

CIOL RVC Scheme – ‘Certified Status’ Programme ‘Maturity Model’ Framework



CIOL uses the following ‘Maturity Model’ in our RVC ‘Certified Status’ programme review process. This framework is used to evidence our decisions and help signpost potential improvements we may recommend. We will ‘score’ programmes against the ‘guiding principles’ and ‘purpose-level alignment’ below and will provide recommendations and make decisions based on the evidence you give us, both in writing and during review meetings. We will use this framework in addition to ensuring your ongoing compliance with RVC ‘Validate’ requirements throughout the review process. The aim of the framework is to help CIOL support good practice and to work with our RVC partners towards leading-edge practice across all aspects of programme standards, quality and governance. If we find insufficient evidence against any of the guiding principles or insufficient evidence of purpose-level alignment, we will not be able to award RVC ‘Certified’ status.

Guiding Principle	Insufficient Evidence	Adequate Evidence	Good Evidence	Leading-Edge Practice
<p>1. Clear ownership and accountability</p> <p>The programme is clearly owned and led, including named contacts who assure the ongoing health of the programme and ongoing CIOL ‘Certify’ compliance</p>	<p>Ambiguous/uncertain leadership of the programme.</p> <p>The programme’s key leader/leaders do not adequately engage with the RVC scheme.</p> <p>Key people do not make themselves available or attend ‘Certify’ review meetings.</p>	<p>Clear named leadership of the programme.</p> <p>The programme’s key leader/leaders visibly engage with the RVC Scheme.</p> <p>Key people make themselves available for the ‘Certify’ review meetings.</p>	<p>Clear named leadership of the programme which is well-embedded beyond single individuals.</p> <p>The programme has managed previous changes in leadership effectively and does not depend on any one individual.</p> <p>The programme’s key leadership make themselves available for the ‘Certify’ review meetings.</p>	<p>As ‘Good Evidence’ but with additional evidence of proactive succession planning for key programme leadership roles and a commitment to sustaining programme excellence.</p>
<p>2. There are consistently high standards of content, course and assessment</p> <p>The programme can evidence it is working to appropriate standards for content, course design and delivery as well as assessment.</p>	<p>Limited or ambiguous evidence of the programmes’ use of clear standards for content, course design, delivery and assessment.</p> <p>The programme cannot sufficiently evidence the standards it is using or the methods used for review and benchmarking.</p>	<p>Adequate evidence of the programmes’ use of clear externally-referenced standards for content, course design, delivery and assessment.</p> <p>The programme can evidence the externally-referenced standards it is using and the methods used for review and benchmarking.</p>	<p>Strong evidence of the use of national and/or international standards for content, design, delivery and assessment.</p> <p>The programme can fully evidence the standards it is using and the methods used for review and benchmarking.</p> <p>The programme engages with other programmes and standard-setters to benchmark itself.</p>	<p>As ‘Good Evidence’ but with additional evidence of proactive input and contribution to benchmarking exercises and standard setting at a national or international level.</p>

Guiding Principle	Insufficient Evidence	Adequate Evidence	Good Evidence	Leading-Edge Practice
<p>3. Embedded quality and continual improvement</p> <p>The programme can evidence appropriate quality assurance processes, regular reviews and cycles of innovation and improvement</p>	<p>Limited or ambiguous evidence of quality assurance processes, regular reviews and cycles of innovation and improvement.</p> <p>The programme cannot sufficiently evidence the quality processes it is using or the methods used for review, innovation and improvement.</p>	<p>Adequate evidence of quality assurance processes, regular reviews and cycles of innovation and improvement.</p> <p>The programme can evidence the quality processes it is using and the methods used for review, innovation and improvement.</p>	<p>Strong evidence of quality assurance processes, regular reviews and cycles of innovation and improvement.</p> <p>The programme can fully evidence the quality processes it is using and the methods used for review, innovation and improvement.</p> <p>The programme engages with external/independent review/reviewers on the quality processes it is using and on the methods used for review, innovation and improvement to challenge and benchmark itself.</p>	<p>As ‘Good Evidence’ but with additional evidence of proactive input and contribution to quality assurance approaches, reviews and programmes of innovation and improvement and good practice at a national or international level.</p>
<p>4. Appropriate staffing and skills</p> <p>The programme can evidence appropriate staffing, the right skills and a level of resourcing which assures good outcomes for learners, stakeholders and the institution/organisation.</p>	<p>Limited or ambiguous evidence of adequate staffing, resources, planning and financial sustainability.</p> <p>The programme cannot sufficiently evidence that it has the resourcing it needs or sustainability for the future.</p>	<p>Adequate evidence of staffing, resources, planning and financial sustainability.</p> <p>The programme can evidence that it has the resourcing it needs and has sustainability for the future.</p>	<p>Strong evidence of staffing, resources, planning and ongoing financial sustainability.</p> <p>The programme can fully evidence that it has the resourcing it needs and has sustainability and prospects for growth, wider engagement or reach in future.</p> <p>The programme engages with other programmes on the levels of human and financial resources, skills and planning processes it is using to benchmark and improve itself.</p>	<p>As ‘Good Evidence’ but with additional evidence of proactive input and contribution to planning, benchmarking, resource allocation choices, staffing and training approaches and good practice at a national or international level.</p>

Guiding Principle	Insufficient Evidence	Adequate Evidence	Good Evidence	Leading-Edge Practice
<p>5. Seeking, listening to and responding to feedback, including assessing value-added</p> <p>The programme can evidence processes for gathering and acting on feedback from learners, regulators, government and other stakeholders and has insight into the value the programme is adding to the academic, career and other progression learners make post-programme.</p>	<p>Limited or ambiguous evidence of gathering feedback or understanding the progression and use made by and impact on learners/those who have followed the programme.</p> <p>The programme cannot sufficiently evidence that it has feedback from learners and stakeholders or the impact the programme is having on careers, lives and life chances.</p>	<p>Adequate evidence of gathering feedback and understanding the progression and use made by and impact on learners/those who have followed the programme.</p> <p>The programme can evidence that it has feedback from learners and stakeholders and has some qualitative and/or quantitative insight into the impact the programme is having on careers, lives and life chances.</p>	<p>The programme has strong evidence of gathering feedback and understanding the progression and use made by and impact on learners/those who have followed the programme.</p> <p>The programme can evidence that it has feedback from learners and stakeholders and has qualitative and quantitative insight into the impact the programme is having on careers, lives and life chances.</p> <p>The programme engages with others on the feedback processes it is using to benchmark and improve itself.</p>	<p>As ‘Good Evidence’ but with additional evidence of proactive input and contribution to positive feedback and improvement processes and setting expectations for progression, careers and the wider language profession at national or international level.</p>
<p>6. Purpose Level Alignment</p> <p>The programme is adding to the intercultural asset which is the global pool of teachers, lecturers, interpreters, translators or those able to use languages in business, the professions or government.</p> <p>The programme is genuinely contributing to the number of linguists with the skills and confidence to work and engage in more than one language.</p>	<p>Limited or ambiguous evidence of genuinely contributing to the numbers of linguists with the skills and confidence to study, teach, work and engage in more than one language</p> <p>The programme cannot sufficiently evidence that it is meaningfully adding to the global pool of skilled language professionals.</p>	<p>Adequate evidence of genuinely contributing to the numbers of linguists with the skills and confidence to study, teach, work and engage in more than one language</p> <p>The programme can evidence that it is adding to the global pool of skilled language professionals to some extent.</p>	<p>The programme has strong evidence of genuinely contributing to the numbers of linguists with the skills and confidence to study, teach, work and engage in more than one language</p> <p>The programme can evidence that it is adding to the global pool of skilled language professionals.</p>	<p>As ‘Good Evidence’ but with additional evidence of proactive input and contribution to policy-making and advocacy for languages and language professionals.</p>