



Oakswood College

Empowering Through Education



Programme Approvals, Amendments, Suspensions & Withdrawals

Policy and Procedure

PROMOTING EXCELLENCE • ENSURING COMPLIANCE
SUPPORTING OUR COMMUNITY



GOVERNANCE



QUALITY



COMPLIANCE



EXCELLENCE

www.oakswoodcollege.co.uk



Oakswood College

Empowering Through Education

(Trading name of Oakswood Group Ltd)

Programme Approvals, Amendments, Suspensions and Withdrawals Policy and Procedure

(Franchised Provision)

Document Control & Version History

Field	Details
Document Title	Programme Approvals, Amendments, Suspensions and Withdrawals Policy and Procedure
Document Type	Academic Policy
Policy Owner	Head of Academic Affairs
Accountable Officer	Chief Executive Officer
Approved By	Academic Board
Approval Date	18 March 2026
Effective From	1 September 2026
Review Cycle	Every 2 years
Next Review Due	March 2028
Related Policies	Assessment Policy, Academic Appeals Policy, Student Attendance and Engagement Policy, Support Through Studies Policy, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy
External Reference Points	UK Quality Code, OfS Conditions B1, B4, C1, C2

This Policy does not apply to Buckinghamshire New University Programmes delivered by Oakswood College. For those programmes, please see the following BNU policies:

- [Programme Approval and Amendment Policy](#)
- [Programme Suspension and/or Closure Policy](#)

1. Introduction and Scope

The purposes of this Policy are as follows:

Firstly: to set out Oakwood College's principles and processes for approvals, amendments, suspensions and withdrawals (including teach-out) of Oakwood College's franchised higher education programme delivery.

Secondly: to ensure Oakwood College staff have a clear understanding around the requisite academic governance and quality assurance relevant to programme delivery, to as to ensure consistency of delivery and that

Thirdly: to provide clear processes and College accountability for the identification and scrutiny of matters relating to programme approvals, amendments, suspensions and withdrawals. As Oakwood College does not 'own' programmes within its franchised higher education provision, the principles and processes set out in this document are centred on identification mechanisms for the matters falling within the scope of this Policy, and internal scrutiny processes prior to relevant submissions to the respective Awarding Body. However, the procedure for proposing new programmes assumes a model of either franchise or validated programme delivery.

With the exception of Buckinghamshire New University programmes, this Policy and its processes applies to all franchised and other programmes of education delivered by the College, including new approvals, minor/major amendments (e.g. module changes), suspensions, and withdrawals. Standalone modules follow the same process where applicable.

This Policy excludes Awarding Body-led changes; College input is required only for impacts on local programme delivery. This Policy also excludes specific timescales, to facilitate agile and bespoke arrangements. Notwithstanding this, any timescales of processes operating under this policy will ensure that relevant student protection requirements (eg student consultation on major changes; student protection measures such as 'teach out' in the event of a programme suspension or withdrawal) are adhered to.

2. Principles

- ◇ This Policy and its procedures are informed by OfS compliance requirements (in particular those falling under the B conditions – Quality, Reliable Standards and Positive Outcomes for All Students, and C conditions – Protecting the Interests of Students), and sector good practices such as those set out in the UK Quality Code 2024 (including in its Advice and Guidance).
- ◇ All franchised and validated programmes delivered at Oakwood College defer to the respective Awarding Body's academic regulations and processes for approvals, amendments, modifications, suspensions, and withdrawals. For the avoidance of doubt, whilst this Policy sets out the College's internal processes, mechanisms and considerations regarding programme approvals, amendments, suspensions and withdrawals, Awarding Body policies and regulations take precedence where both may feasibly be enacted.
- ◇ In its consideration of, and participation in programme approval/ modification/withdrawal etc processes, the College prioritises:

- student interests
 - resource availability
 - market viability
 - compliance with OfS Conditions B1-B6 (governing Quality and Standards, and ensuring a high quality academic experience for all students);
 - consumer law compliance;
 - the UK Quality Code core practices, and Awarding Body Student Protection Plans (SPPs) where these are in place, to safeguard students during disruptions and/or support appropriate and compliant student protection measures in the event of Teach-Out of a programme.
- ◇ Internal scrutiny places student interests, student protections and Student Voice as key priorities.
 - ◇ Internal scrutiny identifies College-specific issues like staffing, facilities, or local demand before submission to the respective Awarding Body.
 - ◇ Internal decisions promote academic standards, employability, inclusive access, and use data such as recruitment trends, progression rates, NSS feedback, and completion statistics.
 - ◇ Internal scrutiny processes are documented in either New Programme Proposals or Programme Scrutiny Reports, as applicable to the circumstances, which are produced by Quality & Standards Committee and approved by Academic Board. Board of Governors will be informed accordingly of scrutiny outcomes and will have access to Proposals and Reports.

Principles governing programme suspension and closure

- ◇ The College will seek clarity from the outset about the precedence of Awarding Body and College policies and procedures, as well as respective responsibilities and liabilities.
- ◇ Whilst Academic Board is responsible for academic governance in the College, the strategic and financial implications surrounding course suspensions and closures means that the Board of Governors must be involved in any strategic decisions regarding programme suspensions or closures.
- ◇ Where a programme is to be suspended or closed, ongoing monitoring must ensure that the quality of experience, and academic quality and standards are maintained. The programme must continue to be actively managed and:
 - Be subject to Awarding Body's requirements regarding module evaluation, annual programme monitoring and external examining;
 - Must retain a Programme Leader for the duration of the 'Teach Out' phase.
- ◇ If the programme is due for revalidation by the Awarding Body during the 'Teach Out' phase but still has one or more cohorts of students on it, or where significant changes need to be made to allow the programme to be taught-out, the College will support the Awarding Body in the operation of any full or adjusted revalidation processes as required.
- ◇ All decisions to suspend or close a programme must be taken in good time, with due regard for the need to address the position of current students and applicants, taking account of

advertising and application timelines and deadlines. *NB It should be remembered that applicants may apply for entry to a programme up to two years before taking up their place.*

- ◇ A programme must not normally be suspended or closed once there are confirmed offer holders, and therefore the timelines for any planned suspension or closure should normally be informed by this principle. However, if this situation is potentially unavoidable, the College will ensure that liaison with the Awarding Body includes liaison with key Admissions staff, to ensure appropriate consideration and management of student protections takes place.

3. Definitions

The definitions set out below are generally aligned with Awarding Body policies and terminology. As Oakswood College has delivery agreements with more than one Awarding Body, wording may not directly reflect precise terminology used by an Awarding Body in all instances.

- **Approval:** Multi-stage process (proposal, curriculum development, formal validation event) for new franchised programmes delivered by the College, ensuring alignment with Awarding Body specifications and applicable Qualifications Framework (eg FHEQ), market demand, and College resources
- **Suspension:** Temporary halt to new intakes, normally of less than 2 academic years' duration (or 2 intakes for shorter programmes). Existing students progress via 'Teach-Out'; student reps involved in planning).
- **Withdrawal/Closure:** Permanent cessation of the programme (where applicable, after suspension if viability fails); includes termination of recruitment and admissions, Teach-Out, student alternatives/refunds/ compensation as relevant and applicable, and a 4-stage process:
 - Evidence-gathering
 - Consultation
 - Approval
 - Implementation
- **Amendments:** All changes to approved programmes (eg content update, timetable adjustments), categorised by the respective Awarding Body policy, broadly following the categorisation principle set out in the table below:

Category	Description	Examples	Key considerations
Material Amendment	Changes resulting in a programme difference to what was advertised at pre-contract stage	Title, structure, delivery mode, delivery location	Needs: External Examiner input; Student consultation; Formal Awarding Body approval process; Clear implementation plan if approved

Non-Material Amendment	Curriculum tweaks which do not comprise any consumer issues	Minor content updates that do not alter the information published in the Course Summary or on Course Webpages	Version control of documents must be accurately maintained
Major Amendment	Notable impacts on programme structure and/or delivery	Requires formal Awarding Body approval process	Timing of implementation for amended programme; External Examiner input
Substantive Amendment	Fundamental changes	More than a third of the programme content / structure affected	Would normally require full programme revalidation; Teach-Out arrangements External Examiner input
Editorial / Administrative Amendment	Minor non-material fixes eg to Programme Specs	Typos, factual corrections	Version control of documents must be accurately maintained

4. Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities	
	New Programme Proposals	Existing Programmes
Head of Academic Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify new programme opportunity via market data, employer demand, and/or College strategic priorities Liaison with Awarding Body 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chairs Academic Board, ensuring due oversight occurs Liaison with Awarding Body (or nominates appropriate member of staff to conduct liaison)
Programme Leads / nominated academic staff (nominated by Head of Academic Affairs or Academic Board)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify potential new programme opportunity/idea and contacts Head of Academic Affairs Support Head of Academic Affairs in completion of proposal document for QSC scrutiny 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies programme issue(s) using evidence (eg Student Voice / feedback) and data
Quality & Standards Committee:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrutinises all proposals, ensuring that proposals are supported with relevant evidence and data analysis where applicable; Makes recommendation to Academic Board regarding internal progression of proposal to Awarding Body; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produces draft report for submission to Awarding Body, together with any relevant recommendations for consideration by Academic Board ahead of sign-off and submission to Awarding Body Ensure report provides evidence-based assessment of respective proposed action

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitors outcomes, reporting to Academic Board accordingly 	(amendment / suspension / withdrawal)
Academic Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Proposal Document plus any QSC recommendations before submission to Awarding Body 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receives QSC reports with any recommendations Signs off final version of QSC report to Awarding Body, deciding on whether any action/planning is required by the College arising from QSC recommendations
Senior Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure resources and strategic fit, liaising as appropriate with College Board of Governors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure strategic impacts/considerations for College are identified and drawn to BoG attention where necessary

OAKSWOOD COLLEGE PROGRAMME PROPOSAL PROCEDURES

This section of this document sets out the internal Oakswood College procedures for:

- new programme proposals (see Section A), and
- proposals affecting existing programmes (amendments, suspensions, withdrawals/closures) – in these circumstances, the Procedure for Programme Scrutiny should be followed (see Section B).
 - Where a programme suspension or closure is concerned, Section C should be followed (Procedure for Safe Suspension/Withdrawal of Programmes), which incorporates the Procedure for Programme Scrutiny within it.

A) Procedure for New Programme Proposals by the College

1. Initiation:

- New programme opportunity is identified by member of staff in the College, referring this to Head of Academic Affairs
- Head of Academic Affairs identifies 'in principle' feasibility of new programme opportunity via market data, employer demand, and/or College strategic priorities, supported by member(s) of staff as necessary and relevant
- Head of Academic Affairs (or their nominee) consults with Awarding Body for an 'in principle' conversation to check Awarding Body requirements and also determine whether further College exploration of the proposal should be undertaken. This avoids potential duplication where a new programme is being proposed. Subject to Awarding Body confirmation, proceed to stage 2 below.

2. Preparation

- Head of Academic Affairs ensures Programme Proposal Template Form (or equivalent Awarding Body form where required) is completed, including:
 - Curriculum outline
 - Identified College resources commitment required
 - Projected recruitment (minimum no. of students)
 - Awarding Body alignment (which policies apply eg Awarding Body Admissions Policy, adjusting alignment as necessary depending on whether the proposal is for franchise or validated delivery)
 - Student protection risks and considerations
- Once complete, the respective form should be submitted to Quality & Standards Committee for review and scrutiny.

3. Quality & Standards Committee New Programme Proposal Scrutiny

- The New Programme Proposal should be submitted to Quality & Standards Committee members affording sufficient time for review and consideration ahead of the committee meeting.
- Students should normally be included in the QSC new programme proposal scrutiny process. This would normally take the form of student reps sitting as members of the Committee.

- QSC reviews proposal and makes any suggested amendments and/or recommendations ahead of submission to Academic Board for oversight and approval for submission of the proposal to the respective Awarding Body.

4. Academic Board proposal oversight

- The New Programme Proposal is submitted to Academic Board for oversight and authorisation of whether to proceed to submit the new programme proposal to the Awarding Body
 - Academic Board determines whether any amendments are required before a submission is considered ready
 - Academic Board must sign off on the proposal before it is formally submitted to the Awarding Body

Subject to having Awarding Body permission to do so, Oakwood College may submit a working draft of the proposal to the Awarding Body for feedback prior to formal submission. Where this occurs, the final draft subsequent to the receipt and implementation of feedback must be re-submitted to Academic Board for official College sign-off before submission to the Awarding Body. The Academic Board may refer a draft proposal with Awarding Body feedback, back to the Quality & Standards Committee or the Head of Academic Affairs for consideration of the feedback, or may determine to consider it directly in order to expedite matters.

5. New Programme Proposal Submission to Awarding Body

- Once Academic Board has signed off the new Programme Proposal, the Head of Academic Affairs (or their nominee) is responsible for submitting it to the respective Awarding Body.

B) Procedure for Programme Scrutiny

1. Issue Identification

- Programme Leads, Heads of Department or Head of Academic Affairs flag issues via annual monitoring, student feedback, or external changes (e.g. low recruitment, resource gaps)
 - Additionally, the Awarding Body may request that the College undertake scrutiny of a programme as a result of an identified or suspected issue identified by the Awarding Body (arising for example from its data analysis or annual monitoring processes)
- Head of Academic Affairs (or their nominee) checks Awarding Body requirements regarding the specific category of issue before proceeding as follows.

2. Information gathering

- Head of Academic Affairs nominates an individual (or more than one where necessary and appropriate) to undertake information gathering, to inform the College further. Evidence and data relevant to the Programme is examined at both programme and module level, such as, for example:
 - Recruitment data
 - Continuation rate data
 - Attrition data
 - NSS data and feedback
 - Internal College relevant survey data and feedback
 - SSLC feedback / minutes, and any other Student Voice feedback

- Information arising from student complaints

Student Protections; Student Consultation; Student Feedback

- **Student protections** are placed as a key priority in the College's scrutiny of any programme under this Policy and its procedures. Accordingly:
 - Relevant Awarding Body policies and documentation will be consulted and referred to where applicable, including (but not limited to): Student Protection Plan, Refunds and Compensation Policy, Terms and Conditions, Fees Policy, Programme approval, amendment, suspension and withdrawal policies;
 - Consumer law requirements will inform College recommendations arising from Programme scrutiny to Awarding Bodies where applicable;
 - Avenues for raising concerns and complaints will be made clear to Oakwood College students in the event of any material changes, programme suspensions or withdrawals, with Awarding Body liaison to ensure clarity of accountabilities and which policies apply in what circumstances.
- **Methodical Student Consultation** must take place where necessary i.e. in the event of:
 - Proposed material changes
 - Proposed suspension of a programme
 - Proposed withdrawal of a Programme

Accordingly:

- The College will facilitate **methodical student consultation** in accordance with student protection requirements, ensuring methods and timelines for these are agreed with the respective Awarding Body prior to commencement;
- This does not preclude the College from undertaking **general student consultation** via its normal Student Voice mechanisms (eg College committees), in addition to methodical student consultation agreed with the respective Awarding Body. Relevant feedback from general student consultation may be taken into account in Programme scrutiny by the College, but will not under any circumstances replace methodical student consultation where this is required.
- **Student feedback** forms a critical consideration factor in the College's scrutiny of any programme, and may be used as a trigger factor in the College's consideration of whether a programme may need to be suspended and/or withdrawn.

3. Proposal Preparation

- Draft summary report is produced and submitted to Head of Academic Affairs, or if produced directly by Head of Academic Affairs, draft report is submitted directly to the Quality & Standards Committee for scrutiny of the matter(s).
 - Timelines for the production and submission of reports under this process are governed by Awarding Body requirements and schedules, and internal College Committee schedules
- Draft summary report should, as relevant, include coverage of:
 - Confirmation of proposed action for Awarding Body to consider (i.e. amendment with details of whether material, substantive etc, and indicating whether Methodical Student Consultation is required - see 'Student Protections; Student Consultation; Student Feedback, above)

- o A copy of the most recent Annual Programme Monitoring Reports, or relevant extracts thereof
 - o Risk assessment, informed by:
 - Strategic College alignment and considerations
 - Market demand data
 - College resource considerations and implications
 - o Consumer law and student protection considerations
 - o Student / staff consultation results and/or proposed consultation plans
 - o Equality Impact Assessment (Academic)
 - o Cohorts that are or would be affected
 - o Proposed timeline for implementation
- The External Examiner for the programme should be consulted for their advice and feedback on the College’s identified issues/proposed actions/recommendations.

4. Quality & Standards Committee Scrutiny

- The draft summary report should be submitted to Quality & Standards Committee members affording sufficient time for review and consideration ahead of the committee meeting.
 - o The timing of QSC scrutiny will be informed by Awarding Body requirements and may necessitate an exceptional sitting of the Committee – and/or of Academic Board, if either committee’s next scheduled sitting would pose a problem or cause challenges that might otherwise be avoided.
- QSC reviews draft report, analysing the evidence and any data trends. QSC may also seek input at any time from the Awarding Body and/or External Officers engaged as critical friends, as deemed necessary by the QSC Chair.
- Students should normally be included in the QSC scrutiny process unless this is not feasible without unduly delaying proceedings.

Outcomes of QSC scrutiny:

Proposed recommendation to Awarding Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Programme Amendments (see Table 1 in Section 2 ‘Definitions’) 	State whether the proposed amendments are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Material / Non-Material, and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantive, or • Major, or • Editorial/Administrative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Programme Suspension 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Programme Withdrawal 	

5. Academic Board Oversight and authorisation

- The draft Programme Scrutiny Report is submitted to Academic Board for oversight:

- Academic Board determines whether any amendments to the report are required before a submission is considered ready, considering in particular:
 - Whether proposed actions are sufficiently supported by evidence and/or are data-informed
 - Risks are clearly identified with appropriate proposed mitigations/remedial actions
 - Compliance with OfS Conditions B1-B6
 - Student protection considerations
 - Student consultation for all affected or would be impacted students has been completed or that there is a viable and appropriate plan for student consultation
- Academic Board must sign off on the final version of the Report before it is formally submitted to the Awarding Body, if this is the outcome of the Board’s oversight (see below).

6. Outcomes of Academic Board Oversight

- Once Academic Board has concluded its oversight, it will reach one of the following outcomes:

Academic Board Decision	Action
APPROVE REPORT, NO AMENDMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Head of Academic Affairs or their nominee submits report to respective Awarding Body, in accordance with its requirements ● Head of Academic Affairs ensures that the College has clarity on associated communications to students regarding any programme changes, liaising with key College staff as appropriate
APPROVE REPORT WITH SMALL NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Member of staff designated by Academic Board to make any small non-material amendments as directed by Academic Board ● Resubmit Report to Chair of Academic Board for final sign-off ● Once signed off, designated staff member proceeds to submit report to respective Awarding Body, in accordance with its requirements
REVISE AND RESUBMIT REPORT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Subject to completion of specific actions designated by Academic Board to QSC and/or individual members of staff, the matter will be paused for a timeframe specified by Academic Board ● Once conditions have been fulfilled (or if this is not possible, this should be recorded in the report), the report should be revised ● Revised report should be resubmitted to Academic Board within the specified timeframe for further review and consideration. Revised report may be resubmitted to QSC ahead of resubmission to Academic Board (optional)
REJECT REPORT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clearly articulate and minute reasons for rejection (eg insufficient evidence; significant issue not given due consideration). A rejection can be outright, or place the

	matter in abeyance for a specified period, as agreed by Academic Board.
--	---

C) Procedure for Safe Suspension/Withdrawal of Franchised Programme (Awarding Body-Aligned)

1. Trigger and Notification:

- a. One or more of the following factors triggers a consideration of the need to potentially withdraw a franchised programme from the College's delivery:
 - i. ¹²
 - ii. Data thresholds unsatisfactory (eg B3 conditions not met)
 - iii. Student feedback strongly indicates untenable issues with the programme that are unlikely to be able to be resolved
 - iv. Resource shortages (inability to sustain specific staffing, facilities or support services pertinent to the programme at required levels, risking student experience and/or academic quality and standards)
 - v. Significant change(s) to Awarding Body arrangements impacting (or likely to impact) the College negatively
 - vi. Significant changes in programme funding
 - vii. Strategic misalignment (College or Awarding Body portfolio changes, or shifts away from subject specialisms; partnership agreement terminates)
 - viii. Breakdown in ongoing relationship with Awarding Body
 - ix. Regulatory/Financial Risks
 - x. Student Protection (where continuation poses detriment)
- b. Senior Management Team gather relevant summary information to support initial discussion with Board of Governors.

OfS Reportable Events

- c. Material changes to provision may constitute a Reportable Event as per the Office for Students' guidance and requirements on Reportable Events³. Assessment of whether the matter may constitute a Reportable Event is undertaken, using the College's Record of Decision tool under its Reportable Events Policy and Procedure.

2. College Board of Governors and Awarding Body authorisation to proceed

Board of Governors authorisation

- d. Board of Governors consider summary relevant information and authorise the commencement of the Procedure for Programme Scrutiny in order to gather all relevant information to enable a considered way forward.

² For BNU programmes, the University's Programme Suspension and/or Closure Policy states: "In addition, a programme which has no registered students and for which there are no outstanding applications should normally be closed automatically. Programmes that fall into this category will be identified as part of the annual curriculum planning process and confirmed as suspended or closed by APC." Where the closure of a Programme delivered by the College is ordered by BNU, the BNU procedures will be followed and supersede any procedures set out in this Policy.

³ See <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/regulatory-advice-16-reportable-events/>

Awarding Body authorisation

- e. Head of Academic Affairs (or their nominee):
- i. notifies Awarding Body as soon as possible of the College's position once the Board has authorised the commencement of the Procedure for Programme Scrutiny to seek Awarding Body authorisation of the commencement of the Procedure for Programme Scrutiny, or earlier if the Board deems it appropriate;
 - ii. raises the issue of Student Protections and Student Consultation with the Awarding Body (in particular, student consultation methods and timelines should be explored), to ensure that consideration of these is instigated at the earliest opportunity. Clarity and agreement with the Awarding Body should be sought about:
 - ◇ the application of College and Awarding Body policies and procedures;
 - ◇ Methodical Student Consultation;
 - ◇ Reporting and Liaison
 - ◇ Timelines and Deadlines
 - ◇ Specific Awarding Body requirements
- f. Subject to receiving authorisation from both Academic Board and the Awarding Body, the Procedure for Programme Scrutiny takes place. Where the Awarding Body declines to authorise the Procedure to commence, the College shall inform the Board of Governors accordingly, and alternative next steps will be agreed with the Awarding Body. In this event, this does not preclude the College from undertaking internal informal programme scrutiny to ensure the Board of Governors has the appropriate assurances it requires to ensure its effective governance of the College.

⇒ ***College Procedure for Programme Scrutiny takes place***

- g. Follow the Procedure set out in Section B above.

Referral to Awarding Body

- h. Once Academic Board has signed off on the Programme Scrutiny Report, it is submitted to the Awarding Body, including:
- i. results and findings arising from student consultations;
 - ii. student protection considerations and proposals, including programme applicants;
 - iii. proposals for any College Teach-Out arrangements;
 - iv. proposed arrangements and considerations for maintaining and safeguarding academic quality and standards;
 - v. a completed Equality Impact Assessment, and
 - vi. a completed risk assessment.

Programme Suspension/Withdrawal Implementation

- i. Once agreement has been reached by the Awarding Body that the programme will be suspended or withdrawn, the College's Senior Management Team will ensure that a Course Suspension/Closure Implementation Plan (or equivalent plan as directed by the respective Awarding Body) that the College will follow, is agreed with the Awarding Body.

- j. Oakwood College Senior Management Team are responsible for formally instigating the Course Suspension/Closure Implementation Plan, and notifying the relevant College departments and key staff, who are then responsible for undertaking the following actions:

PHASE 1 of Course Suspension / Closure Implementation Plan	
Area/Department	Action
Senior Management Team	<p>Before any action formally commences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure clear Student Protection Measures and Course Suspension/Closure Implementation Plan are agreed with respective Awarding Body • Ensure clear prioritisation of actions to be taken, roles and responsibilities, including referral to Business Continuity Plan • Keep Board of Governors up to date
PHASE 2 of Course Suspension / Closure Implementation Plan	
Registry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update the College's records to reflect the status of the programme (i.e. due to be suspended/withdrawn) • Where agreed with the Awarding Body, informing External Examiners and any other relevant external stakeholders
Marketing & Recruitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working to plan agreed with Awarding Body, which includes: • Getting agreed wording from Awarding Body regarding the suspension/closure of the programme, to be published on College website • Removing courses from relevant online directories • Removing courses from relevant print communications (eg prospectuses, posters) • Removing courses from online forms used online and at any College events • Contacting all enquirers booked on an open day for a specific course, to ensure they are appropriately informed <p>The plan <i>may</i> also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing key words from advertising campaigns if applicable (<i>to defray costs at the earliest opportunity, as advertising runs 365 days of the year so costs are incurred on a daily basis</i>)
Admissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of all applicants holding an offer, and all potential applicants who have expressed an interest in the programme • Communication with all applicants including offering places on the programme(s) affected, ensuring that relevant Awarding Body, and UCAS procedures where applicable, are followed

	<i>NB UCAS regulations mean that specific procedures need to be followed in respect of any applicant who has applied for, or is holding, an offer of a place on the programme concerned</i>
Head of Governance, Quality, Compliance & Information Systems (or their nominee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informing current students and those who have temporarily interrupted their studies of the programme suspension / closure, and arrangements for 'Teach Out'. • <i>NB Students should be informed of how the College and Awarding Body intend to assure the quality of the student experience, how matters such as reassessment, interruption of studies etc will be handled, and routes for raising informal queries and concerns, and clarity about avenues for raising formal complaints. Where deemed appropriate and only where agreed by the Awarding Body, arrangements may include a 'fast-track' refund/compensation process proactively put in place by the College.</i>
Head of HR & Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works in conjunction with the Senior Management Team and relevant staff undertaking consultation with staff and recognised representatives, where staff roles/employment are affected by the decision to suspend or close a programme.
PHASE 3 of Course Suspension / Closure Implementation Plan	
Academic Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitors suspension/teach-out arrangements, receiving regular reports/updates, ensuring compliance with student protection requirements and Awarding Body regulations, policies and agreed requirements • May appoint a Working Group or direct Quality & Standards Committee as necessary to support smooth operation of Teach-Out and other associated arrangements regarding programme suspension / closure
Senior Management Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report to Awarding Body and, where relevant, OfS (Reportable Events)