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Hints and Tips before you begin

1. Planning stage
   a. Submission date
      Please be mindful that your whole submission should be based on the most recently completed academic year according to your submission due date. Where data is required for more than one academic year you must include the most recently completed academic year within this data. The term ‘current’ is used in this submission guidance to indicate that data for the most recently completed academic year (at the time of submission) should be uploaded.
   b. Time allocation
      For the average submission (10 programmes with little commonality) we advise that you need to allocate a full-time resource (or equivalent) over a 3-month period to input data and start the planning and collation of data at least 6 months before the visit date. Some of the data input is clerical but it does require input from academic staff, such as module leaders and programme leaders.
   c. Submission Coordinator
      It is recommended that a Senior Academic member of staff takes the lead and coordinates input and collation of information. This person should be the ‘Accreditation Contact’ within ADAMS.
   d. Consult and stay in regular contact with your IET Staff representative
      We can advise on how to use ADAMS to create your submission in a way that suits your institution (within reason). For example, if you have programmes with a significant amount of commonality but have different titles, we can advise on how to limit the amount of duplicate entries you may have to make. If in doubt, please ask!
   e. Housekeeping
      If you have used ADAMS before, you may wish to consider deleting legacy files and data before you start to input new / updated data.

2. Data (un)availability
   Please identify, as early on as you can, any data that you cannot upload into ADAMS.
   In ADAMS there are certain section where you will be able to tick a box to say the data is not available. When ticking this box, you are asked to indicate the reason why you are unable to upload any data or files to the section, namely: -
   a. Will be made available on the visit
   b. Will be made available separately to ADAMS
   c. New module
   d. Non-AHEP module
   e. Other

      Examples of when the ‘data unavailable’ function may be used: -
      a. Data does not exist/ is not available for your institution
      b. Data very difficult to obtain in way that matches the ADAMS format
      c. Data not available in electronic format
      d. Data too large to upload to the system

      The following sections in ADAMS have a ‘data unavailable’ option which can be selected in the above circumstances or if discussed previously with your IET staff contact. It should be noted that selecting ‘data unavailable’ does not necessarily mean that this information is not required; it will need to be provided in another form, either by sending to the IET ahead of the visit or making it available on the visit.
   e. Module-Learning outcomes (only if the module does not deliver AHEP learning outcomes)
   f. Module-Assessment-Exam and test papers, marking schemes, assignment papers
   g. Modules-Marks (for exams/tests and coursework per student)
   h. Programme-Entry Data (UCAS points per student)
   i. Programme-Progression Statistics

      You MUST consult your IET staff contact before selecting ‘data unavailable’ in any section. Failure to do so may result in cancellation or postponement of your visit.

1 We would not expect you to scan in documents solely for the purpose of having them in a format fit for ADAMS.
2 The maximum size of file that is manageable in ADAMS is 10MB and significantly less depending on the internet connection, we strongly recommend that you do not attempt to upload anything larger than 10MB. ADAMS does not accept zip files.
3. **Data / file sharing options**

If you upload one document into many areas of ADAMS this will cause duplicate data and files within your submission. To avoid this, you should use the ‘copy to’ function available in certain sections within the system.

To this end you may wish to think about what the ‘master’ or ‘parent’ programme(s) you are putting forward as you can then simply upload the files/ data into one programme and copy to the other programmes. The intention of this functionality is for the scenario where the same documents or data covers several programmes or there is a very close similarity between programmes. You can edit once you copy files / data over. These links remain if you change the file/ data in the original point of upload, but you are also able to break the link also.

The following sections allow sharing of data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section reference</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme - Details</td>
<td>Programme Specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validation/ Internal review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme - Structure</td>
<td>Block diagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit allocation and weighting table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module selections in programme structure table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme – Entry data</td>
<td>UCAS points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Standard entry data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see the ADAMS user guide for how to use this functionality or ask for a demonstration from your IET contact.

4. **List of programmes within the Activity**

The list of programmes that appear on the dashboard of your activity are the ones that ADAMS uses to run its checks and what it uses to know what to pull through to the output (accreditor view). You must make sure that this list is correct. You will need to report any anomalies to IET Staff.

5. **Progress check**

Outside of an activity you can track the progress of your submission on an individual module basis, individual programme basis and across all sections in ‘Supporting Information’. ‘Progress Check’ buttons are located on the landing pages for Modules and Programmes and against every section in ‘Supporting Information’. Note that this checks against all inputs within Supporting Information.

If you have a live activity within ADAMS and you are assigned the Head of Department or Accreditation Contact, you can use the ‘submit’ button in task 3 in the task tracker to run the full submission check. Note that the main checker cannot check module level inputs until the programme structures are completed.

6. **Pre-requisites**

For planning purposes, please note the following pre-requisites within the system. The following sections are inactive until certain information is added to the system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section reference</th>
<th>Pre-requisite(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module – Assessment - Papers, Assignments &amp; Marking Schemes</td>
<td>Module - Assessment - Exams, Tests and Coursework Assignments (table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Structure</td>
<td>Select Delivery mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme – Structure – Credit Allocation and Weighting Per Year (table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the modules associated with the programme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module details tab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module learning outcomes tab (tick boxes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module – Assessment - Exams, Tests and Coursework Assignments (table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Learning outcomes</td>
<td>Programme - Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All other sections can be completed in any order.

7. **Substantial inputs**

A [site map](#) of the submission sections is provided at the end of this document; however, the following sections have been identified as those that require the most resource:

- a. Initial set up of Modules – on first use of the system and in future if new modules are introduced
- b. Uploading of assessments for modules - Requires 3 years’ worth of exam papers, 1 year of assignments and 1 year of student samples.
- c. Programme level learning outcomes is the most important and potentially the largest (in terms of the number of inputs) part of the submission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of accreditation</th>
<th>AHEP learning outcomes count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full CEng</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial CEng</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial CEng (Further Learning)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full IEng</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial IEng</td>
<td>Up to 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial IEng (Further Learning)</td>
<td>Up to 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The AHEP mapping needs to be provided per programme. For example, if you are seeking Full CEng accreditation for 5 programmes you will have a total of 190 comments to enter.

A template is available on ADAMS to aid the collation of the programme level learning outcomes outside of ADAMS which can then be uploaded to the relevant programme. We would encourage you to use the template rather than the webform.

If a module is delivered across many programmes, you must map against all the levels of accreditation. E.g. if a Masters level programme is delivered on both a MEng and a MSc programme you must map the module to both the Full CEng learning outcomes (learning outcomes suffixed with ‘m’) and the Partial CEng (Further Learning) learning outcomes (suffixed with ‘fl’).
Introduction

This document provides an overview of the submission requirements for an IET Accreditation visit in the Accreditation Database and Management System (ADAMS) and draws together guidance for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) on how to complete an accreditation submission.

The submission requirements for joint visits not led by the IET are different and advice on these is available separately.

Once all the necessary data is uploaded and submitted, ADAMS will then process this automatically into the format required by IET accreditation assessors without further formatting being required.

The ADAMS submission is split into three areas: Modules, Programmes and Supporting Information. These three menu items will be found on the left of the screen. When a menu item is chosen a set of tabs will appear across the top right of the screen. In this document menu and tab selections are written in a purple bold font in the table below. Information must be entered for all modules before entering programme level detail, as much of the module information (learning outcomes, assessment, etc.) informs the data at the programme level.

The table that follows this introduction outlines the input required at each level of the submission. Most of the sections can be completed by uploading a PDF document or completing a text box that provides the required information. All sections that require a file upload have a ‘multi-upload’ function. For other sections, templates or data input boxes are provided to ensure that information is submitted in the correct format for creating “accreditor ready” documents and to ensure consistency across submissions. ADAMS will generate an error message if data is not in the correct format.

The table below also contains

- Guidance on each section (also contained within ADAMS);

- Additional guidance on each section is provided in a long box beneath an entry.

- IET specific policies and guidance are stated within the IET Academic Accreditation Information Pack. This is available on the IET’s website and within your Accreditation Visit activity on ADAMS.

- ADAMS will not allow submission unless all the required items listed below have been uploaded, or it has been indicated that they will be provided on the visit, or at the same time as the rest of the submission, outside of ADAMS. A report of the ‘data not available’ within ADAMS will be generated for the accreditors in the submission output.
## Itemised List of Submission Requirements and Guidance notes

**ALL ITEMS ARE MANDATORY UNLESS STATED OTHERWISE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADAMS Category</th>
<th>ADAMS Tab</th>
<th>Documentation or data evidence type</th>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>ADAMS Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Choosing the Module level:**
  - Please map the level of the module to "The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland" (FHEQ). For example, Universities in Scotland should use level 7 to indicate level 11 modules and level 6 to indicate level 10 modules. Universities from outside of the UK should seek advice from IET Staff on how to complete this information.

- The Module marking scheme must be selected from the options CGPA/GPA (10-0), A-F and 0%-100%. This will also determine the template type you will use to enter the module marks data.

- When uploading documents, please use PDF versions.

---

### Additional Guidance

- **Standard:** Choosing this option means that the module is not a major project module.
- **Major individual project:** Only select this option for the major individual project. The same information for a standard module is required for this type of module plus details about project management, see further down this table for details.
- **MEng Group project:** Only select this option for the major group project (MEng only) and not for modules that contain group work. The same information for a standard module is required for this type of module plus details about project management, see further down this table for details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Module Descriptor</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Upload the current version of the module descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS Category</td>
<td>ADAMS Tab</td>
<td>Documentation or data evidence type</td>
<td>Time period</td>
<td>ADAMS Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes, tick boxes</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please indicate which AHEP learning outcomes this module satisfies by clicking in the associated check boxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The AHEP learning outcomes descriptors are specified for every level of accreditation and indicated by a suffix. These are: Full, Partial IEng and Partial IEng Further Learning (all the same) with suffix &quot;i&quot;; Partial CEng suffix &quot;p&quot;; Full CEng suffix &quot;m&quot;; and Partial CEng Further Learning suffix &quot;fl&quot;. A module that delivers learning outcomes for one accreditation class should have only learning outcomes of one appropriate suffix selected; e.g. EA1 for Full IEng will be EA1i. However, a module that contributes to more than one accreditation class should have learning outcomes from all those classes selected; e.g. if a module contributes to both partial and full CEng learning outcome EA1 then both EA1p and EA1m must be selected. Further guidance on how to select the correct learning outcomes is given in a separate document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NB</strong> It is Engineering Council policy that all programmes accredited for Partial CEng automatically meet the requirements for Full IEng. There is no need to map to both sets, unless the module is part of the programme that is going for IEng accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please note that this needs to be repeated for each of the five (5) areas of AHEP which are accessed via the tabs to the left of the webpage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Data unavailable option:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You can only select this option if the module does not deliver any AHEP learning outcomes. Choosing this option means that the module level learning outcomes, assessment and marks data are not required for this module, but the module is still available to map to the programme structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance is available in the document GuidanceOnMeetingAHEPLearningOutcomes.pdf which can be found in the Resource pod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes, comment boxes OPTIONAL</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please note that comments at module level are <strong>OPTIONAL</strong>. They are pulled through to the Programme - Learning Outcomes to act as an aide for completing the comments at programme level. If you do enter module level comments, please keep them brief and bear in mind that the accreditors will only see the comments made at programme level and not the module level comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS Category</td>
<td>ADAMS Tab</td>
<td>Documentation or data evidence type</td>
<td>Time period</td>
<td>ADAMS Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Data about exams, tests and coursework assignments</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Provide information on the number, duration (where applicable) and weighting of examinations, unseen tests and coursework/laboratory assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Module         | Assessment| Exam and test papers and marking schemes, assignment papers | See guidance | Please upload PDFs of all relevant exam papers, test papers and assignments including marking schemes. Please note that we require:  
- three years’ worth of examination papers with solutions  
- 1 years’ worth of coursework assignment briefs with marking schemes  
If an assessment type is worth less than 30% of the overall module mark you do not need to provide the assessment or student work for that assessment type. However, if you have many assessments of the same type that are worth less than 30% individually but add up to more than 30% of the overall module mark you do need to provide a sample of these assessments. Where possible please provide the assessment(s) with the highest weighting.  

**Data Protection**

Please note you should have the individual student’s permission to include their name and/or student ID with their work. If this has not been agreed (either directly or via a data policy signed by the student covering such eventualities) then please blank out all personal data i.e. Name, Student ID etc.  

‘Data unavailable’ option:  
Before selecting this option, you must consult your IET staff contact. Normally this option is only selected if no assessments are unavailable in electronic format. You cannot select this option if some assessments are available for the module. Note that these documents will still need to be provided if the submission guidance requires it, either on the visit or uploaded to the output when the rest of the submission is submitted.  

This may also be used when the module does not deliver AHEP learning outcomes but is still required for the programme structure.  

**Additional Guidance**  
Examination, test and assignment papers should be a tool to identify levels of ability, particularly for more able students. Particular focus is usually paid to the level in final year bachelors and masters level examinations. The levels should reflect AHEP and national frameworks such as those published by QAA and SCQF.  
If the ‘data unavailable’ option is selected this will create an entry in the ‘data not available’ report for accreditors in the submission output.  

**Module**

| Assessment | Examples of student work | Most recent 1 year | If available in electronic format, please upload examples of marked student work (one sample of the lowest scoring pass for each assessment). Only one year's worth of these is needed for standard modules.  
If this is a PROJECT module, please upload a total of NINE (9) samples of student work (if available):  
three high performing, three mid-way point, and three threshold pass, including their marking sheets showing all markers. Please note you should have the individual student’s permission to include their name and/or student ID with their work. If this has not been agreed (either directly or via a data policy signed by the student covering such eventualities) then please blank out all personal data i.e. Name, Student ID etc.  
The panel may ask the following questions:  
• Do the assessments provide a fair test of whether the students are achieving the learning outcomes?  
• To what extent do assessments provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their design and analytical skills?  
• Do the assessments seek to assess synthesis, analysis, application, innovation and creativity?  
• Do the assessments provide challenge to the more able student?  
• Are the exams structured so that students can avoid major topics? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADAMS Category</th>
<th>ADAMS Tab</th>
<th>Documentation or data evidence type</th>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>ADAMS Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Module         | Marks     | Marks for exams/tests and coursework per student | 1 year      | Please enter the actual marks achieved by students studying this module for the most recent cohort. These marks should be split into two categories:  
- Combined mark for each student for examinations and other unseen timed tests  
- Combined mark for each student for coursework and laboratory assignments  
In both cases the marks range must be adjusted to fit the full range of the marks type selected; e.g. if the coursework element is marked out of 40 and the exam out of 50 then the marks should be scaled by 2.5 and 2 respectively so they cover the range 100%.  
The marks type is selected in the Module/Details tab and can be one of three types:  
- CGPA/GPA (a range 0 10)  
- A – F  
- 0% - 100%.  
For modules that use CGPA/GPA with marks different to 0 to 10 please scale your marks to fit the range 0 to 10 and enter these scaled marks here. ADAMS checks that data of the correct type has been entered and reports errors if not.  
Please do not identify students when entering their marks but do list results by student, e.g. showing the exam/test mark next to their coursework/lab mark.  
**Data unavailable option:**  
Before selecting this option, you must consult your IET staff contact. Normally this option is only selected if no marks are available in the format required for ADAMS. If you select this option, you cannot upload any marks for this module and these must be provided separately and must resemble the ADAMS submission output that would otherwise be generated (a histogram and scatter gram for assessment marks per module, grouped by module level). These files should be uploaded to the activity forum in ADAMS at the same time as the rest of the submission. |
| Additional Guidance | ADAMS will produce histograms of this data which are required to enable the panel to quickly assimilate the spread of student performance, including first time assessment task failure rates, and the magnitude of the difference between student performance in examinations and coursework for any given module. If the ‘data unavailable’ option is selected this will create an entry in the ‘data not available’ report for accreditors in the submission output. |
| Module | Project Management | Project Handbook | Current | Please upload the relevant Project Handbook here, as a PDF.  
Project guidelines / handbooks should include:  
- Contact details of all supporting staff  
- Policy for health and safety  
- Policy on plagiarism  
- Selection of projects  
- Timescales  
- Format for the project layout  
- Marking scheme details  
- Mechanisms for feedback, complaints and special support |
Please upload PDF documents, and / or enter a comment in the text box, an explanation of the following aspects of the project:

- The mechanisms that are in place to ensure effective and timely project selection and allocation for all students taking this module.
- The management processes that are in place to ensure the smooth running of the project and what supervision arrangements are in place for the students.
- What is expected from the students in terms of planning and managing their projects and whether these aspects are assessed? Include health and safety risk assessment, technical risk assessment and student support.
- Please explain the processes that are in place for ensuring fair, consistent and equitable marking of the projects and what methods are used to enable effective moderation of the marks across the cohort.
- Finally, if you allow resitting of the project is the mark capped at the pass mark?

Given the significance and the weighting attached to the project, it is important that students select, or are allocated, topics which can provide appropriate challenge, and which can be supported within the expertise of the staff considering staff loading. Reference should, where appropriate, be made to student guidance/instructions on the process as well as staff procedures. Copies of any documents referred to should be made available to the IET.

The IET would expect to see a clear procedure whereby the student would have regular contact with a clearly nominated academic supervisor (in addition to any industrial supervisor). It is expected that the supervisor will provide high level project management, as well as supporting the student through specific hurdles.

The IET would expect to see details of scheduled meetings as well as mechanisms such as interim reports which would indicate that progress is monitored throughout the project.

There should be regular contact between staff and project students:
- How often do supervisors meet students?
- What supervision do students receive?
- What supervision is available for industrial projects?
- Who supervises the industrial projects?

How are students work plans managed?

Laboratory guidance and supervision should include:
- Details of Health and Safety modules relating to working in the laboratory;
- Details of laboratory technicians;
- Access to the laboratories for project work.

When reviewing sample project reports and log books, the accreditors will expect to see clearly articulated objectives of the project (and how they have been met or otherwise), a work plan which includes evidence of risk assessment and management. A management process should also be evident showing how the project was monitored for progress against the objectives and how changes to the plan and/or objectives were decided upon, dealing with changes to plans as well as commercial costing.

For group projects, it should be evident how decisions were made within the group and how disputes were resolved.

The IET would expect guidance to the students to contain full details of what is expected from both students and supervisor in respect of managing the project team.

It should be evident in the process documentation and in the project report and log book that the students have managed the group project themselves.

The panel would expect to see evidence of systems that are in place for dealing with discrepancies and arriving at agreed marks.

The panel may ask the following questions:
- Is there a second supervisor or internal assessor?
- Are the marks moderated?
- Is there an appropriate spread of marks?

Select the marking scheme used for degree results. The options are:
- First/Second/Third
- Distinction/Merit/Pass
- CGPA/GPA
- A – F
- 100% - 0%

The results in the Graduation Profile must match this selection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADAMS Category</th>
<th>ADAMS Tab</th>
<th>Documentation or data evidence type</th>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>ADAMS Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Delivery site</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>To indicate that the programme is taught in a mode at a particular campus or site, please select the appropriate duration(s) below. Please round this to the nearest 1/2 a year. If a campus you were expecting to appear doesn't appear in the list below, please go to your department profile and add it there. Other delivery site: Please select 'yes' if the programme is delivered in full or in part at another site, typically expressed as 'study abroad' (unless there is a separate entry for these variants in ADAMS). Credit bearing: Please select 'yes' if the part of the programme delivered elsewhere is credit bearing and contributes to the final award. Whether the delivery is credit bearing or not, you will be prompted to provide further information about this in the supporting information – admissions – assessment of prior learning section for which an inline link is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td>For non-credit bearing delivery:  • Details of which of the university’s students could choose for their study abroad  • How modules are selected and monitored by your university.  • At what point in their studies will the students be able to select this option.  • Will the study abroad replace other modules (rather than being in addition to)  • Does a student who completes the study abroad receive a different degree title to those who complete all years at the home university?</td>
<td>For Credit bearing delivery:  • How does the department satisfy itself that the other institution’s QA processes are robust?  • How modules are selected and monitored by your university.  • Whether the study abroad counts towards the final degree award.  • At what point in their studies will the students be able to select this option.  • Does a student who completes the study abroad receive a different degree title to those who complete all years at the home university?  • Will the study abroad replace other modules (rather than being in addition to)  • Details of which of the University’s students could choose for their study abroad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Programme Documents</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Upload Programme Specification Please supply documents providing the following information for each programme:  • Aims of the programme;  • Programme learning outcomes;  • Programme structure including names and credit weighting of the modules and whether they are core or optional;  • Assessment regulations. (If this is the same for all the programmes, please include only once.) Note: For each programme, some or all this information may be included in a single document (e.g. a programme specification). If submitting more than one document per programme, please add a comment to explain what the document contains. The sharing file/data option is available in this section. Please see the ADAMS user guide on how to use this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td>This information is used to ensure that each programme has a distinct and appropriate set of aims and programme learning outcomes linked to AHEP. The content of each programme should reflect the stated aims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Internal review and Validation</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please provide a summary of any formal internal reviews of the programme since the last accreditation, including dates and key outcomes; this is likely to include such items as annual programme monitoring reports. If the programme has been validated or re-validated in the last 5 years, please include relevant validation documents here. Please note that documentation relating to Periodic Review of overall provision is not to be included here but is dealt with Documents under the Quality Assurance section (found under 'Supporting Information'). Please use PDF files where possible. The sharing file/data option is available in this section. Please see the ADAMS user guide on how to use this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td>The IET needs to ensure that all programmes being presented for accreditation have been validated (authorised) and are regularly reviewed. We would expect programmes to undergo an internal review or revalidation as part of your institution’s quality assurance procedures. Evidence of a working quality assurance process is a condition of accreditation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS Category</td>
<td>ADAMS Tab</td>
<td>Documentation or data evidence type</td>
<td>Time period</td>
<td>ADAMS Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Block Diagram</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Upload a Block Diagram showing the possible pathways through the programme, complete with modules studied and possible entry and exit points. The sharing file/data option is available in this section. Please see the ADAMS user guide on how to use this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The panel may ask the following questions: • Are options available? • Is the overall structure coherent? • Is there commonality with other programmes? • Is service teaching appropriately engineering oriented especially management and maths? • Does core material underpin subject disciplines? • Is the balance between engineering and non-technical subjects acceptable? • What is the proportion of non-technical related material?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Delivery mode</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>You have the choice to map the programme structure against any of the programme delivery modes. This determines the number of years you must enter data against in the programme structure tab. This includes, the credit allocation and yearly weighting and the plotting of core and optional modules for each year of the programme. You may wish to consider selecting ‘Full-Time-Equivalent’ in the drop down if the programme is not delivered in a Full-time mode (i.e. which is usually the shortest duration). This will then allow you to select the number of years you would like to enter the data against. Note that this activates the remaining sections of the programme structure tab and you cannot change it once it has been selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Credit Allocation and Weighting Per Year</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Indicate the credit allocation for each year of study and the weighting of each year towards the final degree grade awarded. The sharing file/data option is available in this section. Please see the ADAMS user guide on how to use this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Weighting of Continuous Assessment</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please enter the proportion of examination versus continuous assessment for the programme. Please exclude the Major Projects from this calculation. You can use the comment box to provide an explanation of the figures you have provided as an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One of the IET Guidelines is that we would normally expect CEng Accredited programmes to include an overall contribution of coursework to the overall degree classification in the range 20% to 60%, excluding major project(s). Programmes for IEng may have a coursework contribution which is at the upper end of this range, or possibly higher. An Accreditation Panel will carefully examine the programme assessment strategy to ensure: • An appropriate range of assessment activities is in use; • Assessment tasks are well matched to the Learning Outcomes assessed in each module; • The activities themselves are valid and reliable with robust quality assurance arrangements including External Examiner involvement where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Selection of modules for each year</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please use the 'select modules and pathways' option to select the modules taught in each year of the programme, identifying core and optional modules. Please note: this needs to be completed on a year-by-year basis selecting the relevant year on the tabs above. The sharing file/data option is available on a year by year basis. Please see the ADAMS user guide on how to use this function. Note that this is only applicable to the selection of modules and not the selection of pathways. Please select the modules that are taught on this programme in the year indicated above. Please differentiate between core (compulsory) modules and optional modules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programme: Learning Outcomes

**Pre-requisite:** Please indicate the programme mode that you wish to build your programme structure under. For example, if the programme is run in part time and sandwich modes you may wish to select the one that has the shortest duration. You must have entered all your modules for this programme, with at least the details, learning outcomes and assessment table completed, (unless you have indicated that the module is 'non-AHEP').

Once the accreditation level has been selected from the pull-down menu below, the table summarises the analysis of learning outcomes for this programme based on the module information and programme structure provided. Within each Year you can review the module level comments made against each AHEP learning outcome by clicking on the 'View Comments' button.

On the 'Combined' tab please click on the 'Add/Edit Comment' button for each learning outcome in turn and use the box provided at the bottom of the list of module comments to summarise how each AHEP learning outcome is developed and assessed within the programme.

**Alternatively,** you can also use the AHEP excel spreadsheet templates provided within ADAMS to complete the programme level AHEP mapping and commentary. You must use the templates provided within ADAMS as on upload it will automatically populate ADAMS for you.

Guidance on meeting AHEP Learning Outcomes from the Resource Pod.

### Programme: Entry Data

**Breakdown of UCAS points per student**

Provide individual UCAS entry scores (or other form of combined entry grade).

**‘Data unavailable’ option:**

- Before selecting this option, **you must** consult your IET staff contact. Normally this option is only selected if the data is unavailable in the format required for ADAMS or of the data needs to be aggregated to combine programme data. Note that this data must still be provided and must resemble the ADAMS output that would otherwise be generated. This information will need to be uploaded to the activity forum within ADAMS when the rest of the submission is available.

The sharing file/data option is available in this section. Please see the ADAMS user guide on how to use this function.

Additional Guidance: The IET will consider the entry profile to the programme and how the cohort entry extremes will be supported.

If the ‘data unavailable’ option is selected this will create an entry in the ‘data not available’ report for accreditors in the submission output.

### Programme: Entry Data

**Breakdown of non-UCAS entries per student**

Upload a document telling us about any non-standard entry data that does not fit into the entry score format above. A list of each student’s entry qualification is the sort of format expected, but do not identify the students.

The sharing file/data option is available in this section. Please see the ADAMS user guide on how to use this function.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADAMS Category</th>
<th>ADAMS Tab</th>
<th>Documentation or data evidence type</th>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>ADAMS Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Departments with programmes that have a significant number of direct entry students into the final year must ensure that this does not have an adverse effect on those following the accredited programme. Franchise arrangements will require a visit to the franchise institution and the preparation of a separate submission. This includes identical courses delivered by home staff at alternative sites. The programme on which the franchised programme is based should normally be accredited before a visit takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feeder courses from partner institutions (e.g. further education providers delivering a Foundation Degree) may be included within the scope of the accreditation, subject to the information and data on these programmes being included within the Form A or as an appendix to the submission. A short visit to the provider will be required to consider the resources and facilities and to meet the staff. Students from franchised programmes or feeder programmes that are not included within the scope of the accreditation should be clearly identifiable to external parties normally using a different degree title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under normal circumstances, a suite of programmes should have a minimum of ten students graduating per year to make it viable for accreditation. For a visit considering new programmes only, the IET would normally expect that a minimum of ten students per year were being recruited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Industry Information</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please upload a file or type into the text box an explanation of how industrial input affects the programmes and how this is organised and managed. You will have the choice to upload a file that addresses the industrial input and influence on Programme Design, Student Experience or Both. Also, what arrangements are made for industrial sponsorship or training and how it is organised and managed. If you have an Industrial Advisory Board, please tell us about the membership of this board, how often it meets and what its remit is. If you don't, please tell us in what other ways you obtain industrial input into programme content, structure and delivery. Industrial Advisory Board Minutes should be supplied if appropriate. Upload any additional information on Employability Skills (other than those indicated in the AHEP General Skills, in Supporting Information – Assessment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Entry Requirements</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please upload a brief PDF document which tells us about the entry requirements for your programmes, for example: 3 A levels (or equivalent), minimum grades B, B, C; Baccalaureate, HND. Please also tell us about any conditions you impose on these entry requirements, for example, Maths at grade C or above, minimum of 7 Merits. Additional Guidance The entry requirements need to be coherent with the support offered to students and lead to a reasonable expectation of success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Guidance**

Industrial input and influence are an important mechanism in keeping undergraduate courses up to date and relevant. When this input is visible to students it also provides an insight into the opportunities that exist within industry and other commercial organisations which interact with the university.

It is important to show how industrial input impacts the course design. It will be helpful to describe the process through which industrial input is integrated into the curriculum supporting your answer with examples. Accreditors generally expect to see a combination of formal and informal arrangements.

Typical forms of industrial input and influence:
- Industrial experience and on-going interaction of staff. If cited in this context, it is important to describe how this impacts the course design with examples.
- Industrial input into projects.
- A description of other links to industry such as assessments, project open days, encouraging placements, careers talks etc.
- Provision of facilities or equipment by industry, relevant to the courses being accredited.
- Lectures given by industrialists might be cited. Make it clear if any such lecturers are part of an examined / credit awarded module.

The IET encourages early contact for students with the industrial engineering environment. Industrial sponsorship and training is seen as a good mechanism to achieve this. Even where not all students are involved, the presence of such interaction serves to bring relevance and purpose to a programme.

The IET is non-prescriptive about the form of industrial sponsorship and training but it is important to show how this impacts the course.

The IET would expect to see the encouragement and facilitation by the department of students seeking industrial placements. Such placements may take any form from vacation work through to a year out in industry.

Provide details of the process of finding placements, support and monitoring during placement, assessment (if any) and evidence of tangible benefits gained by the students. Present any statistics that are available such as students who take advantage of an industrial placement average X per cent higher than others in the final degree classifications.

Industrial sponsorship of students through their university course is also a useful indicator of the relevance of the course. Provide any available statistics of numbers of students being sponsored on courses and the companies involved. If the course is part of a formal company training scheme, give details. If the course is part of a sponsorship scheme such as the IET Power Academy or UKESF or E3 Academy, give details.

The panel may also ask the following questions:
- Is there a placement policy?
- What is the percentage of students on placements?
- Is there support available to students in obtaining placements?
- How is monitoring handled, particularly when the student is in another country?
- Are students given a presentation on their placements?
- How are placements assessed? (e.g. Are they part of the award or are they freestanding?)

Upload a document telling us if you have an Industrial Advisory Board, the membership of this board, how often it meets and what its remit is. If you don't have an Industrial Advisory Board, please tell us in what other ways you obtain industrial input into programme content, structure and delivery. Where relevant, please also upload minutes from the last three meetings of your Industrial Advisory Board. If you do not have a formal industrial advisory board, please describe the mechanism for obtaining formal input into the programmes and how effectively this operates.
Entry, Exit, and Graduation data (Progression Data)

For each Academic Year (Most recent data for length of programme plus 2 years) please provide progression data for each level of your programme.

A template for progression data is available on request. However, you can upload your own version of the data after consulting with your point of contact for accreditation at the IET to ensure it contains the information required for the submission.

Entry Data:
For each academic year you must show the number of students at each level of the programme. Entry data are the head counts at each level at the start of an academic year. The data must show the following:

- New entry (direct entry after level 1);
- Progressing from the previous level (not level 1);
- Continuing PT (at the same level because they have more modules to complete);
- Repeating the level;
- Transferring from another programme (which should include those returning from a placement year).

Exit Data:
This refers to students that exit at the end of the academic year. Exit data are the head counts at each level at the end of an academic year. The data must show the following:

- Progressing to the next level or graduating if it is the final level;
- Continuing PT at the same level (because they have more modules at that level);
- Repeating the same level (because they have not done well enough);
- Withdrawing (which includes those who fail);
- Transferring out (which should include any student moving onto a placement year).

NOTES: Students who exit level n labelled as progressing enter the next academic year progressing to level n+1. Students exiting level n labelled as continuing PT or repeating enter the next academic year as continuing PT or repeating level n. Students that are continuing PT into an academic cycle would expect to leave that cycle progressing to the next level and not be labelled as continuing PT unless they still had further modules to complete at that level.

Supporting Information Admissions Progression data

Most recent data for length of programme plus 2 years

Supporting Information Admissions Assessment of Prior Learning

Current

Please provide a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, giving details of your procedure for assessing students of advanced standing who are permitted to enter the course later than the beginning of Year 1. Details of IET policy and guidance regarding final year direct entry can be found in the Information Pack located in the Resource Pod within the Task Tracker tab as well as at [http://www.theiet.org/academics/accreditation/policy-guidance/](http://www.theiet.org/academics/accreditation/policy-guidance/).

If you have indicated that a programme(s) is delivered at an additional site (whether it is credit bearing or not), please enter the required information in this section.

Supporting Information Admissions Credit bearing/ Non-credit bearing delivery at other sites

Current

This section will automatically show if 'other delivery sites/ study abroad options' have been selected for any of the programmes going forward for accreditation.

Please see Programme - Delivery site guidance for what to provide in this section.

Supporting Information Admissions Entry Routes

Current

Please enter the information requested about the distribution of students in your entry cohort as set out in ADAMS. This is required for both Undergraduate and Postgraduate students where appropriate.
Supporting Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions</th>
<th>Assessment regulations</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Upload documentation that states:
- The requirements for successful progression between levels, including any compensation, condonement or trailing of credit that is allowed
- The requirements relating to attainment of marks within components of modules (e.g. threshold requirements).
- The marks or grades for classification boundaries of the award of the final award
- The algorithm that is used to calculate the final award

Please indicate in what context exceptions outside the normal regulations have been permitted and the numbers for the previous year.

Additional Guidance

To check that the Assessment regulations support the achievement of the learning outcomes. Further information on Assessment Regulation is available in the IET Information Pack.

Accreditors will consider the following when reviewing the material in this section and the answers you provide in the ‘Self-assessment’ section in order to establish whether the assessment regulations are in line with IET guidance:
- What must the students do to successfully progress through the programmes?
- What is the pass mark for modules?
- Is there a component threshold in place and is this at an acceptable level?
- What is the policy on compensation, condonement and/or trailing of modules?
- What are the rules relating to referrals/re-sits?
- Do MEng and MSc students have to achieve an overall mark of 50% or above?
- How do students’ progress to other awards?
- How is the final mark established (e.g. weighting of each year towards final award; discounting)?

Supporting Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions</th>
<th>Academic and Pastoral Support for Students</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please provide a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, giving details of academic and pastoral support given to students, such as:
- Personal tutoring schemes
- Pastoral care
- The support that is in place to accommodate the planned breadth of student intake.
- Actions taken to support students whose entry profile or performance is outside the nominal range for which the programme is designed.

Additional Guidance

AHEP requires the IET to consider how the cohort entry extremes will be supported. Accreditors are likely to explore this topic with students at the visit. Student support should be appropriate to the intake. Students should have access to staff and know how to achieve this. Mechanisms should be in place to support those needing help but not seeking it.
### Supporting Information

#### Assessment

| Laboratory And Continuous Assessment | Current | Please provide a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, giving details of the marking schemes and the generic or specific marking criteria which are used for the assessment of laboratory work and continuous assessment. Include an explanation of what processes are used for the moderation of coursework assessments and what the role of your external examiners is in these processes. |

#### Additional Guidance

The panel will expect to see that students are presented with clear information on what is expected of them. The level that the assessment is measuring should be distinguishable and there should also be an opportunity for more able students to show their ability. The panel may also ask the following questions:

- How are marks moderated?
- How is feedback on coursework handled (e.g. turnaround time)?
- Is the content of Laboratory Work clearly defined?
- Are the marking schemes appropriate?
- In what way are the external examiners involved in the laboratory and coursework assessment process?
- How does the department assure itself that laboratory and coursework assessment is as robust and secure as examinations?
- Do the assessment methods and associated processes ensure that the opportunity to plagiarise is minimised and occurrences are detected?

The panel will expect to see an appropriate balance of coursework and examination papers. Typically, coursework would be expected to contribute no more than 40% towards the final award of a CEng accredited programme (excluding the major individual project) though more importantly there is expected to be a rationale for this balance and if a significant proportion of assessment is through coursework particular attention is likely to be paid to the department’s methods for ensuring robustness and security of assessment (e.g. QA and plagiarism avoidance and detection). The panel will pay attention to the correlation of marks awarded to each component. The panel will expect significant alignment of marks or an understanding of the issues that have led to imbalance and steps in place to address as appropriate. For a module to be passed, both components will need to be above the threshold, these being expected to be set at 30% as explained in the IET’s Accreditation guidance.

#### Supporting Information

| AHEP Additional General Skills | Current | Complete and upload the template provided explaining how the programmes have been designed to meet the AHEP Additional General Skills. Ideally, use one template for all programmes. |

#### Supporting Information

| Recruitment, Development and Training | Current | Please provide a PDF document, or enter the text box below, giving details of:
- the university and/or departmental policy on the recruitment, development and training of new and existing staff.
- the department’s policy on professional registration. The annual spend on these activities. |

The panel may ask the following questions:

- Is there an adequate budget available for training?
- Is there an adequate budget available for training?
- Is there a staff development / training plan including professional registration for all members of staff?
- Is there a succession plan?

#### Supporting Information

| Teaching Fellows, Postgraduate Tutors, Demonstrators and Visiting Staff | Current | Please upload a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, an explanation of how you use and train Teaching Fellows, Postgraduate Tutors, Demonstrators and Visiting Staff. |

#### Supporting Information

| Teaching Fellows, Postgraduate Tutors, Demonstrators and Visiting Staff | Current | Please upload a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, giving details of:
- the university and/or departmental policy on the recruitment, development and training of new and existing staff.
- the department’s policy on professional registration. The annual spend on these activities. |

The panel may ask the following questions:

- Is there a staff development / training plan including professional registration for all members of staff?
- Is there an adequate budget available for training?
- Is there a succession plan?

#### Supporting Information

| Teaching Fellows, Postgraduate Tutors, Demonstrators and Visiting Staff | Current | Please upload a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, giving details of:
- the university and/or departmental policy on the recruitment, development and training of new and existing staff.
- the department’s policy on professional registration. The annual spend on these activities. |

The panel may ask the following questions:

- Is there a staff development / training plan including professional registration for all members of staff?
- Is there an adequate budget available for training?
- Is there a succession plan?

#### Supporting Information

| Teaching Fellows, Postgraduate Tutors, Demonstrators and Visiting Staff | Current | Please upload a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, giving details of:
- the university and/or departmental policy on the recruitment, development and training of new and existing staff.
- the department’s policy on professional registration. The annual spend on these activities. |

The panel may ask the following questions:

- Is there a staff development / training plan including professional registration for all members of staff?
- Is there an adequate budget available for training?
- Is there a succession plan?

#### Supporting Information

| Ratios | Current | In each case please provide the number of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs). |

For the purposes of these calculations we are only interested in Academic Staff involved in teaching so those who are seconded to other activities for all or part of their time should be included at the relevant FTE. Similarly, if an Administrator works from 9 to 3 rather than 9 to 5 they would count as a 0.71 FTE

As far as is possible please be consistent with the relevance of the numbers used; e.g. if you are using staff numbers for the whole Department, then student numbers should include all students in the Department.

#### Supporting Information

| Ratios | Current | In each case please provide the number of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs). |

For the purposes of these calculations we are only interested in Academic Staff involved in teaching so those who are seconded to other activities for all or part of their time should be included at the relevant FTE. Similarly, if an Administrator works from 9 to 3 rather than 9 to 5 they would count as a 0.71 FTE

As far as is possible please be consistent with the relevance of the numbers used; e.g. if you are using staff numbers for the whole Department, then student numbers should include all students in the Department.

#### Supporting Information

| Ratios | Current | In each case please provide the number of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs). |

For the purposes of these calculations we are only interested in Academic Staff involved in teaching so those who are seconded to other activities for all or part of their time should be included at the relevant FTE. Similarly, if an Administrator works from 9 to 3 rather than 9 to 5 they would count as a 0.71 FTE

As far as is possible please be consistent with the relevance of the numbers used; e.g. if you are using staff numbers for the whole Department, then student numbers should include all students in the Department.

#### Supporting Information

| Ratios | Current | In each case please provide the number of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs). |

For the purposes of these calculations we are only interested in Academic Staff involved in teaching so those who are seconded to other activities for all or part of their time should be included at the relevant FTE. Similarly, if an Administrator works from 9 to 3 rather than 9 to 5 they would count as a 0.71 FTE

As far as is possible please be consistent with the relevance of the numbers used; e.g. if you are using staff numbers for the whole Department, then student numbers should include all students in the Department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Subject Expertise and Professional Registration Levels of Academic Staff</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Please download the template, complete and then upload the finished document. Alternatively, you may upload an existing document of your own which contains the same information.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff expertise and wider professional activities should support the curriculum. Other professional activities could include activities with professional institutions, external examining, research, consultancy etc. To ensure that courses are being designed and delivered by an appropriate percentage of professionally registered engineers who are members of the IET. It is generally expected that a department should have 50 per cent of their staff professionally registered, half of these with the accrediting body.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Scholarship, Research and Consultancy</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please upload a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, a description of the Department's Scholarship, Research and Consultancy activity and how this has an influence on and benefits the programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>The IET believes that strong leading-edge research, industrial design and / or industrial consultancy work can be a very good mechanism for keeping courses up to date and relevant, as well as demonstrating to students, the process, challenge and excitement of technological advancement. The IET is non-prescriptive about the form of scholarship, research and consultancy but it is important to show how this impacts the course. Evidence of the existence of such work within the HEI needs to be supported by details of where and how this activity feeds into the courses. We would expect to see the influence in the final year of a Bachelor's degree and M level of both MEng and MSc. Strengths should be reflected in aims and programme learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Current Resources</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please provide a PDF document, or enter the text box below, a brief outline of the current resources and facilities and any major planned expenditure over the next five years. Please explain how you ensure that the equipment in your laboratories is kept up to date and include information on budget size and allocation processes. Please explain how funding is secured for new equipment and how the need for this is identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>The IET needs to be assured that the overall provision of resources and facilities are adequate for the programme for students to be given the appropriate support during their studies and for the duration of the accreditation period. Give a brief outline of any major planned expenditure over the next five years. Provide details of the budget process for laboratory upgrades and resourcing of new equipment (for key areas such as teaching, research and administration). If an existing document contains this information, please provide copies and references e.g. last internal review self-assessment document. The provision of laboratory facilities should support the curriculum, reflect the current state of equipment available and be enough to provide access for full cohorts, including outside timetabled periods. Planned expenditure should be commensurate with improving, updating or maintaining the current provision depending on the current status. The panel will assess the resources and facilities on the day of the visit during the laboratory tours or via your submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Computer Facilities</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please provide a PDF document, or enter into the text box below, details of how you ensure that all students have access to computers and up to date software packages, including any remote access facilities. Include information on budget size and process as well as opening hours and a list of software packages available to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>There should be enough computers to provide access for students including outside timetabled hours. Computers should be of appropriate age and specification to support the applications running on them (as dictated by the curriculum). Software needs to support curriculum with enough seats to enable access for class size. Outside normal hour’s access to computers with appropriate specialist software could be substituted (or supplemented) by remote access to key software packages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Programme Review And Modification</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Please upload a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, a description of how you assess the effectiveness of the programmes you teach, how you modify them as a result of this assessment process and how you check the effectiveness of these modifications. Please also tell us how new programmes are initiated and how they are designed and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Additional Guidance** | Summarise how programmes are modified, and new programmes initiated. Explain how their effectiveness is reviewed, changes are made, and new programmes are designed and implemented, including the use of student and industry feedback and external examiner comments. If an existing document contains this information please provide copies and references or links, such as the annual review or periodic review procedures. Design, review and improvement mechanisms should be appropriate, documented, understood by all staff and followed as a matter of course. | Accreditors may ask the following questions:  
• Are programme review procedures clear? How are they audited?  
• Is programme management clearly stated?  
• How are exam questions reviewed? Are there annual feedback reports? Are students asked to provide feedback?  
• Is there a staff-student liaison committee?  
• Do external examiners reports influence the programme development?  
• How are new programmes initiated? |
| Supporting Information | QA | Periodic Review Report and Departmental Response | Current | Please upload PDF copies of the department's most recent Periodic Review Report and the Department's response to this. |
| Supporting Information | QA | NSS Report and Response | Current | Please upload a PDF copy of the department's most recent NSS report. |
| Supporting Information | QA | Committee Minutes | Last 3 meetings | Please upload at least one year's worth of Staff Student Committee and Teaching and Learning Committee minutes. This is best done regularly following each meeting. These should be in PDF format where possible. |
| Supporting Information | QA | External Examining Arrangements (Role) | Current | Please tell us in a pdf document, or enter a comment in the text box, about the role of External Examiners in the development of programmes and modules as well as their contribution to assessment and moderation. |
| Supporting Information | QA | External Examining Arrangements (Names) | Current | Please upload a PDF document, or enter a comment in the text box, the list of your current External Examiners and their periods of tenure. |
| Supporting Information | QA | External Examining Arrangements (Reports) | 3 most recent years | Please upload PDF copies of the External Examiners' reports on an annual basis. Before final submission, please ensure that there are sets for at least three years where these are available. |
| Supporting Information | QA | Response to External Examiners Report | 3 most recent years | Please upload a PDF copy of the Department's response(s) to the above External Examiners reports. This may well be an extract from the Department's Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (or equivalent). |
### Additional Guidance

External examiners should be appropriate in number and subject knowledge to give coverage for all modules and courses. They should engage appropriately (including timely) in all assessment which makes significant contribution to the award of the programmes. External examiner’s comments and concerns need to be considered and the loop closed, whether a decision is made to change processes or assessment details.

Accreditors may ask the following questions:
- Does the template used for reports encourage meaningful comments?
- How does the university handle external examiners’ comments?

The external examiner has the right to see all degree examination scripts and any other work that contributes to the degree result.

The external examiner should act as a moderator of the decisions of internal examiners. Student work will be marked in the first instance by internal examiners and some or all of the work should be made available to the external examiner for moderation.

It is good practice to involve the external examiner in decisions that will result in the student being required to leave the university. The external examiner may also act as an adjudicator where there are disagreements between internal examiners.

External examiners should be asked to review and subsequently approve all examination papers contributing to the final degree result. It is also good practice to consult the external examiner on other forms of assessment contributing to final degree results while in draft form e.g. coursework essay titles or project outlines.

### Supporting Information

**Overview**

- **Department and Programme Overview**
- **Current**

In order to give accreditors an introduction to the Department and Programmes, please upload a PDF document, or enter the text box below, a top-level description of:

- The University and Departmental philosophy and aspirations
- An overview of the programmes submitted for accreditation and how these fit with the above philosophy
- Any major changes or revisions to the programmes that has occurred since the last accreditation visit.
- Any major changes or revisions which are planned for the next 5 years (including changes to department/faculty structure, facilities, campus location etc).
- How programmes are grouped; for example, please explain if there are several programmes that are very similar with the selection of final year options determining the title.

This section should help the panel understand the overall shape of the portfolio and any significant commonality between programmes.

In addition, please enter a file named “SpecialFeatures.pdf” which explains anything your department does that you feel is distinctive or unusual.

This is the first section that is presented to the accreditation panel. It is an opportunity to provide an overview of the programmes and of the submission and a chance for you to highlight what is special about your programmes and the teaching and learning.

As regards major changes we are interested in changes that have been made since your last accreditation visit or which you are planning to make within five years of this accreditation visit. If you are planning major revisions to your programmes within one to two years of the planned date for your accreditation visit you might wish to consider delaying the visit - please contact us to discuss this.

A major revision is defined as replacing more than 30 per cent of programme content with material not currently being taught on accredited programmes. It is a condition of accreditation that you notify the IET of any major changes made to programmes. If there is a major change to a programme that is accredited, we will need to be assured that the AHEP learning outcomes are still achieved.

The “Special Features” Document is an opportunity to specifically highlight items of good practice or unusual and innovative approaches to the panel. A short summary may be provided, giving examples and providing links to relevant documents and / or further information. This section is not assessed by the panel; however, it may be that they feel the special features presented are commendable. With your permission, the IET may publish this information with the aim of promoting good practice in engineering education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Self-Assessment</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use the radio buttons to indicate the department’s University’s alignment (or otherwise) with the IET Requirements and Guidelines for accreditation. If you hover your mouse cursor over the short codes for the Requirements and Guidelines the full text will display. All the Requirements and Guidelines are available within the IET Information Pack which is available for download. A comment box is provided for you to qualify your selection in the grid and so that you can signpost the accreditors to any relevant documentation, please try to be as specific as you can when referencing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Student Numbers</th>
<th>3 most recent years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please upload a table that shows the total number of students per programme, or group of programmes, for the last 3 years. Ideally this should also be split by delivery mode (FT, PT, SW etc).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Supplementary Information for Joint Visits</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If you are having a IET led visit with other PEI involvement this section should be used to provide any additional Information that has been requested from the other PEI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Updated Action Plan</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upload the department's updated action plan which should show the progress made against the original. If you need the IET to send you the latest version held by them then please email <a href="mailto:accreditation@theiet.org">accreditation@theiet.org</a>. If you do not have a formal action plan to update, for example if this is your first accreditation visit, please upload a brief response to the previous review by the IET. If you have progressed straight to an accreditation visit, please upload a statement to this effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Additional Guidance | We see ourselves in the position of a critical friend to a department, providing advice in good faith for the better provision of programmes for students. We are keen to see what progress has been made since our last visit and to learn whether (or not) the action taken has had a beneficial effect. Evidence that previous actions have been addressed gives confidence that future intakes can be accredited without risk. Please tell us the result of the action or a reason why an agreed action is no longer relevant. We would be especially interested to know whether the implementation of our suggestions had a net beneficial effect and in what way. Failure to complete actions agreed at a previous accreditation visit may reduce the maximum length of accreditation awarded following your next visit to three years instead of five years. |
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Modules
1. Credit
Credit is a unit that gives weight to the value of an academic module taken at an educational institution. Typically a three year UK Higher Education Degree will consist of 360 credits. This is broken down into modules of work each worth a set amount of credits (usually 120 per year).

2. Examination
This is a paper or computer test typically taken in a confined area under examination conditions. I.e. limited and specific resources available to the candidate (for example set texts only, calculator etc), independently completed without any outside assistance.

3. Lab & Coursework Assignments
This refers to any work completed by the student during each module which is assessed and counts towards the final mark for that module. Typically this includes coursework which the student may do alone or in a group, with or without lab work as well as standalone lab assessments. It does not include end of module examinations or timed tests within a classroom.

4. Learning Outcome
Learning outcomes are statements that describe significant and essential learning that learners have achieved, and can reliably demonstrate at the end of a module or programme. In other words, learning outcomes identify what the learner will know and be able to do by the end of a module or programme. In terms of the Learning Outcome for IET accreditation, we have a set list of Learning Outcomes which need to be met from an accredited degree programme. These are listed in ADAMS and you will be asked to identify which of these Learning Outcomes each Module and Programme demonstrate.

5. Module
This is a single unit of learning /course on a particular subject. Several modules when completed will make up a degree programme. A module will have its own Learning Outcomes, assessment and usually a module leader who is in charge of the delivery of that module. Students will receive one mark for the completion of a module, although this could be made up of several components (coursework and examinations for example).

6. Module Descriptor
This will be a document which describes the following about the module:
- Title – i.e. Introduction to Electronics
- Code – any form of code used internally to identify the module. E.g. AB101
- Duration – How many semesters does this module cover
- Credit value – How many credits is this module worth
- Purpose – Why is the module an option for students what does it aim to give them?
- Format – Is it only lecturers, will there be seminars and laboratory sessions too? If so how many and how long etc.
- Assessment – How will the students be assessed during and on completion of the module
- Learning Outcomes – What are the Learning Outcomes a student will achieve on completion of this module? Leader – Who oversees the running of this module?

7. Module Level
This refers to at what level in relation to the UK National Qualifications Framework a module is. All modules within the same academic year will have the same level. An example of levels and where they fall within a UK degree are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foundation year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bachelor year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bachelor year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bachelor year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Masters year 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **Unseen Timed Tests**
   An unseen exam is a time-constrained assessment task, presented to students for the first time at the beginning of the assessment. These are usually within the middle of the module and are separate to the end of module examinations. For the sake of IET accreditation we are only interested in any unseen timed tests which count towards the final mark for that module.

9. **Weighting**
   For Modules we require you to confirm the weighting of a component in the final module mark as a percentage. For example if a module has one examination and one piece of coursework will these each be presented equally in the final mark achieved by the student (50% and 50%) or is one assessment worth more than the other (for example Examination 70% and coursework 30%).

---

**Programmes**

1. **Cohort**
   This refers to a group of students who enter the programme at the same time. For example all students who entered the degree programme in September 2016 may be referred to as the 2015/16 cohort.

2. **Credit** (See Modules No.1)

3. **Credit Allocation**
   This refers to the weighting of this module within the degree programme.

4. **Delivery Site**
   This refers to the address where the programmes are taught.
   (Site visits and Industrial placements will not count as separate delivery sites but if an entire module or group of modules are taught at a separate campus for example this would count as a separate Delivery Site).

5. **Entry Requirements**
   What academic qualifications and/or industrial experience you will accept from a student in order for them to begin their studies on this programme.

6. **Graduating Year**
   Refers to the year a student completes their studies.

7. **Intake Year**
   Refers to the year a student starts their studies

8. **Internal Review**
   Refers to the process which your department/faculty or university will review your current programmes and modules. This may be an annual review or part of a larger review every few years.

9. **Learning Outcome** (See Modules No. 4)

10. **Non-Standard Entry Data**
    Entry Data refers to the qualifications and/or industrial experience that students on the programme achieved prior to commencing their studies. For the sake of ADAMS Non-Standard Entry Data will be the information for students who did not have a UCAS score. (This will be relevant for all non-UK students/ institutions)

11. **Programme**
    This is the degree programme. For example Bachelor of Engineering in Electrical Engineering

12. **Programme Classification Type**
    This refers to how the degree is awarded on completion. For example First/Second/Third or a C/GPA score.

13. **Programme Specification**
This refers to a brief document which defines the overview for the programme and what the overall learning outcomes a student will achieve on completion of the programme. It may contain number of years of study, brief details of the topics available and any projects within the degree.

14. Programme Type
This refers to the type of qualification for example Bachelors (BEng/BE/BSc etc) or Masters (ME/MEng/MSc).

15. Progression Conditions
This refers to the standards that a student must maintain in order to progress from one level or study to the next. For example do they need to achieve a particular average pass mark for that level, do they need to pass each piece of assessment etc.

16. Subject Category
This refers to the type of engineering that this programme falls into. For example Electrical Engineering or Mechanical Engineering.

17. UCAS or Short Code
For UK programmes this will be the code given by UCAS applicants for postgraduate and overseas programmes this will be the short code you use to refer to the programme within your internal documents. If you have no official short code this can simply be entered as XXXX.

18. Validation
This refers to the approval process a university will conduct before running new programmes. Some universities will also complete a re-validation process every 5 years or so to confirm that the programme is still a valid programme to be running.

19. Weighting (See Modules No. 9)

Supporting Information
1. Progression Data
This details how each cohort moves through the programme. For example how many progress to the next stage, how many fail that stage, how many continue on a part time basis. It will also detail the graduation statistics, i.e. how many students achieved the top classification. (A spreadsheet template is available for this to help you with this section of the submission.)

2. External Examiner
External Examiners act as independent reviewers of standards and procedures related to assessment. They may also advise on the development of the curriculum. They will review examination papers and coursework assignments, examples of students work and can attend the assessment boards. They will write an annual report to the university commending what is good and making recommendations for improvements where needed. The department/university should create a formal response to these reports. More guidance on External Examining / External Peer review is available within the Information pack.

3. NSS Report
This refers to the UK National Student Survey Report. Non UK universities will not have one of these but there may be an equivalent.

4. Overview of Philosophy & Aspirations
This refers to how the department/faculty etc fits within the university. What are the aims for the department for the future. Brief history on how the department was formed if this is seen as relevant.

5. Periodic Review
The purpose of periodic review is to monitor the quality and standards of the programmes and awards offered by each department. The process enables the University to check the health of its taught provision, to identify areas for development and to identify and disseminate good practice in learning and teaching. This is more of an overview for the department than the internal review or validation processes.

6. Programme Review and Modification
This is how you assess the effectiveness of the programmes you teach, how you modify them as a result of this assessment process and how you check the effectiveness of these modifications. Please also tell us how new programmes are initiated and how they are designed and implemented.
7. **QA (Quality Assurance)**
   This is an overview term relating to any steps you have in place to ensure that the quality of your programmes, assessment and teaching are maintained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>Sub section</th>
<th>Upload or Data input required?</th>
<th>‘Data unavailable’ option?</th>
<th>Data Sharing option available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Type, Code, Title, Level, Marking scheme, Credit allocation</em></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Module Descriptor</td>
<td>Upload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Learning Outcomes tick box (comments optional)</em></td>
<td>Yes, but only if it does not deliver AHEP learning outcomes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Exams, Tests and Coursework Assignments</td>
<td>Table to indicate number, duration and weighting of assessment components</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Papers, Assignments &amp; Marking Schemes</td>
<td>Uploads Dependant on module assessment, may be all or subset of the following: Exam Paper Exam Paper marking scheme Exam example lowest scoring pass Test Paper Test Paper marking scheme Test example lowest scoring pass Assignment Paper Assignment example lowest scoring pass</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Module Marks</td>
<td><em>Marks for exams/ tests and coursework per student</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Project Handbook</td>
<td>Upload. Note: This is for Major Individual Project or Group Project Type modules only.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload Note: This is for Major Individual Project or Group Project Type modules only.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Tab</td>
<td>Sub section</td>
<td>Upload or Data input required?</td>
<td>‘Data unavailable’ option?</td>
<td>Data Sharing option available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Details</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>durations, additional delivery sites (and whether these are credit bearing)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Details</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Programme Documents</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Structure</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Block Diagram</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Structure</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Structure Delivery Mode (first time input only)</td>
<td>Select delivery mode to enter programme structure against</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Structure</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Credit Allocation and Weighting per year</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Structure</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Weighting of continuous assessment towards the final award</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Structure</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Programme Structure</td>
<td>Module selection table for each year of the programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Outcomes commentaries. Template available to complete offline.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Entry Data</td>
<td>Entry Data</td>
<td>Entry Data</td>
<td>Breakdown of UCAS points per student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Entry Data</td>
<td>Entry Data</td>
<td>Non-Standard Entry Profile</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Accreditation status</td>
<td>Accreditation status</td>
<td></td>
<td>Details of accreditation awarded. Non-editable, produced from database</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Department level’ information:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>Sub section</th>
<th>Upload or Data input required?</th>
<th>‘Data unavailable’</th>
<th>Data Sharing option available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Industry Information</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload and Employability Skills template</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Entry Requirements</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Progression data</td>
<td>Upload(s) Template available on request</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Assessment of Prior Learning</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Entry Routes</td>
<td>% Breakdown of home/abroad, entry type (college/mature) and type of course studied (FT, PT, etc) for Undergraduate and Post graduate programmes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Progression Conditions</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Academic and Pastoral Support for Students</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Laboratory And Continuous Assessment</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Group Working Skills</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>AHEP Additional General Skills</td>
<td>Template provided for completing offline. Comments on how the programmes have been designed to meet the AHEP Additional General Skills</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Recruitment, Development and Training</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Teaching Fellows, Postgraduate Tutors, Demonstrators and Visiting Staff</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ratios</td>
<td>Number of students, academic staff, administrative staff and technicians</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Subject Expertise And Professional Registration Levels of Academic Staff</td>
<td>Upload(s). Optional template provided</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Tab</td>
<td>Sub section</td>
<td>Upload or Data input required?</td>
<td>'Data option? unavailable'</td>
<td>Data Sharing option available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>IET Student advisor</td>
<td>Pre-populated from department profile but editable. Optional comment box provided.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Scholarship, Research and Consultancy</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Current Resources</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Computer Facilities</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Programme Review And Modification</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Self-Evaluation Document</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Periodic Review Report and Departmental Response</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>NSS Report and Departmental Response</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Committee Minutes</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>External peer review (External Examining) Arrangements</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Response to External peer review (External Examiner) Report</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Department and Programme Overview</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Student numbers</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Supplementary Information for Joint Visits</td>
<td>Choice of Free text or upload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Table and comment boxes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Action Plan</td>
<td>Updated Action Plan</td>
<td>Upload(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>