogue**: the online module catalogue is the platform to be used for proposing modifications to individual modules and to programmes involving module changes. Pertinent information about modules included in the catalogue is then published publicly to inform current and prospective students and other stakeholders about the University’s programmes. See: [https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/programmes/programme/](https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/programmes/programme/)

Further definitions are provided in the undergraduate, postgraduate and graduate frameworks for programme design, available at: [http://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/programme-development/programmes/programme-design/](http://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/programme-development/programmes/programme-design/)

B: Overview

1. Primary responsibility for considering and approving modifications to programmes of study rests with Boards of Studies (BoS) (or Graduate School Boards (GSB), where these have delegated power for postgraduate programmes). Modifications affecting combined programmes should also have the approval of the Combined Executive Committee and Chair(s) of the BoS for the partner department(s). For those departments/programmes within a faculty, where modifications are more far-reaching, or affect the current cohort of students (normally classed as ‘major’), approval of the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group (FLTG) to which the Department reports is also required. For those departments/programmes outwith one of the three faculties where modifications are more far-reaching, or affect the current cohort of students (normally classed as ‘major’), please contact the Academic Quality Team in ASO for advice on the appropriate approval route.

2. Modifications to programmes are categorised for procedural purposes as ‘minor’ or ‘major’. These categories are described in more detail in section F. To help determine which category a modification falls into, please refer to the flowchart and appendix 1 and 2 below. For minor modifications, final approval rests with the BoS (or delegated GSB). For major modifications FLTG approval is also required and, in some cases the comments of the relevant external examiner(s) should be sought in support of the modification.
3 Departments should factor in sufficient time for the approval of modifications, particularly those deemed major and which therefore require the approval of FLTG. For example, if a modification is considered by the full Committee (rather than by Chair’s action), the process of approval may take a few months (see section C).

4 As a general principle, modifications should be implemented for the next entering cohort and not for current students. Modifications affecting current students and prospective students (once the admissions cycle has begun) require careful consideration, consultation with students and usually the confirmed agreement that students do not object to the change. See the boxes below on Modifications Affecting Current Cohorts of Students and Modifications Affecting Prospective Students.

5 Modifications affecting programmes included in the prospectus of the International Pathway College (IPC) and, onto which IPC students may progress, may require additional consultation and consideration by the Director of the IPC and IPC Board of Studies. It is expected that all programme modification proposals involving modifications to single or multiple modules will be proposed via the online module catalogue.

6 Modifications concerning the introduction or withdrawal of study abroad or work-based learning placements may require additional consultation with Registry Services due to the potential implication of the modification for Tier 4 visa compliance; Departments should seek advice from the Visa Compliance Team (tier4@york.ac.uk) prior to submitting proposals for approval.

7 All modifications to programmes must be documented and filed by the BoS/ GSB so that cumulative changes to programmes can be tracked. These records will be audited, as a minimum, as part of the University’s periodic review process.

8 Where a modification to a programme involves collaboration with another institution or external body, the Academic Quality Team (AQT) in the Academic Support Office and the relevant University guidance on teaching collaboration should be consulted (https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/programmes/collaboration/).

Changes to Accommodate Individual Students

If a department wishes to change the approved programme of study for a single student (e.g. to propose a variation in the standard pattern of registration or progression), it must make a case to the Special Cases Committee (SCC).

If a department wishes to change the assessment regime for a single student in advance of the assessment (e.g. to allow a student to submit an essay in place of undertaking an examination), it should make a case to the Standing Committee on Assessment (SCA).

If a department wishes to change the assessment regime for a single student in retrospect (e.g. following failure to attend an examination), it should make a case to the SCC.

Modifications Affecting Current Cohorts of Students

It is normal practice to implement modifications with a new cohort of students (i.e. a cohort new to the programme of study). If a department wishes to implement a modification for a current cohort, in most cases it will be dealt with as a major modification, i.e. FLTG approval is required. However, see also Appendix 1 below, which sets out the approvals required for the different types of modifications for current students. In a small number of scenarios BoS approval is sufficient (e.g., the addition of optional modules).

The reason for treating the majority of modifications affecting current cohorts as major is not, per se, to prevent such modifications taking place but rather to serve as an additional safeguard and to meet the University’s responsibilities to students as set out by the Consumer and Markets Authority. This is important, given that a modification could compromise the student experience and serve as grounds
for a student to complain or appeal. Moreover, as the relationship between a University and its students is considered in law to be contractual and regulated by consumer law (the student contract), a student whose programme is modified could take legal action against the University.

A modification that affects a current cohort is likely to be approved if:

(A) the department can provide evidence that no student involved (including visiting students and students taking a module as an elective) will be disadvantaged by the change. That is, the change is minor and either neutral or advantageous in terms of its impact on the student experience (and consequently unlikely to provide grounds for a complaint, appeal or legal action – or any such move could be dismissed as unreasonable). For example, minor modifications that allow new research to be brought into the curriculum, or that specifically address the concerns of students, external examiners, or professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs), will normally be approved.

AND/OR

(B) all students involved (including visiting students and students taking a module as an elective) have been consulted and given their informed consent for the change. Written consent from all students is likely to be a requirement in cases pertaining to changes to the published teaching timetable (see also section on Timetabling Implications), the assessment regime or assessment regulations. As far as is practicable, departments should ensure they give sufficient time for students to feedback their concerns/ consent, record the students’ views and if applicable inform all students of the modification’s approval and implications for their studies.

Occasionally, circumstances may arise where programme changes that could have a negative impact upon a current cohort of students are unavoidable (e.g. because of unforeseen staff changes at short notice). In such a scenario, a department should, as a matter of urgency, consult with the Chair of the FLTG, the AQT and, if appropriate, the Chair of the SCA. The aim will be to devise a plan that protects the interests of the students by ensuring that the impact of any modifications to the programme are minimal and that the student experience is not compromised. The department may be asked to take action to prevent a similar situation arising in future.

**Modifications Affecting Prospective Students (including those in the IPC)**

Modifications affecting prospective students, including those in the IPC expected to progress to a York degree programme must also be handled carefully if the University is to avoid complaints and legal action.

Individuals apply to the University on the basis of the information available to them at the time of application, e.g. in the prospectus, in departmental flyers, and on departmental websites. A department must inform prospective students, *at the earliest opportunity*, of any major changes to a programme made between the time the offer of a place is made and registration is completed, and advise prospective students of the options available in the circumstances (including the chance for individuals to change their minds about their place on the programme). Major changes would include the withdrawal of key modules, major alternations to the teaching, learning and assessment arrangements for the programme and a change in the status of the programme, for example the withdrawal of PSRB accreditation.

Student Recruitment and Admissions should be consulted about modifications made once the admissions cycle is underway (e.g. renaming a programme mid-recruitment cycle is problematic).

The Director of the IPC and IPC Board of Studies should be consulted about proposed changes to the titles of programmes included in the IPC prospectus and any substantial changes to the programme that may affect its representation to IPC students.
Publicity Material

Departments should bear the student contract in mind when preparing prospectus entries and placing information on websites etc. Particular attention should be paid to: (i) module choice (for example, departments are advised to focus on the range and likely areas of option modules, rather than on specific offerings, especially those dependent on a single member of staff) and (ii) methods of assessment (e.g. the balance between open and closed assessments). Departments may also find it helpful to include appropriate disclaimers in their publicity material but should note that the use of disclaimers does not, in itself, provide protection against complaints, appeals or legal action. Departments should contact Student Recruitment and Admissions and Communications and Marketing if they have any queries about the suitability of publicity material.

C: Obtaining Departmental and University Approval for a Proposed Modification

Departmental Stage of Approval

9 Once a proposed modification has been explored it should be developed and proposed in the online module catalogue and/or using the FLTG Modifications Pro Forma (see Appendix 3) by relevant staff, with appropriate consultation with, and support from, University offices and individuals as appropriate to ensure that the implications of the programme modification can be considered. (See: https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/programmes/programme). Departments should also consult their departmental UTC contact who will act as a critical friend in reviewing the proposal and supporting its development prior to its submission to the FLTG (https://www.york.ac.uk/about/organisation/governance/sub-committees/teaching-committee/contacts/).

10 Once the proposal has been completed in the online module catalogue and/or using the FLTG Modifications Pro Forma, the proposer will submit it to the appropriate Chair BoS (or GSB) for approval with any relevant supporting documentation (for example a revised PDD). Once the modification has been considered and approved by the Chair BoS/GSB a record of the approval should then be filed in the department for audit purposes.

11 Definitions of minor and major modifications are provided below in Section F.

12 For minor modifications, approval by the BoS (or GSB) marks the end of the approval process. There are a series of related actions, for which departments are responsible, that might need to be carried out following approval (see section D below).

13 Once a major modification has been approved by the BoS (or GSB), it must be approved at University level. The modification proposal in the online module catalogue should be submitted to the FLTG by the Chair BoS, along with any written comments from the external examiner(s) and other documentation to the department’s AQT contact (https://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/). (NB. where there are resource implications, Planning approval through the FLTG might be needed. Departments should consult their Planning Officer about this http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/po/staff.htm).

University Stage of Approval

14 In relation to major modifications, the Chair of the FLTG, in discussion with the AQTC and, where appropriate, the departmental UTC contact, will decide whether the proposed modification can be dealt with by Chair’s action or whether it should be considered by the full FLTG at the next appropriate meeting. The following major modifications will normally be referred to a full FLTG meeting:

- Proposals to change the mode of delivery of the programme
- Addition, or substantive revision, of a work-based placement or study abroad element
• Content changes that affect the intended learning outcomes of the overall programme for current students
• Shared teaching involving non-consecutive Stages
• Addition/withdrawal/modification of core or option modules that result in changes to the intended learning outcomes of the overall programme and/or a reduction in the range of options within the programme
• Systematic re-structuring of a programme, or part thereof

If a department is unsure as to whether a major modification is likely to be referred to the full FLTG it should contact its AQT contact.

15 In the case of modifications relating to assessment, the FLTG will normally consult with the Chair and Secretary of the SCA.

16 In the case of modifications with the potential to impact on compliance with immigration regulations, the FLTG (through the AQT) will want assurance that advice has been sought from the Visa Compliance Team, and that the proposed modification has been amended accordingly (see paragraph 6).

17 Although the FLTG and its Chair will endeavour to provide a swift response, departments should factor in sufficient time for the approval of major modifications. Chair’s action may take, on average, two-three weeks and consideration by the full FLTG may take a few months (depending on the timing of the next meeting).

18 Once the FLTG or its Chair has approved the modification, the Chair of the BoS (or GSB) will be notified by the Academic Quality contact by email and/or via the FLTG minute correspondence. The full FLTG will be informed of all modifications approved by Chair’s Action.

19 The proposed modification may be implemented following AQT confirmation of FLTG (full meeting or Chair’s Action) approval. There are a series of related actions, for which departments are responsible, that may need to be carried out following approval (see section D below).

Record Keeping

20 Records of all modifications to programmes should be kept by the BoS or GSB. UTC will examine these records as a minimum at periodic review: the records may also need to be made available to external auditors e.g. the QAA and PSRBs.

D: Post-approval

21 The department should ensure that relevant departmental information is updated in hard copy and on the web, including the written statement on assessment policies and practices and programme specifications/PDD where appropriate (see section E regarding changes to programme specifications).

22 The department should ensure that any substantive changes affecting prospective students (including IPC students due to progress to a degree programme) are notified in writing to those individuals by liaising with Student Recruitment and Admissions (and the Director of the IPC).

23 When a modification is approved through the online module catalogue this will notify Registry Services so SITS can be updated. The Department should contact (sits-assessment@york.ac.uk) with any additional information required for changes to the programme record in SITS to take place.

24 The department should contact the Timetabling Team to resolve any timetabling issues (see note below).
25 The department should inform relevant Combined Executive Committees, or other departments/programmes affected by the change, that the modification is proceeding.

26 The department should inform the providers of learning resources, if appropriate, (e.g. the Library and IT Services) that the modification is progressing.

27 The impact of the change (in the context of any other changes made previously) to the programme should be monitored through the Annual Programme Review (https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/review/annual/) and other departmental monitoring procedures (e.g. annual programme level survey).

28 When a major modification is approved by the FLTG, the AQT will notify colleagues in other sections in order that they may take any action necessary to implement the change.

**Timetabling Implications**

29 Modifications to programmes (particularly the introduction of new modules/ revised modular structures and changes to combined programmes) for effect in the immediately subsequent academic year may have an impact upon timetabling and, in certain cases, it may be difficult to incorporate the changes without creating clashes. Departments are advised to contact their cluster Timetabling Manager (http://www.york.ac.uk/campusservices/timetabling/contact.html) if they have any concerns about the feasibility of a proposed modification from a timetabling perspective.

30 If a modification is to be fed into the annual timetabling process for the next academic year, Timetabling Services (timetabling@york.ac.uk) will need to be informed early in the Spring Term in line with the published timeline. Depending on their size and significance, modifications submitted after this window are likely to meet with timetable scheduling difficulties.

31 Changes to the published teaching timetable once the term has begun may be considered a variation of the contract with the student and should be carefully managed. If such changes are required, departmental timetabling representatives should, in the first instance, contact Timetabling Services (timetabling@york.ac.uk).

**E: Modifications to Programme Specifications/Programme Design Documents**

32 Departments are responsible for editing their programme specifications/PDD on at least an annual basis to ensure that they are accurate, current and take account of modifications that have been approved by the BoS/ GSB/ FLTG. Departments are also responsible for maintaining an archive of their programme specifications/PDD and for ensuring that it is clear to which cohorts a particular programme specification/PDD applies.

33 Programme specifications/PDD are made publically available on the University webpages. Departments are responsible for submitting them to the AQT during the August prior to the new academic year commencing.

34 Further information on programme specifications/PDD is available at: http://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/programme-development/programmes/programme-specifications/
Flowchart for Determining the Nature of a Modification and Whether Faculty Learning and Teaching Group (FLTG) Approval is Required

1. Does the proposed modification affect current students?*
   - Yes: Refer to Appendix 1
   - No: Proceed to next step

2. Does the proposal affect programmes offered by other departments where agreement has NOT been reached with those departments (eg in relation to combined degrees)?
   - Yes: Proceed to next step
   - No: Proceed to next step

3. Does the proposal have resource implications? (eg adding the study of LPA as optional modules?)
   - Yes: Proceed to next step
   - No: Proceed to next step

4. Does the proposal involve collaboration with another institution/organisation and/or overseas delivery?
   - Yes: Refer to Appendices 1 and 2
   - No: Proceed to next step

5. Does the proposal comprise a change in assessment format, timing or rules including the designation of modules as pass/fail, non-compensable, non-reassessable?
   - Yes: Proceed to next step
   - No: Proceed to next step

6. Would the BoS/GSB benefit from some external input in considering the proposal?
   - Yes: MINOR modification - FLTG approval NOT needed
   - No: Proceed to next step

---

* Meaning the proposal affects students within the year and/or students in a future stage (whether they have made their future module choices or not)

* Consideration should also be given to the affect of the proposal on prospective students, their programme choice and the information they have received outlining the programme applied for

NB: All modification requests are expected to comply with the University's Framework for Programme Design and Guide to Assessment policies and procedures.

Advice should be sought from the Academic Quality Team regarding modification proposals affecting degree programmes included in the International Pathway College prospectus.

BOX 1 - Does the proposal comprise one or more of the following
- a change to the programme title and/or the nature of the award (eg MA to MSc)
- the addition or removal of another award route as an entry or early exit point (eg introducing a PGDip)
- a change to the duration of the programme
- a change in the mode of delivery (eg face-to-face to distance learning, full-time to part-time)
- the addition or substantive revision of a work-based placement or study abroad element
- shared undergraduate and postgraduate teaching/ modules
- the addition/ withdrawal of core or optional modules that change the intended learning outcomes of the overall programme (as defined in the programme specification)
- a change to the learning outcomes of a module that changes the learning outcomes of the overall programme
- the systematic restructuring of a programme or part thereof (eg the redefinition of modules and changes to the credit ratings)
- the addition of a standalone module for credit

MAJOR modification requiring FLTG approval
F: Defining Minor and Major Modifications

**Minor modifications**

35 The following changes to programmes are examples of typical minor modifications:

- the addition of new option modules for a current cohort of students, provided there is no linked withdrawal of programme options and the modules do not have special assessment rules (see also Appendix 1).

- the addition or withdrawal of individual option modules for a future cohort of students, where this does not affect the overall intended learning outcomes as defined in the programme specification/PDD, and does not lead to a reduction in the range of options within the programme.

- changes within core or option modules (e.g. to reflect a different emphasis brought to the module by a new or different member of teaching staff), where these do not affect the overall intended learning outcomes as defined in the programme specification/PDD, although there might be some changes to module outcomes.

- changes to the mode of delivery of a module or modules (e.g., the replacement of lectures with seminars), where these do not affect the summary statement in the programme specification/PDD relating to the teaching and learning methods for that programme or the intended learning outcomes.

- changes to the assessment for a module or modules, where these have not already been published to students (including in the programme specification/PDD or written statement of assessment policies and practices) or where students will be informed sufficiently in advance of a change to a published details (such as a change of deadline or word length) to not be disadvantaged (see also page 2 and Appendices 1 and 2).

**Major modifications**

36 The following changes to programmes normally constitute major modifications:

- a change to the programme title, the nature of the award (e.g. changing an MA award to an MSc award) or the addition or removal of other award routes as part of an existing programme where these have not already been approved (e.g. new points of entry and/ or exit).

- a change to the duration of the programme.

- a change in the mode of delivery of the programme (ie. the introduction of a part-time route).

- collaboration with another institution or organisation and/ or delivery of a programme, or part of a programme, overseas.

- the addition, or substantive revision, of a work-based placement or study abroad element (please see also [https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/programmes/design/](https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/programmes/design/)).

- substantive changes to the assessment rules (e.g. changes to the weighting of different elements, changes to assessment methods, such as the balance between open and closed assessments) or changes to such as assessment lengths or deadlines that could lead to students making a reasonable claim that they would have made different option choices had the proposed change been known earlier (see also Appendix 2).

---

1 A move from face-to-face tuition to distance learning of vice versa, or the introduction of an additional distance learning route to an existing face-to-face programme or vice versa will be approved as though a new programme.
• the addition/withdrawal/modification of core or option modules that results in changes to the intended learning outcomes of the overall programme (as defined in the programme specification/PDD), and/or a reduction in the range of options within the programme.

• the systematic re-structuring of a programme, or part thereof, for example as a result of a departmental review (e.g. the reorganisation of a stage of the programme and/or changes to module credit values/levels).

• the designation of modules as pass/fail, non-compensatable or non-reassessable.

• the designation of modules as Independent Study Modules (ISMs).

37 There are sometimes difficult cases that would benefit from, or require, consideration at University level, which also fall under the definition of a major modification:

• any variation in the assessment regime described in module documentation available to students at the time module choices were made (this includes modifications to the timing of assessment as well as its nature).

• changes to the published teaching timetable once teaching has begun.

• modifications to a programme of study that affect programmes offered by other departments where agreement has not been reached with those departments, in particular in the case of combined degrees.

• modifications for which there are resource implications that cannot be met from within the department's budget (e.g. new modules where additional library purchases are required that cannot be met from the existing departmental library budget, introducing study of LFAs as optional modules in programmes) or where resource needs might be severely reduced (e.g. staffing levels).

• modifications which do not comply with the University's quality assurance framework (https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/programmes/design/) and/or the Guide to Assessment, Standards, Marking and Feedback https://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/registry-services/guide/.

NB: departments should note that modifications which do not comply with the University's quality assurance framework will only be approved in exceptional circumstances (e.g. to ensure compliance with non-negotiable requirements of PSRBs). In the case of proposed modifications that require an exemption from the quality and standards framework, the view of the Chair of University Teaching Committee will be sought prior to the consideration by FLTG.

• other unusual modifications that the BoS (or GSB) may decide would benefit from input from outside of the department.

38 LFA provision offered as part of academic programmes of study

There are currently ten languages which can be taken as part of academic programmes of study: Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, Classical Latin, Medieval Latin, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian and Spanish. Departments should note the credit level stage requirements in the framework for programme design (https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/programmes/design/).

Introducing LFA provision into an academic programme of study as a core or optional component (as opposed to an elective) has resource implications for the Department who need to cover the cost of the LFA teaching through adjustments being made to their departmental contribution. Modifications to programmes which have resource implications need FLTG approval, this is usually by Chair’s action and if well justified will not require further supplementary evidence.

The following additional procedure should be followed for a major modification which proposes to offer LFA provision as part of academic programmes of study:

• agree feasibility with the Head of the Department of Language and Linguistic Science, address the logistical and administrative issues (e.g. timetable, provision of information to
students, progression hurdles, degree weightings), and seek approval at the BoS/ GSB meeting.

- consider and agree any resource implications with the departmental Planning Officer (http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/po/staff.htm).
- If the modification is approved at the BoS/ GSB, the AQT departmental contact should be provided with confirmation that the Department of Language and Linguistic Science and Planning have been consulted and approve of the modification.

G Support available for departments in working through potential programme modifications

39 Support for departments in preparing programme modifications is available from a variety of sources. Details of relevant offices and individuals, the nature of support available and contact details are provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of information</th>
<th>Nature of advice</th>
<th>Name and contact details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Office (Academic Quality Team)</td>
<td>General advice on procedures relating to modifications to programmes; in determining whether a modification is minor/ major; and in using the online module catalogue</td>
<td>Department Quality contact: <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/quality-assurance/">http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/quality-assurance/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Committee departmental contact</td>
<td>Advice on academic matters relating to programme modifications</td>
<td>Departmental contacts: <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/about/organisational/governance/sub-committees/teaching-committee/contacts/">http://www.york.ac.uk/about/organisational/governance/sub-committees/teaching-committee/contacts/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Office/ Standing Committee on Assessment</td>
<td>Advice on assessment policy in relation to research, postgraduate and undergraduate programmes, and timetabling implications</td>
<td>Gillian Wright, <a href="mailto:sits-assessment@york.ac.uk">sits-assessment@york.ac.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:sca@york.ac.uk">sca@york.ac.uk</a> <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/about/organisational/governance/sub-committees/sca/">http://www.york.ac.uk/about/organisational/governance/sub-committees/sca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Systems Development Team</td>
<td>Advice on implications for the SITS Record System</td>
<td>Del Gee ext. 4655, <a href="mailto:del.gee@york.ac.uk">del.gee@york.ac.uk</a> <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/student-systems/">http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/student-systems/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Advice on implications for library resources</td>
<td>Relevant Academic Liaison Librarian Please see: <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/library/aboutus/librarianstaff/academicliaison/">http://www.york.ac.uk/library/aboutus/librarianstaff/academicliaison/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>Advice on implications for computing resources</td>
<td>David Surtees ext. 3803, <a href="mailto:david.surtees@york.ac.uk">david.surtees@york.ac.uk</a> Departmental Computing Officers Please see: <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/it-services/groups/dco/">http://www.york.ac.uk/it-services/groups/dco/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Learning Development</td>
<td>Advice on using the VLE and other e-learning/ blended learning issues</td>
<td>Richard Walker ext. 1138, <a href="mailto:richard.walker@york.ac.uk">richard.walker@york.ac.uk</a> <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/e-learning">http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/e-learning</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and Diversity Office</td>
<td>Advice on equal opportunities and student inclusion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:equality@york.ac.uk">equality@york.ac.uk</a> or ext. 4680 <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/eo/">http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/eo/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td>Advice on any student support/welfare implications</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Student-support@york.ac.uk">Student-support@york.ac.uk</a> or ext. 4140 <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/student-support-services/">http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/student-support-services/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Office</td>
<td>Advice on strategic planning and the business case for programmes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/po/">http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/po/</a> or ext. 2133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Recruitment and Admissions</strong></td>
<td>Advice on recruitment and admissions cycle, marketing and internationalisation</td>
<td>Maxine Charlton for UG Admissions, Emma French and Helen (L) Barrett for PG Admissions: Andrea Bourne for UG and PG Recruitment Gwion Sims for international PG and UG recruitment <a href="https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/external-relations/sra/staff/">https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/external-relations/sra/staff/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timetabling</strong></td>
<td>Advice on the timetable implications of modifications, particularly after timetables have been agreed</td>
<td>Cluster timetabling managers: <a href="mailto:timetabling-managers-group@york.ac.uk">timetabling-managers-group@york.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visa Compliance Team</strong></td>
<td>Advice on modifications with the potential to impact on compliance with immigration regulations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tier4@york.ac.uk">Tier4@york.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Pathway College</strong></td>
<td>Advice or comment on modifications affecting degree programmes included in the IPC prospectus and onto which IPC graduates can progress</td>
<td>Matthew Perry (IPC Director) <a href="mailto:matthew.perry@york.ac.uk">matthew.perry@york.ac.uk</a> Steve King (Chair IPC BoS) <a href="mailto:steve.king@york.ac.uk">steve.king@york.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centre for Global Programmes</strong></td>
<td>Advice on study abroad exchanges and programmes with a year abroad</td>
<td><a href="mailto:global-programmes@york.ac.uk">global-programmes@york.ac.uk</a> <a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/international-relations/global-programmes/">http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/international-relations/global-programmes/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Careers</strong></td>
<td>Advice on work-based learning placements and programmes with a year industry</td>
<td><a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/careers/staff/careers-contacts/">http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/careers/staff/careers-contacts/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1

Modifications Affecting Current Students

(To be read in conjunction with the flow chart on page 7 of the policy guidance).

Where a proposed modification affects current students (modifications within a stage or a subsequent stage of a student's study) the following guidance should be used to determine whether the proposal constitutes a minor or major modification. Departments should seek the advice of their AQT contact if they are unsure of how to categorise a proposed modification: [http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/quality-assurance/](http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/quality-assurance/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typically minor modifications</th>
<th>Typically major modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The addition of a new option module (with no associated withdrawals)</td>
<td>• Changes to the credit value of a module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change to a module title</td>
<td>• Changes to the credit level of a module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change of module coordinator or department delivering the module</td>
<td>• Changes to ISMs (Integrated Masters and PGT students only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared teaching involving undergraduates at different stages</td>
<td>• Changes to the teaching cycle of the module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes to the allocation of notional hours between forms of activity</td>
<td>• Content changes that affect the intended learning outcomes of the overall programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes to the module aims</td>
<td>• Shared teaching involving stage three (L6) students and masters (L7) students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes to the module learning outcomes (where there is no impact on the overall programme learning outcomes)</td>
<td>• Changes to assessment rules, special assessment rules, reassessment tasks*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minor changes to module content where there is no impact on the intended learning outcomes of the overall programme</td>
<td>• Withdrawal of modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes to aims, learning outcomes or content that have resource implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes that could be seen to disadvantage students (e.g. reduction of contact hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See separate table (Appendix 2) for modifications to assessment requirements

Departments must ensure that due consideration is given to inform and consult students on proposed modifications that will affect their programme of study, to the recording of student feedback following consultation and to how students will be informed about the implication/implementation of any approved modification (see page 2).
Appendix 2

Modifications to Assessments

The following guidance should be used where a proposed modification concerns student assessment. Departments are advised to contact their AQT contact about proposed assessment changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students affected</th>
<th>Assessment task</th>
<th>Timing of the assessment</th>
<th>Length of examination (time)/ Length of written task (words) (as appropriate)</th>
<th>% Contribution to the module mark (summative only)</th>
<th>Designation as pass/fail, Non-Reassessable, Non-Compensatable (or reverse of)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New cohort or future stage for current students (pre-module selection and non-core)</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future stage for current students (module selection made or core)</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current students - same stage</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departments must ensure that due consideration is given to inform and consult students on proposed modifications that will affect their programme of study, to the recording of student feedback following consultation and to how students will be informed about the implication/implementation of any approved modification (see page 2).
## Appendix 3

UNIVERSITY OF YORK
FACULTY LEARNING AND TEACHING GROUPS

Major Modifications Approval Pro Forma

Departments should complete this pro forma when proposing major modifications to programmes to the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group (see guidance on page 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. Programme(s) affected by the modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1b. Department(s) involved in the delivery of these programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Brief summary of the proposed modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attach/ provide a link to revised Programme Design Document/ specification(s)/ module descriptors/ statement on assessment policies and practices where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. What is the rationale for the modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Proposed date for the introduction of the modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Approval of Modifications to Existing Taught Programmes of Study for guidance on timing and consultation with professional services required to determine an appropriate implementation date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Does the modification have implications for other departments, the faculty/ies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. List the Boards of Studies/Combined Executive Committees/ GSB/ Faculties affected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. Have those listed in 5.b have been formally consulted and agreed to the proposed changes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant email or paper-based correspondence should be kept for reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further information:

6. Does the proposed modification entail new or substantially revised modules?
If so, new/modified module descriptors should be proposed using the online module catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a</th>
<th>New or substantially revised modules?</th>
<th>Yes/ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Module descriptions attached?</td>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Does the modification entail the addition, or substantial revision, of a work-based placement or study abroad element?
See Policy Statements on Study Abroad and Work Placements

Yes/ No

Brief description:

Supporting documentation attached: Yes/No

8. Student consultation
Provide details of how students have been/will be:
   a) consulted about the proposed modification(s),
   b) informed of the reason(s) for, implementation and implication of the proposed modification(s)
See Approval of Modifications to Existing Taught Programmes of Study

9. Comments from the external examiner(s)
In the case of some major modifications, attach comments from the relevant external examiner(s).

Comments provided/attached: Yes/No/Not applicable

10. Does the modification require approval by a professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB)? Relevant email or paper-based correspondence should be kept for reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10a</th>
<th>PSRB approval required?</th>
<th>Yes/ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>Name of relevant PSRB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c</td>
<td>PSRB approached</td>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of approach:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10d</td>
<td>PSRB approval received:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further information/context:

11. Are there any implications for the International Pathway College (IPC)?

Yes/ no

Further information (including a summary of any discussions with the IPC):

12. Are there any resource implications arising from the proposed modification?

Consultations within and beyond the department should take place regarding any identified increased or decreased resource needs resulting from proposed modifications.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Staff resources identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>Library resources identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>Computing resources identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d</td>
<td>Use of Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e</td>
<td>Laboratory/teaching space needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11f</td>
<td>Study/field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11g</td>
<td>Relevant supporting documentation attached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Other University consultation

Appropriate consultation should take place with professional services regarding the potential impact of proposed modifications Eg: Registry Services, SCA, Accommodation and Timetabling, Student Recruitment and Admissions (SRA). The outcome of discussions should be detailed below.

**NB:** Programme title changes must be discussed with SRA and their comments included below.

14. Equality and diversity

Does the modification have any implications for equality, diversion and inclusion (disability, gender or race relations etc)? ([https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/supporting-students/issues/disability/](https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/supporting-students/issues/disability/)

[https://www.york.ac.uk/admin/eo/policies/EqualityDiversityPolicyStudents.htm](https://www.york.ac.uk/admin/eo/policies/EqualityDiversityPolicyStudents.htm)

Yes/ No

Further information:

15. Record of Approvals

Date approved by the Board of Studies or Graduate School Board:

Date of Planning approval (where relevant):

Date approved by FLTG (where relevant):

**GUIDANCE NOTES**

This *pro forma* should be completed by departments proposing major modifications to an existing programme of study. Boxes will expand as you write.

**To determine whether a modification is minor or major please refer to the flow chart and section F in the document *Approval of Modifications to Existing Taught Programmes of Study*.**

The completed *pro forma* should be submitted to the Board of Studies (BoS) (or Graduate School Board (GSB)) with relevant supporting documentation for its approval before being forwarded for consideration by the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group (FLTG).
The Chair of the BoS (or GSB), should forward the completed pro forma to the department’s Academic Quality Team contact (http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/quality-assurance/) and also to the department’s contact on UTC (http://www.york.ac.uk/about/organisation/governance/sub-committees/teaching-committee/contacts/).

Modifications to modules, either individual ones or a series of linked changes, should be proposed for approval using the online module catalogue accessed via https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/procedure/programmes/programme/ and copies of the descriptors forwarded with the pro forma as required.

**Student consultation** should take place in accordance with the guidance in *Approval of Modifications to Existing Taught Programmes of Study* and the advice of the department’s Academic Quality contact sought if there are any uncertainties as to the level of consultation required.

All proposals to change programme titles need Planning approval as well as academic approval (also through the FLTG), and should be discussed with the department’s Planning Officer (http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/po/), Student Recruitment and Admissions (SRA), and if applicable with the International Pathway College. Planning approval may also be needed where there are resource implications.

Modifications concerning the introduction or withdrawal of study abroad or work-based learning placements may require additional consultation with SRA and the Visa Compliance Team due to the potential implications for Tier 4 visa compliance.

Once the modification has been considered and approved, an approval date should be recorded on the pro forma. The department should file the pro forma for audit purposes.

Any questions about the approval of modifications should be directed to the departmental Academic Quality Team contact (http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/academic-support/staff/quality-assurance/).