



The Metanoia Institute

Academic Quality and Standards Manual

2025-2027

Principal Authoring Department:
Quality and Governance

Approved by:
Academic Board

Date approved: July 2025

Document title: Quality Assurance Manual		No of pages: 36
Version Number: 1	Date first published: July 2025	
Approved by: Academic Board	Last review date: -	
Date originally approved: July 2025	Due for next review: May 2027	

Contents

Section		Page
1.	Introduction	4
2.	Overview of Governance and the Quality Assurance Framework	6
3.	Admissions (including RPL)	10
4.	Academic Framework	11
5.	Programme Approval, Validation and Periodic Review/Revalidation	12
6.	Suspension of Programme	20
7.	Extension of Programme	21
8.	Publicity and Marketing	21
9.	External Examining	21
10.	Annual and Periodic Monitoring and Reporting Framework	25
11.	Marking and Moderation	29
12.	Teaching and Learning	30
13.	Policy Development and Approval Purpose and Process	31
14.	Academic Action Plan	34

Foreword: This Manual is published annually as a reference guide to inform Metanoia's staffing body and other stakeholders about the range of mechanisms employed by the Institute to ensure that academic standards are set appropriately and remain secure, and that quality is assured and deliberately enhanced. Each section signals where the associated strategies, policies and procedures may be accessed. While individual policies may contain details of the associated operational processes and procedures in relation to implementation.

Contact: Quality - quality@metanoia.ac.uk

Document Control dates:

Academic Board for consideration for approval: July 2025

Academic Board for consideration for approval of updates: May 2026

This Document works in collaboration with the following policies/framework(s):

- Governance Handbook
- Student Representative System
- Student Engagement With Governance Policy
- Policy Approval Policy (new development)
- Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures
- Peer Review Policy
- External Examiner Policy
- Annual Monitoring Framework
- Metanoia Academic Regulations
- Moderation Policy
- Recognition of Prior Learning Policy
- Enhancement Strategy

Acronyms:

AB	Academic Board
APPF	Academic Provision Proposal Form
BoT	Board of Trustees
CEE	Chief External Examiner
EdC	Education Committee
ExC	Executive Committee
EE	External Examiner
HoP	Head of Programme
MEE	Module External Examiner
MI	Metanoia Institute
MAMR	Module Annual Monitoring Report
ML	Module Leader
OFS	Office for Students
PAMR	Programme Annual Monitoring Report
PEE	Programme External Examiner
NBDF	New Business Proposal Form
MMF	Major Modification Form
MdX	Middlesex University
QA	Quality Assurance
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency

Section 1. Introduction

Established in 1984, the Metanoia Institute (hereafter “the Institute; or “Metanoia”) offers specialist education and training opportunities in the fields of psychotherapy and counselling, with a mix of University-validated and Institute-approved programmes of study at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Where Metanoia Institute awards apply, academic standards are set and maintained via a range of published processes overseen by and implemented through the operation of the academic governance structure and its various committees and sub-committees (see Section 10). Where academic provision is validated, Middlesex University sets the standards through a rigorous programme validation process, with responsibility for ensuring that those standards are maintained largely delegated by formal arrangement to the Institute.

Metanoia, an HEI listed on the Office for Students’ (OfS’s) Register of (English) Higher Education Providers as an Approved (fee cap) provider¹, subscribes to the definitions of quality and standards provided by the Quality Assurance Agency (‘the QAA’) in its ‘sector-agreed’, revised and republished UK Quality Code for Higher Education²:

Quality – *refers to how well providers support students to consistently achieve positive outcomes in learning, personal development and career advancement, while meeting the reasonable expectations of those students, employers, government and society in general.*

Standards/academic standards – *these are the standards that degree-awarding bodies set and maintain for the award of academic credit or qualifications. Degree-awarding bodies are responsible for defining their own academic standards by setting the pass marks and determining the grading/marking schemes and any criteria for classification of qualifications that differentiate between levels of student achievement above and below the threshold academic standards. These individual standards align to national qualifications and credit frameworks and/or the Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area³.*

The Institute is committed to ensuring that its learners have a high-quality, high-value experience within an explicitly outcomes-based student success framework. The student experience at Metanoia is underpinned by a range of student-focused support services and outcomes-focused enhancement activities.

1.1 Metanoia’s Vision and Aims

1.1.2 Vision and Core Purpose

Academic standards are set and maintained, quality assured and enhanced, within the context of the Institute’s vision. Metanoia’s published Vision Statement is as follows:

To lead the way in therapy education and training, cultivating an outstanding, culturally responsive, and highly skilled psychological workforce. We aim to transcend barriers, making therapy accessible to every corner of society, using our influence to create impactful and positive change.

¹ See Section 17: Regulation, below.

² The [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#) (revised and republished, 2024) remains ‘a key reference point for the quality arrangements in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. In England, the Quality Code is not regulatory, but providers are able to use it to inform their approach to quality, as a way of providing comparability across the UK and to aid international visibility.’

³ [The Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area](#).

The Institute's core purpose is two-fold:

- Education – *[To] provide a transformative and enriching teaching and learning experience that empowers students to achieve their potential and inspires them to make a positive impact in their communities. We will nurture a supportive learning environment that fuels growth, sparks creativity, and cultivates critical thinking. We will use research to continuously explore and implement evidence-based approaches for the most effective and impactful educational experience.*
- Training – *[To] deliver programmes that integrate clinical practice with academic rigour underpinned by research to provide well-defined and flexible training pathways that lead to immediate employability across all sectors, allowing graduates to make a meaningful impact from day one.*

1.1.3 The Institute's Aims (2023-28)

The vision and aims are underpinned by four strategic aims centred on the following principles and priorities: Inclusion, Innovation, Intelligence and Sustainability.

Strategic Aim 1: To foster a culture of inclusion that promotes diversity, equity and belonging for all students and staff through inclusive teaching practices, an inclusive curriculum and an inclusive environment.

Strategic Aim 2: To drive innovation across all aspects of our institution by modernising education design and delivery methods, upgrading supporting infrastructure, enhancing our brand and marketing efforts and leveraging digitisation.

Strategic Aim 3: To become an intelligence-led institution that prioritises data-driven decision-making, evidence-based education and practice and a student-centred approach whilst staying ahead of emerging trends in Higher Education.

Strategic Aim 4: To ensure long-term sustainability by becoming an autonomous organisation, maximising growth and income opportunities, and embedding sustainable development principles across all our plans, including financial security.

1.1.4. Information about the Institute and its programmes

Metanoia is committed to providing to its range of stakeholders – including its staff, students, potential students, collaborative partners and employers – fully accurate information about the Institute and its academic provision in a timely and appropriately accessible manner. It does this in a multitude of ways, from the publication of definitive programme and module specifications within key information sets, its Academic Regulations and the policies and procedures that support them to internal and external communications managed through a dedicated Marketing and Communications unit.

Section 2: Overview of Governance and the Metanoia Quality Assurance Framework

2.1 The governance structure consists of several committees and sub-committees, each designed through their terms of reference to focus on specific areas of responsibility, which are detailed in the Metanoia Governance Handbook, located on the Governance SharePoint.

There are two branches of responsibility: Organisational Governance and Academic Governance. Quality Assurance largely falls under the remit of the Academic Governance branch, though quality assurance processes often include a reference to Organisational Governance when strategic decisions are required.

The Quality Assurance's parent committee is the Academic Board (AB), which reports to the Board of Trustees (BoT). The Executive Committee (ExC) reports directly to the Board of Trustees. Each of the committees and sub-committees are responsible for reviewing its terms of reference at the first meeting of each academic year. Proposed amendments to the ToRs are required to be approved by their parent committee; for Quality Assurance, this will be the Academic Board and for the Executive, the Board of Trustees.

Quality Assurance is a framework that feeds through the Metanoia Governance structure. The system incorporates clear parameters of responsibility and accountability through a collective committee approach that includes the Metanoia community, i.e. staff and students.

The Quality Assurance Framework referred to in this manual consists of:

- Governance Handbook
- Student Representative System Framework
- Student Engagement With Governance Policy
- Policy Approval Policy (under development)
- Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures
- Peer Review Policy
- External Examiner Policy
- Annual Monitoring Framework
- Metanoia Academic Regulations
- Moderation Policy
- Recognition of Prior Learning Policy

Students are invited to get involved with governance through the Student Representative System; the Framework document is located on the Quality SharePoint. Staff membership is either through their designated role and relevant expertise, or they are encouraged to volunteer to attend as observers as part of professional development. Metanoia staff also have individual responsibility in the performance of their duties.

The systematic approach to Quality Assurance aligns with the QAA Code (2024)⁴ Sector-Agreed Principles and OFS Conditions of Registration⁵.

2.1.1 Key Elements of the Governance Framework:

- **Accountability and Transparency:**

⁴ [UK Quality Code for Higher Education 2024 - Sector-Agreed Principles](#)

⁵ [OfS Conditions of Registration](#)

A strong framework clearly outlines roles and responsibilities, ensuring that everyone involved is accountable for quality and standards.

- **Continuous Improvement:**

The framework should actively encourage and facilitate continuous improvement through regular monitoring, evaluation, and feedback mechanisms.

- **Stakeholder Engagement:**

It's crucial to involve all relevant stakeholders, including students, staff, and external partners, in the quality enhancement process.

- **Data-Driven Decision Making:**

The framework should rely on data and evidence to inform decisions about quality and enhancement, ensuring that improvements are based on sound information.


- **Alignment with National and International Standards:**

The framework should be aligned with relevant national and international standards and best practices in quality assurance and enhancement

2.1.2 Governance Structure

Below is a visual of the Metanoia Committee Governance Structure for further details about the system and how it functions, refer to the Governance Handbook, located on the Governance SharePoint.

Governance Structure Diagram



2.1.3 Student Engagement in Quality Enhancement and Assurance

2.1.3.1 The Metanoia Institute values meaningful and productive student engagement in the institution's governance arrangements as key for sustaining and developing a high-quality learning and teaching experience for its learners and trainees.


Student engagement in governance, as part of a wider institutional enhancement strategy, recognises the importance of student contribution via the students 'voice and through learners' active participation in governance structures and in key quality assurance and enhancement (QA&E) processes that operate through and are overseen by those governance arrangements.

The Metanoia Student in Engagement in Governance Policy, located on the Governance SharePoint, provides details of Metanoia's commitments, underpinning commitments and engagement opportunities in practice. Contact the Governance Team, governance@metnaoia.ac.uk, if you have any queries.

Refer to the Governance Handbook for information pertaining to committee structure, membership and terms of reference, which is located on the Governance SharePoint. If you have any queries, contact the Governance Team, governance@metanoia.ac.uk.

2.1.3.2 Metanoia has developed and implemented a student representative system, which is essential to ensuring accountability of the institute, an effective feedback system and the relationship between the Institute and students.

The Student Representative system consists of: Class Reps, Course Reps and Institutional Reps; the system is designed for collaborative work resulting in continuous feedback.



Representatives are identified through the process of cohort student rep nominations conducted by the programme teams; students must be nominated by peers to become a student representative. The student rep's tenure is one year.

For further details on the system framework, process, role descriptors, responsibilities and tenure, refer to the Student Representative System document available on the Quality SharePoint. If you have any queries, contact quality@metanoia.ac.uk.

Section 3: Admissions (including RPL)

3.1 Metanoia Institute values the wealth of experience, skills and knowledge that students from a wide and diverse range of backgrounds bring to the Institute and the learning experiences of others. The Institute welcomes a rich diversity of learners and aims to foster a culture of inclusion, respectfulness and celebration of difference, where students, staff and our wider community are valued and safe.

Metanoia Institute operates a fair admissions policy with clear entry criteria for its courses. Prior qualifications are not in themselves the basis for acceptance onto a programme of study and the Institute welcomes applications from those in under-represented groups.

The Admissions Policy, located on the Metanoia Website policy page and Quality SharePoint, provides details for staff roles, responsibilities, processes, GDPR and entry requirements. If you have any queries, contact admissions@metanoia.ac.uk of the Registrar (registrar@metanoia.ac.uk)

3.2 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

The primary purpose of Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) is to formally acknowledge and credit learning and skills gained outside of traditional educational settings, such as through work experience, training, or life experiences. This process allows individuals to demonstrate their knowledge and competencies to meet the requirements of a qualification or course, potentially leading to exemptions, credits, or accelerated pathways

Recognition of Prior Learning is appropriately evidenced learning that has normally been achieved outside the formal education system offered by Metanoia Institute and can consist of the following:

3.2.1 Accredited Prior Certificated Learning (APCL) is learning which has been recognised previously by an education provider, evidenced by formal certification, and assessed and recognised for the award of credit by the Institute. The previous learning must be relevant to the programme for which a student is applying, and if their application is successful, the credit will count towards their chosen programme of study.

3.2.2 Accredited Prior Experiential Learning (APEL) is learning which has been achieved through experiences outside the formal education and training systems normally associated with a working environment, which has been assessed and recognised for the award of credit by the Institute.

The Institute will consider applications for both APCL and APEL.

The PhD and Doctorate in Psychotherapy by Professional Studies degrees are outside the scope of the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy because they are awarded by a validating partner, solely on the basis of assessment of the thesis and there are no credit values attached to such programmes.

Refer to the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy, located on the Metanoia website or the Quality SharePoint, for details on processes, application, maximum credit, criteria and RPL assessment.

If you have any queries, contact the Registrar registrar@metanoia.ac.uk.

Section 4: Academic Framework

4.1 Metanoia Institute has developed its regulations to operate alongside the Quality and Standards Manual in accordance with the principles established by the UK Quality Code⁶ for Higher Education.

Metanoia's Academic Regulations, located on the Metanoia website or the Quality SharePoint, apply to students and course activity on programmes which are approved by Metanoia Institute. Where a programme is validated by Middlesex University, the University's Regulations apply.

Below is an outline of the qualifications awarded by the Institute and the number of stages the programme consists of to achieve the number of credits required to achieve the award.

- Clinical Diploma in Counselling at FHEQ level 6 consists of 3 stages (equivalent to 360 UK credits)
- Clinical Diploma in Psychotherapy at FHEQ level 7 consists of 2 stages (equivalent to 240 UK credits)
- Clinical Diploma in Psychotherapeutic Counselling at FHEQ level 7 consists of 3 stages (equivalent to 180 UK credits). Stage 1 (the foundation year) of this course is validated by Metanoia, the PgCert aspect is validated by Middlesex University, refer to Middlesex University Postgraduate regulations.

For further details about the academic framework and the policies that scaffold the framework, refer to the Metanoia Academic Regulations located on the Metanoia Website or the Quality SharePoint.

If you have any queries, contact the Registrar (registrar@metanoia.ac.uk)

4.2 Approach to the Postgraduate Research

4.2.1 Vision

Research-informed learning, teaching, practice and scholarship strategy is based on the Institutional Educational strategy, and forms one of its components. It aims to develop excellence in teaching, ensure that curricula are contemporary, enrich the students' learning experience, and contribute to the development of the professional field.

The framework is an expression of the principles embedded within the Educational Strategy:

- Student engagement in scholarship and research in the professional field and within the institute, and engagement with the wider societal issues.
- Enhancement of opportunities to engage with the existing research and scholarship in the field, and within the institute.
- Development of research culture focused on practice-based research, development of theory and practice within the professional field, and research-informed and innovative teaching.

⁶ [UK Quality Code](#)

4.2.2 Application

Application of the framework will encompass the following:

Integration of research and enquiry into the curricula

- Evidence of research learning, teaching, practice and scholarship throughout the student journey and at all levels, reflected in programme specifications and assessment

4.2.3 Student engagement

- Creation of a related sequence of opportunities for research and enquiry, so that students steadily build up their abilities and confidence.
- Prompting students to make conceptual connections between apparently disparate elements of their wider programme.
- Enabling students to develop a clear picture, or narrative, of their overall learning journey and to analyse their personal progress and future goals.
- Provide opportunities for students to engage with students on different programmes.
- Provide opportunities for students to meet researchers and prominent scholars within the institute.
- Provide opportunities for students to take part in research enquiries within the institute and publish with academic staff.

4.2.4 Staff development

- Creating learning and development opportunities for staff through organisational CPD, events and opportunities for publication,
- Creating research mentoring programmes for academic staff,
- Supporting research into teaching,
- Creating opportunities to engage with a broader academic and scholarly field in their discipline.
- Creating opportunities for sharing knowledge within and between academic teams.

4.2.5 Organisational development

- Application of a workload model for academic staff with an allocation of time for scholarship and research activity.
- Allocation of institutional structures and resources for research activities and events.
- Development and access to up-to-date academic resources for scholarship and research.

For further information and the schedule of work, refer to the Framework document located on the Quality SharePoint.

Section 5: Programme Approval, Validation and Periodic Review/Revalidation

5.1 Metanoia's programme development model is a community approach, involving staff, students, alumni and externals through a process of consultation. This is done through input in programme design, validation and governance.

5.2 Setting Academic Standards (Validation)

Where the Institute's provision is validated by an awarding body (currently Middlesex University) sets the academic standards for a programme through a comprehensive process of validation, which is a quality assurance process. By formal agreement, through a signed Memorandum of Co-operation and associated documents, the maintenance of these standards is largely delegated to Metanoia.

Where programmes are approved (through internal validation) by Metanoia, the Institute sets the standards and retains full responsibility for ensuring that those standards remain secure through the operation of the range of assurance mechanisms in place and monitoring through the governance structure.

The Metanoia's Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures, located on the Quality SharePoint, confirms the purpose and principles of programme approval in the Metanoia context and details the processes and procedures that are followed to ensure every learning opportunity within the Institute's portfolio of academic provision is properly benchmarked to sector-recognised external frameworks (e.g., level and credit) and other resources (e.g., subject benchmark statements) as appropriate. In this way, Metanoia assures itself and its stakeholders that the programme approval process is a robust process for ensuring that standards are set appropriately and assured through the range of assurance mechanisms that operate through the academic governance structure.

5.3 Programme and Module Review Processes

5.3.1 Annual and periodic monitoring and review represent key quality assurance processes that operate alongside the in-depth quinquennial review⁷ of academic programmes. These processes are deliberately aligned to external agency (statutory and regulatory, notably the Office for Students⁸) requirements for an institution to set⁹ and maintain academic standards, provide a high-quality student experience that represents value for money and deliver the best possible student outcomes. Further, this QA activity reflects the principles and practices of the sector-agreed UK Quality Code for Higher Education ('the Quality Code')¹⁰.

The purpose of both annual and periodic monitoring of the academic provision is to engage in evaluative processes of reflection to facilitate continuous improvement at module, programme (and, where relevant, departmental and institutional) levels, aligned with the requirements of the Office for Students' Regulatory Framework¹¹.

⁷ The normal period of validation is five years, six years by exception.

⁸ The Institute is an HEI listed on the OfS's Register of Higher Education Providers in England.

⁹ As the validating body, Middlesex University sets the academic standards for MU-validated programmes within the portfolio of MI provision.

¹⁰ The Quality Code remains 'a key reference point for the quality arrangements in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. In England, the Quality Code is not regulatory, but providers are able to use it to inform their approach to quality, as a way of providing comparability across the UK and to aid international visibility.' <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/the-quality-code>

¹¹ [OfS Regulatory Framework](#)

5.4 Validation/ periodic review/revalidation process

5.4.1 New developments commence through seeking approval from the Executive Committee, and once approved, will come under the remit of academic governance for oversight and monitoring.

Programmes due for the periodic review (also known as revalidation) will automatically go through the quality process for the revalidation of programmes. Both processes are demonstrated below, in section 6.4.2.1, in a visual presentation.

The approval procedures are relevant to both Metanoia's and Middlesex University's validated and joint programmes.

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures located on the Quality SharePoint for more information.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (gulaity@metanoia.ac.uk).

5.5 The Approval and Validation Process

5.5.1 Purpose

The following process is used to seek approval to develop either a new programme, review of an existing programme coming to the end of its five-year validation period, or to make a major modification to an existing programme. For existing programmes, the process can also be used to request additional cohorts and a change of mode of delivery.

What constitutes a review/revalidation of a programme: Review/revalidation refers to an existing programme that has been validated either internally by Metanoia or externally by Middlesex University. All validated programmes typically have a life cycle of five years or can be extended by request to a maximum of six years; extension is not an automatic right; a formal request must be submitted.

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures located on the Quality SharePoint for more information.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (gulaity@metanoia.ac.uk).

5.5.2 New development and five-year periodic review/revalidation of programmes

Considerations of new developments must be submitted to the Executive a year in advance of the implementation and delivery of the programme.

The programme validation period is five academic years; however, it is possible to request an extension for a maximum term of one year. Recommended approval will be sought through the PARC and the Education Committee, reporting to the Academic Board, and final approval will be sought from the Executive.

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures for further information, located on the Quality SharePoint or contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk)

5.4.3 Major Change

Major change(s) to programmes are those which substantially change the character of the programme.

The following major changes to existing programmes will require a revalidation/review event:

- Change in mode of delivery of a programme other than to PT/FT mode, for example, adding a distance education version of the programme
- A significant change to the programme learning outcomes
- A change of more than 1/3 of the core/compulsory credits of a programme (or the optional modules of a programme where the programme learning outcomes are affected), during the period of Validation involving changes to the structure (the addition or deletion of modules) or to existing modules involving changes to learning outcomes.

5.4.4 Major change(s) to programmes defined:

- Any replacement of a core module
- Any addition, removal or allocation to a different level of a core module;
- Any change in the credit weighting of a core module;
- Any significant change to the learning outcomes of a core module (with or without a change in the title of a module);
- Any significant change to the curriculum content of a core module other than routine updating (with or without a change in the title of a module);
- Any change in the mode of delivery of a module (e.g. from on-campus/blended to distance education mode)

Records must be maintained by Quality and the HoP to log changes that take place during the validation period of a programme, to track and identify when the changes have affected 1/3 of the credits of the programme.


Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures located on the Quality SharePoint for more information.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (gulaity@metanoia.ac.uk).

5.4.5 Minor Changes

The Education Committee can approve minor changes to programmes/modules in collaboration with PARC, reporting to the Academic Board.


5.4.5.1 New development and five-year periodic review/revalidation of programmes



5.4.5.1.1 The schedule for when each of the approving committees meet throughout the academic year.

Committee	
Exec	Monthly
PARC	November, January, April and June
AB	November, January, April and June
EdC	November, January, April and June

5.4.6 Overview of Approval and Validation Processes



5.4.7 New Development/Major modification: The HoP submits the New Business/Course Development Proposal form (NBCDF) or Major Modification form (MMF) to Quality, who will hold a record and will pass the request to the Executive Servicing Officer for consideration by the Executive Committee.

5.4.7.1 Once the proposal receives unconditional approval from the Executive, the Executive Servicing Officer shall notify the HoP and PARC Servicing Officer, to inform and prepare the Committee to consider the Academic Professional Proposal Form APPF. The Education Committee Servicing Officer, to report and record the outcome of the APPF submission at the next meeting and inform Quality within five working days of the approval; Quality will inform Registry of the development. If the proposal is declined or receives approval with conditions, the proposal is passed back to the HoP. The proposal will not proceed through the process until the proposal has received the Executive's unconditional approval.

For queries relating to the approval of a proposal, contact the relevant committee Servicing Officer.

Approval has a one-year expiry date; therefore, if a validation/review event is not held within one year of receiving approval, a new request must be submitted for approval.

5.4.7.2 Unconditional approval received: The Academic Provision Proposal form (APPF) is required for both new development and programme review/revalidation. The form is completed by the HoP and submitted to Quality, who will hold a record and submit it to the PARC Servicing Officer for the committee to consider. The purpose of the APPF is to provide a rationale for the programme, an overview of the programme structure, credit information, an overview of programme resources required, student numbers for the past three years and mode and format of delivery. PARC's response to the proposal could be unconditionally approved, approved with conditions or rejected; a rationale for the outcome shall be provided to the HoP to provide a response or to take relevant action in amending the proposal. If the APPF requires further development, the proposal shall stay with PARC until the Committee is satisfied that the proposal meets all essential academic requirements. Once recommended approval is received, the Education Committee will consider it before reporting to the Academic Board.

- Major modifications to existing validated modules: You are required to complete a Module Change Form for consideration by PARC; the process is the same as the above.

Approval has a one-year expiry date; therefore, if a validation/review event is not held within one year of receiving approval, a new request must be submitted for approval.

5.4.7.3 Unconditional approval received for Metanoia validated programmes: Quality shall initiate the scheduling of a planning meeting where the setting of key dates and work schedule are agreed. Quality will advise on the process.

The process for Middlesex University validated and joint programmes is the same as the above; however, approval is also sought from Middlesex University. Quality will negotiate the event date with Middlesex, and you will use the Middlesex templates provided by Quality. Be aware that Middlesex templates change yearly; therefore, please wait for the templates to be issued by Quality.

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures located on the Quality SharePoint for more information.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (qulaity@metanoia.ac.uk).

5.4.7.4 Minor Modification: The HoP is required to complete a Modification form (MF), and submit it to Quality, who will pass it to the PARC Committee Servicing Officer; once approved, the amendment will be reported through the Education Committee and held on record by Quality. Records of changes must be ultimately held by Quality; however, the HoP should hold records to track when the accumulation of changes amounts to a major modification.

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures located on the Quality SharePoint for more information.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (gulaity@metanoia.ac.uk).

5.4.8 Validation of new programmes/revalidation of existing programmes

Refer to the validation checklist for a full inventory of tasks or the Programme Approval, Validation and Periodic Review/Revalidation Policy, both located on the Quality SharePoint.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk)

5.4.8.1 Event Planning and Key Dates

Quality and the programme development team will meet and agree on key dates. Consider in your schedule that the *first* submission for internal scrutiny of all required documentation is required approximately 8 weeks before the event date; the curriculum documents for a Middlesex validation are also required 8 weeks in advance, with a second submission required 4 weeks in advance of the validation event. Refer to Section 6.4.7.3 for further information on the Planning meeting.

5.4.8.2 Programme Development

Programme development is a team approach led by the HoP and overseen by the Associate Director. Planning is advised to commence at least a year in advance of validation. This is an opportunity for the academic team to bring forward ideas and their creativity to develop a robust, future-proof programme.

Student consultation must be factored in as part of the planning process; student involvement is not scripted, however, consultation must be demonstrated and evidenced as part of the submission for the Panel's consideration.

5.4.8.3 Documentation requirements for the validation event

- Programme Overview
- Programme rationale
- Critical Review (for existing programmes)
- Programme Specification
- Programme Handbook
- Module Specifications
- Assessment Mapping
- Resource materials
- Demonstration of student consultation
- Programme team academic CVs

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures, located on the Quality SharePoint.

5.4.8.4 Validation Panel

Metanoia Programmes: A Panel is appointed on behalf of the Metanoia Academic Board and takes full responsibility for its collective decision.

- Middlesex validated and joint programmes, Middlesex arrange the panel.

5.4.8.5 Panel Members and Their Role

The following aligns with both Metanoia and Middlesex's approach to Validation Panels.

The validation event is a process where there is panel of, typically, 5/6 members, dependent on the size or number of programmes being considered for approval.

Panel membership:

- Associate Director, Director of Department (Chair) x1
- Head of programme x1
- Academic member (selected from a directorate different to the presenting programmes) x1
- External members from (an)other institution(s) as appropriate x1/2 dependent on programmes being presented.
- A student from each faculty, to be drawn from a pool of elected representatives (selected from programmes outside of the presenting programme) x1
- Internal or external members may be involved; these may be professional body representatives (number not specified)

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures located on the Quality SharePoint for more information.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk).

In attendance

- Servicing Officer
- Quality representative

Members "in attendance" do not have voting rights.

The panel consists of staff members and a/an external assessor(s) with relevant subject and academic expertise. In-house members are identified by Quality and the external assessor; the HoP identifies and nominates to Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk). The nomination is required to be submitted on the relevant nomination template, located on Quality SharePoint, accompanied by the nominee's CV.

- The External Assessor must be suitably qualified for the role, follow the guidance in the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures
This role is not the same as an External Examiner.

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures located on the Quality SharePoint for more information.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk).

Panel members are expected to read the documents far enough in advance of the event, and the Chair should query any problems concerning the paperwork or the proposal and ensure adequate time has been allocated to the agenda. These should be addressed to Quality, who will consult with the Director of Education as appropriate. The Chair should have a prior briefing on the proposal with Quality, where required.

Panel members should understand as much as possible the proposal's history, ethos and context as well as the details of the programme and module specifications.

Contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk) for further information or clarification in advance of the meeting.

Internal Panel members should be familiar with the current Metanoia Regulations and quality procedures. External Assessors are sent a link to the Regulations by Quality as part of the paperwork.

The Panel provides scrutiny of the proposal to ensure required standards at national, institutional and directorate levels. Internal and external panel members have different roles within the overall task, but in practice, the concerns of all panel members overlap, and their roles are not rigidly fixed.

For full details of the Panel's role and responsibilities, refer to Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures, located on the Quality SharePoint, or contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk).

5.9 The Validation Event

Quality will provide a schedule of meetings for the event and the agenda.

The agenda will include meetings with the Associate Director, HoP, programme team, including the Academic Co-ordinator, students and alumni representatives. **It is a requirement for the suggested attendees to attend the event.**

5.10 Staff Development for Internal Panel Members

Directorates should gradually prepare interested staff for the role of Panel members and Chair by encouraging staff to undertake staff development opportunities listed below, as appropriate.

Quality arranges workshops for new members as well as for experienced panel members who are interested in chairing events.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metania.ac.uk)

Section 6: Suspension of Programme

6.1 Suspension of a programme is temporary and normally no longer than one year; requests for an exceptional two-year interruption period is ultimately at the discretion of the Executive Committee. Suspension of programme is not an automatic right and requires a formal application, located on the Quality SharePoint or refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures. Submit the completed suspension form to Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk), who will hold a record and forward it to the Servicing Officer of the Executive Committee.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk).

Section 7: Extension of programme request

7.1 An extension request of a validated programme refers to an agreement to extend the original end date of the programme validation period. An extension is requested by using the Extension Request form, located on the Quality SharePoint or refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures. Submit the completed request form to Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk), who will record the request and pass it to the Executive Committee Servicing Officer. The outcome of the request will be communicated by Quality.

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures located on the Quality SharePoint for more information.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk).

Section 8: Closure of Programme

What does programme closure mean: The Institute is discontinuing a specific course of study and will no longer admit new students. This can happen for various reasons, for example:

- **Budget Constraints:** not enough candidates to make the programme viable.
- **The programme no longer meets industry needs:** If the program's curriculum no longer meets the needs of employers or professional bodies.
- **Quality Concerns:** documented concerns about the program's quality or integrity can also lead to closure.

Current students on the affected programme will need to have their academic progress and graduation options addressed.

What this could look like:

- **Teach-out:** implement the "teach-out" policy, allowing current students to complete their studies and graduate, even if the program is closed.
- **Credit transfer:** students may be able to transfer credits to other programs at the same university or another institution.
- **Alternative Options:** students may be given options to complete their studies through alternative routes, such as transferring to a similar program.

In the case of programme closure, we must provide support and guidance to students affected by the programme closure, including information on academic options, financial aid, and career services. The plan to support students must be made clear on the proposal form.

Refer to the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures for further information.

If you wish to raise any queries, please contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk)

Section 8: Publicity and Marketing

8.1 Metanoia is required to follow the guidelines of the Competition and Marketing Authority¹² (CMA).

¹² [Higher education: guide to consumer rights for students - GOV.UK](#)

- 8.1.1 Promoting programmes before validation: programmes can be marketed once the Executive Committee confirms that the programme is fully approved to proceed to validation. However, all marketing materials should clearly state that the programme is '**subject to validation**' until all validation procedures have been satisfactorily completed, then the statement 'subject to validation' can be removed.
- 8.1.2 If, for any reason, a programme becomes under review, all relevant marketing materials surrounding this programme need to state '**subject to review**' in a clear format that is visible to the consumer. Once the review has been successful, the wording can be removed.
- 8.1.3 Once the programme has been successfully validated, the HoP will contact Marketing for appropriate programme advertising; this should include a copy of the Programme Specification, Module Specification(s) and fee information.

Section 9: External Examining

9.1 Overview and purpose of External Examining

External Examiners (EEs) are central to Metanoia's quality assurance and enhancement procedures. Their role is to act as independent moderators, consider student attainment overall with impartiality, and serve as one of the main safeguards for maintaining nationally comparable standards.


The impartiality of EEs is paramount in ensuring equity for students and the fair application of Metanoia's and Middlesex University's Regulations, as confirmed by their annual reports. They confirm the integrity and rigor of assessment practices, comment on good practices and make recommendations for enhancement. Refer to the External Examiner Policy, located on the Quality SharePoint, for further information.

9.1.1 The purpose of the external examiner system:

- To help ensure that all Metanoia and Middlesex University validated and joint programmes meet the standards expected by the Institute and align with the standards of similar awards across the UK higher education sector
- and,
- To provide an external evaluation of the effectiveness of academic regulations and the consistent and fair application of those regulations and associated processes and procedures.

External Examiners are required for both Metanoia and Middlesex University validated and joint programmes.

9.1.2 External Examiner Model



The model consists of a Chief External Examiner (CEE), Programme External Examiner (PEE) and Module External Examiner (MEE). The responsibilities of each role are the same, which is to ensure Metanoia Institute awards and externally validated and joint programmes meet the standards expected by the Institute and align to the standards of similar awards across the UK higher education sector and to provide an external evaluation of the effectiveness of academic regulations and the consistent and fair application of those regulations and associated processes and procedures.

The MEE will be introduced from academic year 2026-27, aligning with the Office for Students' implementation of lifelong learning¹³, which takes a modular approach to study. The role is similar to the PEE but with a specific focus on a given module of study.

The External Examiner Policy provides full details of Metanoia's external examiner processes. The Policy outlines the process for the nomination, appointment, induction and EEs' right to work requirements. The information provided covers processes for both Metanoia and Middlesex University validated and joint programmes. Refer to the Policy, located on the Quality SharePoint, for further information.

10.2 Overview of the Recruitment Approval Process

The process for the recruitment of EEs for both Metanoia and Middlesex University validated and joint programmes are largely the same, using templates designed specifically to meet each provider's framework. Templates are located as appendices in the External Examiner Policy and on the quality SharePoint. If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk)

9.2.1 Before making the nomination, check that the nominee meets the role criteria, refer to the External Examiner Policy, located on the Quality SharePoint. The nominee must meet the required criteria to be considered for the role, however, there may be instances where not all criteria are met, and there may be room for some flexibility. If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk).

Once the completed nomination form and the nominee's CV have been received by Quality, Quality will review the nomination to ensure the nomination meets the essential criteria. If the nomination does not meet the criteria, the nomination will

¹³ [Lifelong Learning Entitlement - Office for Students](#)

be returned to the HoP with a rationale for why the nomination has been returned at this stage.


If the nomination meets the role criteria, the nomination will be passed to the Education Committee for consideration; the committee will either approve, approve with conditions or reject the nomination.

If the EE nomination is for Middlesex validated and joint programmes, the nomination will be submitted to Middlesex for consideration once it has received recommended approval from the Metanoia Education Committee.

Quality will circulate the outcome to the HoP and hold definitive records of the application, outcome and tenure details.

HR will complete the recruitment process by conducting a right to work check, refer to the Policy, located on the Quality SharePoint, for further guidance.

9.2.2 Refer to the diagram below for the External Examiner nomination process:



9.2.3 EE Annual reporting process and timing

Once the EE is appointed, they are required to attend the three Metanoia Assessment Boards held during the academic year, September, February and June, Registry will provide further information, and to provide an Annual Report at the end of the cycle, which informs annual monitoring and reporting, aligning with the Metanoia Annual Monitoring Framework, located on the Quality SharePoint.

The EE annual reporting is not a standalone process; the reporting informs the Module and Programme Annual Reports, which informs the Director of Education Thematic Annual Report and the Middlesex University Education Monitoring Enhancement Report.

- The Education Thematic Annual Report is received by the Academic Board for consideration for report approval for requesting BoT sign-off and approving any recommendations for implementation.

EE annual reporting feeds into Academic Governance through the Metanoia annual reporting, refer to the Annual Monitoring Framework, located on the Quality SharePoint, which is monitored by the Education Committee with oversight of the Academic Board.

The process aligns with the Metanoia Annual Monitoring Framework, located on the Quality SharePoint.

9.2.4 Overview schedule of the External Examiner reporting process

Date	Activity	Lead
June/July/Sept	External Examiners' annual reports (interim reports if expected in September)	Quality
	Metanoia is required to provide a response to the Annual Report (within 4 weeks of its receipt)	Quality/HoP
November	Summary of comments from the EE annual report are presented for information and comment at the following boards and committees for information and discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board of Study • JSSC • EdC • AB 	Quality/Committee Servicing Officer
November	The EE Annual Report informs the Programme Annual Monitoring Reports (PAMRs) The completed PAMRs (incorporating action planning) to be presented to the Boards and committees for information and discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board of Studies • JSSC • Education Committees 	Quality/Committee Servicing Officer
December/January	The PAMRs inform the overarching MDX Education Monitoring and Enhancement Report (EMER) for submission to the Academic Board for sign-off for submission to Middlesex University.	Quality/HoP/ Director of Education

	The PAMRS informs the Education Thematic Annual Report for consideration by the Board of Trustees	
November, January, April and June	Monitoring of the PAMRs action plans through the Education Committee and the Academic Board	Quality/EdC Servicing Officer
Quinquennial periodic review of programme	The Programme Annual Monitoring Report feeds into the periodic review process of programmes.	Quality/HoP

Section 10: Annual and Periodic Monitoring Reporting Framework

10.1 What is Annual and Periodic Monitoring

Annual and periodic monitoring and review are key Metanoia Institute quality assurance processes that operate alongside the 5-year periodic review/revalidation of programmes.

10.1.1 Purpose: These processes are deliberately aligned to external agency (notably the Office for Students¹⁴ requirements to set¹⁵ and maintain academic standards, provide a high-quality student experience and deliver the best possible student outcomes. Further, this QA activity reflects the principles and practices of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education ('the Quality Code')¹⁶.

10.2 Review Structure

10.2.1. The monitoring and review process consists of three elements:

- **Three-level Annual Review:** this includes a reflective and evaluative review at both module and programme levels at the end of each academic cycle, to identify a series of recommendations for improvement and/or enhancement as demonstrated through the appropriate level review and action-planning process. In addition, an

¹⁴ The Institute is an HEI listed on the OfS's Register of Higher Education Providers in England.

¹⁵ As the validating body, Middlesex University sets the academic standards for MU-validated programmes within the portfolio of MI provision.

¹⁶ The Quality Code remains 'a key reference point for the quality arrangements in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. In England, the Quality Code is not regulatory, but providers are able to use it to inform their approach to quality, as a way of providing comparability across the UK and to aid international visibility.' <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/the-quality-code>


annual review is conducted at an institutional level, with the production of an MI Annual Monitoring Report. See diagram below, which includes department-level reporting. Departmental-level reporting: programme-level reviews will be collated into larger departmental reflective reports, one for undergraduate (UG) provision, one for postgraduate (PGT) and a third for PG research-based programmes (PGR). These three reports will form a key aspect of institutional review.

The diagram below demonstrates the data used to inform reporting and the process followed, but these are not exhaustive; other matters that will feed into reflection and evaluation include matters such as resourcing for learning and teaching, appropriate learning and teaching spaces, student academic support and wellbeing, and staffing matters. The diagram details how the reporting feeds into and informs governance.

- **Periodic Review:** The review and revalidation of a programme is normally held in the last year of the programme's 5-year validation period. This process provides an opportunity for enhancement, in part informed by an annual review of outcomes. The normal cycle of periodic programme review is five-yearly (quinquennial). Refer to Programme Approval, Validation and Periodic Review, Section 3, of this document or the Programme Approval and Design Policy and Procedures, located on the Quality SharePoint.
- **Thematic Continuous Improvement Review:** a thematic approach, where specific themes will be identified for an in-depth review over a rolling five-year period. Chosen themes will be influenced by institutional processes and external agency interests and concerns, which include, but are not limited to, the Office for Students and the subject-relevant professional bodies.

The Annual Monitoring Framework document, located on the Quality SharePoint, houses templates relevant to both Metanoia and Middlesex University programmes and provides full details of the operational process and responsibilities.

10.3 Annual Reporting Process



10.3 Schedule of process for annual monitoring

10.3.1 Module Schedule of Process

Date	Activity	Lead
July	The MAMR template and data sets (interim/provisional results) circulated to the HoP for distribution to the Module Leader.	Registry and Academic Services
July/August	The completed MAMR is peer reviewed.	ML
August	The MAMR receives approval from the HoP	ML/HoP
September	The content of the MAMR feeds into the overarching programme-level AMR (PAMR).	HoP
October/November	MAMR to be presented at the relevant Board of Studies.	ML

10.3.2 Programme Schedule of Process

Date	Activity	Lead
June/July/Sept	Receive EEs' annual reports (interim reports if expected in September) Produce a response to the EE	Quality/HoP
July	PAMR template provided to Head of Programme for completion	Quality
September	Student survey results issued: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-house surveys • NSS • PTES • PRES 	Marketing and Communications (Marcoms) team
September	Data sets circulated to the HoP	Registry
October	Completed PAMRs signed off by D of E as fit for purpose	HoP
November	PAMR presented to the Board of Studies	HoP
November	The completed PAMRs (incorporating action planning) to be presented to the Education and JSSC Committees for information and discussion	Registry and Academic Services

November	The HoP to receive an invitation to attend Education Committee to present their PAMR before its submission to the Academic Board ¹⁷	EdC Servicing Officer
December	Preparation of the overarching MDX Education Monitoring and Enhancement Report (EMER) for submission to the Academic Board for sign-off to Middlesex University.	Registry and Academic Services
October, January, April and June	Monitoring of the PAMR action plans through the Education Committee and the Academic Board	EdC Servicing Officer/ Registry and Academic Services
Quinquennial periodic review of programme (<i>i.e. revalidation</i>)	The PAMR feeds into the periodic review process of programmes	HoP/Quality

For full details of the Annual Monitoring Framework, refer to the Framework document located on the Quality SharePoint.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk)

Section 11: Marking and Moderation

11.1 The Metanoia Institute has a long tradition of providing high-quality learning and teaching. Our assessment and quality assurance strategies are designed to build upon that experience and our existing good practice.

11.2 In accordance with the Institute's Assessment Strategy, moderation activity is seen to be an essential part of the quality assurance and enhancement cycle. Our assessment practice is aligned to Metanoia Institute's strategic vision, mission, goals and ethos; ensuring that our approach to moderation is equally forward-thinking, inclusive in its approach to our patterns of provision for undergraduate, postgraduate and doctoral programmes and has parity or experience and equality of opportunity as a central tenet.

11.2 Metanoia's internal Moderation processes help to monitor and maintain the appropriateness, consistency, transparency and fairness of assessment. All programmes and assessments leading to recognised and accredited qualifications are subject to Internal Moderation. These processes operate throughout the programme of study, each academic year and particularly at summative assessment points.

This broad approach ensures that student learning and assessment:

- Is reviewed at different stages of programme delivery

¹⁷ From 2024-25 reporting, the Department-level AMR will go to Academic Board, rather than the full set of PAMRs.

- Receives evaluation relating to the quality of formative feedback during studies, in preparation for assessments
- Undergoes a sampling procedure of sufficient size and structure to ensure quality assurance standards are maintained
- Is monitored for consistency and standardisation
- Can be confirmed as appropriate and in line with best practice.

The Moderation Policy, located on the Quality SharePoint, provides details of objectives and operational processes. The Policy works in conjunction with the activity described by the External Examiner Policy.

If you have any queries, contact the Registrar (registrar@metanoia.ac.uk.)

Section 12: Learning and Teaching

12.1 Metanoia's approach to learning and teaching centres around active learning, student engagement, and fostering critical thinking. The aim is to create a student-centred environment where individuals can take an active role in their education and develop valuable skills scaffolded by research-led teaching and inclusive practices.

Key Approaches and Principles:

Active Learning:

- This approach encourages student participation through various methods, stimulating curiosity and motivation. It provides opportunities for hands-on engagement, collaborative work, and real-world problem-solving, supporting critical thinking and creativity.

Student-Centred Learning:

- Focuses on individual student needs and learning preferences, promoting a personalised educational experience.

Research-Led Teaching:

- Enhances the learning environment by incorporating current research and scholarly work.

Inclusivity and Equity: Prioritises creating a diverse and supportive learning environment where all students feel valued and can succeed, regardless of background or identity.

Evidence-Based Practices:

- Utilising data and research to inform Learning and teaching strategies, ensuring continuous improvement and quality.

Professional Development:

- Providing ongoing support and resources for staff to enhance their teaching skills and stay current with best practices.

Curriculum Development:

- Designing and implementing effective curricula

Technology Integration:

- Leveraging technology to enhance learning experiences, create engaging content, and facilitate online learning.

Assessment for Learning:

- Using formative assessment to provide feedback and guide student learning, rather than solely focusing on summative evaluation.

12.2 Peer Review

Metanoia operates a system of peer review, which is managed locally by programmes.

Section 13: Policy Development, Purpose, Approval and Process

13.1 The purpose of policy development is to establish a clear and consistent framework for decision-making, ensuring Metanoia's operations align with its strategic goals, values, and legal obligations. Well-defined policies guide the Metanoia community, promoting efficiency, transparency, and inclusivity.

13.2 Useful Definitions outlining the purpose of specific documentation:

Strategy	Statement that sets out how Metanoia will manage its resources and meet the aims in the Institute's Strategy.
Regulation	Sets out the Metanoia's rules or standards governing an area. Often, but not exclusively, academic rather than administrative.
Policy	Sets out the direction or guiding principles governing an area. Often, but not exclusively, administrative rather than academic.
Procedure/Protocol	Description (involving linked action steps) of how to do something, to ensure consistency of practice. Often supports a Regulation or Policy. Developed with the user/customer in mind.
Code of Practice	Advisory document which supports a policy/regulation and can include expectations of behaviour and/or good practice.
Guidelines/Guidance/Guide	Document giving detailed practical advice on a particular area.

13.3 Each committee is required at the first meeting of the academic year to set a schedule of work for policy development or review of existing policies. The committee Servicing Officer is responsible for the implementation of the schedule.

13.3.1 Process for committee policy development and review

The relevant committee Servicing Officer will initiate the following process:

1. Each committee will receive at the first meeting of the academic year a copy of the policy schedule to set review dates for each policy for implementation the following academic year.

2. The document author will receive a prompt three months prior to the policy due date from the relevant committee Servicing Officer. The prompt will be sent as a Microsoft calendar appointment.
3. The relevant committee Servicing Officer to ensure the submitted policy incorporates the relevant back sheet for process information, a list of significant amendments and the amendments are highlighted within the document, for ease of reference, in readiness for consideration by the relevant committee.
4. The calendar reminder will include:
 - the policy or template for new development;
 - a list of the committees the document will be presented to and for what purpose (information/ recommended approval/approval);
 - the date of each committee meeting;
 - the deadline for submission;
 - the expected end-date of the approval process; and
 - any other information considered helpful.
5. The relevant committee Servicing Officer will send a further reminder 6 weeks before the deadline.
6. The relevant committee Servicing Officer will provide support and relevant information to the author of the document throughout the approval process.
7. The Policy approval aspect of the process is complete when it has received final approval. What this means: If the membership of the committee recommends amendments, the committee must have sight of the amendments to sign off the amendments before their publication
8. The relevant committee Servicing Officer will forward copies of the approved policy with a list of amendments, if applicable, to the Quality Support and Standards Manager, who will code the document and deposit it into the central repository.
9. The Quality Standards and Support Manager (QSSM) will be responsible for ensuring the relevant teams are made aware of the updated/new policy. An email will be circulated to the Associate Directors, Heads of Programme, Registrar, Academic Co-ordinators and Head of Marketing and Communications for upload onto the website under the relevant academic year and any other relevant staff. The email will indicate when the policy comes into force.
10. The Quality Standards and Support Manager will deposit the definitive policy in the central governance repository located on the governance SharePoint.

13.4 Policy Review Group

The purpose of the Policy Review Group (PRG) is to review, assess, and recommend updates to the Metanoia policies and procedures across both academic and operational branches of the institutional governance structure. The group ensures that institutional policies remain compliant with current legal, regulatory, and sector standards and reflect

best practices. It reports to the Executive Committee, which in turn reports to the Board of Trustees.

13.4.1 How does policy development and review feed into the work of the PRG?

13.4.1.1 Each committee will provide a schedule of work for policy development or review in the first quarter of the academic year to the PRG and an end-of-year report to include policy status and potential/new developments.

To locate existing policies, refer to the Quality SharePoint or the policy section of the Metanoia website.

If you have any queries, contact Quality (quality@metanoia.ac.uk).

Section 14: Academic Action Plan

14.1 Metanoia's Academic Action Plan is a detailed plan outlining how Metanoia will improve teaching and learning, focusing on specific goals and measurable actions. This plan is often part of a broader quality assurance framework and is regularly updated based on ongoing monitoring and evaluation. Members of the Education Team have specific areas of responsibility and are required to update their areas of the Action Plan regularly for quarterly reporting purposes.

Key Components and Purpose:

Focus on Improvement:

- The plan identifies areas for improvement in teaching and learning and outlines steps to address those areas.

Specific Goals:

- It sets clear, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) goals for enhancement.

Actionable Steps:

- The plan details specific actions and tasks that will be undertaken to achieve the stated goals.

Timeline and Deadlines:

- The plan establishes deadlines and milestones for each action, ensuring progress tracking.

Monitoring and Evaluation:

- It includes a mechanism for monitoring progress, evaluating the effectiveness of actions, and making adjustments as needed.

Improving assessment practices:

- This might involve refining rubrics, providing more timely feedback, or using a variety of assessment methods.

Enhancing student learning resources:

- This could include creating new online resources, improving library access, or providing tutoring services.

If you have any queries, contact the Governance Team, who administers the plan, governance@metanoia.ac.uk.

Policy Title:	Policy Development Policy
Author/Owner:	Quality Standards and Support Manager
Rationale: <i>Outline the purpose of the policy, and its scope e.g. credit-bearing provision</i>	To support staff with the development and review of policy.
Consultation undertaken: <i>List all groups and/or committees where consultation was undertaken e.g. students, administration, external advisor, EdC, etc.</i>	Consultation taken through the membership of the Education Committee and Academic Board.
Resource implication: <i>Outline the potential financial, human and technological resource implication of the policy</i>	Click or tap here to enter text. None

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Section 2 - to be completed by receiving committee.

Choose an item.	
Circulated to:	Metanoia Staff

Approved:	July 2026	Date for adoption:	September 2025
------------------	-----------	---------------------------	----------------

Version and document Code:	QSSM1	Date for review:	April 2027
-----------------------------------	-------	-------------------------	------------