
6 Professional, Statutory and or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)

6.1 Accreditation

6.1.1 Scope

Programmes validated by the University may also be accredited or recognised by a range of Professional, Statutory and/or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs).

Many PSRBs require separate accreditation events. Wherever possible and desirable, however, validation/accreditation will be conducted jointly between the University and the relevant Professional, Statutory and/or Regulatory Body, to achieve effective academic and professional validation. This procedure outlines requirements for both accreditation as separate events as well as for joint events as part of a University validation/review.

International partners may additionally be subject to the requirements of external in-country regulators. Confirmation of receipt of authorisation from in-country regulators should be provided to Academic Partnerships Office.

6.1.2 Responsibilities

On agreement with the Academic Dean of Faculty, a programme may be accredited by, or have accreditation sought for it, from a UK PSRB. The appropriate Deputy Dean is responsible for the accreditation of Faculty provision and for ensuring each accredited course is allocated a designated academic Faculty contact. The appropriate Faculty will provide the PSRB with the documentation it requires. For joint collaborative programmes, AQS will ensure effective liaison with the partner institution for PSRB visit arrangements as well as production of the required documentation.

Twice annually, AQS will send out to Faculties the PSRB Register, which lists the programme accreditations and academic Faculty contacts for updating. Faculties will return this information to AQS who will maintain the PSRB Register of all programme accreditations in the University. Faculties are to provide AQS with information as to upcoming PSRB reviews/visits and the outcomes/reports following any such review. This information will be provided by AQS to the Assurance Committee in an annual report in October each year, and incorporated into the Unistats return.

Collaborative programmes which have validated status seek direct accreditation from a PSRB. Therefore, AQS may provide developmental support to the partner but will not take responsibility for supporting the proposal nor maintaining PSRB requirements post accreditation.

6.1.3 Accreditation as part of a University Validation/review event

The practical arrangements for when a joint Validation/Review and accreditation is convened are managed by the AQS Panel Officer in conjunction with the Faculty in a way that meets both the University and the PSRB requirements.

The status of each panel member, Co-Chair arrangements if any, and dual aims of the event must be clearly stated. All participants must be aware that although the event is a single process the outcomes may require separate approval by the University and PSRB before the programme can commence.

The outcomes of the validation/review event must clearly state the outcome of the PSRB accreditation, including the accreditation or exemption granted to each programme separately.

6.1.4 Accreditation as a separate event or by correspondence

The practical arrangements for accreditation as a separate event or by correspondence are managed by the Faculty, with the support of AQS as appropriate.

After the event the Faculty must submit to AQS a copy of:

- The PSRB report.
- The Faculties response to the PSRB outlining how it has met any conditions and considered/implemented recommendations.
- If applicable, the final letter or certificate from the PSRB confirming the programmes which have received accreditation and the renewal year. Alternatively, the correspondence may confirm withdrawal of accreditation for all or some programmes.

The above documentation will be included on the agenda of the Academic Planning and Quality Committee (APQC) for noting.

The information from this documentation will also be entered onto the PSRB Register for monitoring and reporting purposes.

6.2 Post accreditation

The designated academic Faculty contact takes day-to-day responsibility for ensuring that the Programme is delivered as agreed with the PSRB and for communicating as necessary with its officers. For joint and franchised programmes both the University and Institutional Link Tutors have responsibility for this.

This includes responsibility for ensuring PSRB requirements relating to annual monitoring are adhered to. The Faculty must submit to AQS correspondence relating to successful completion of the annual monitoring process and any associated reports. This documentation will be included on the agenda of the Academic Planning and Quality Committee (APQC) for noting. The information from this documentation will also be entered onto the PSRB Register for monitoring and reporting purposes.

This also includes communication with regard to any proposed / approved programme and module changes, where required by the PSRB. The Faculty must submit to AQS correspondence relating to approval of any programme and module changes and any associated reports. This documentation will be included on the agenda of the Academic Planning and Quality Committee (APQC) for noting. The information from this documentation will also be entered onto the PSRB Register for monitoring and reporting purposes.

6.3 Investigating complaints by Professional Statutory and/or Regulatory Bodies

In the interests of transparency and fairness, a Faculty cannot be permitted to investigate serious complaints against itself without some independent input.

Accordingly, in the case of complaints made by professional, validating or accrediting bodies, or complaints which relate to or arise out of a validation issue or some

contractual obligation into which the University has entered, the following formal procedures apply:

- a.** A Faculty which receives a complaint by a professional, validating or accrediting body etc shall immediately inform the appropriate member of Executive who shall, after consultation with the Academic Dean of Faculty, determine whether the complaint may be investigated internally within the Faculty, or whether a totally independent investigation shall be held.
- b.** If the complaint is to be investigated internally, the appropriate member of Executive shall set a date by which a report shall be made, jointly by the relevant Academic Dean and a member of the Assurance Committee nominated by the Director of Academic Quality Service (AQS), to the Assurance Committee, which shall either endorse the report and action taken, or decide that other action is needed.
- c.** If the complaint is to be investigated independently, the investigation shall normally be Chaired by the Director of AQS or nominee; a majority of members of the investigating panel (normally three, plus officer) shall be drawn from persons who are not members of the Faculty in question. A report shall be presented to the Assurance Committee.