Programme and Module Approval Board

Minutes of the meeting of the Programme and Module Approval Board Wednesday 24th November 2010

CONFERMED

Present:
Prof. Susan Dilly (Chair)
Peter Rosenberg
Prof. Olwyn Westwood
Dr. Andy Robinson
Angie Raymond
Dr. Theo Kreouzis
Prof. Omar Garcia-Obregon
Dr. Henri Huijberts

In attendance:
Ken Chow (Secretary)
Prof. Joy Hinson (on behalf of
Prof. Anthony Warrens)
Raluca Vasiliiu-Mclver
Dr. Alastair Owens
Prof. David Adger
Alan Evison

Jane Pallant
Sophie Richardson (on behalf of Vraj Domalip)
Dr. Peter Wyatt
Dr. Simon Eaglestone
Prof. Ray Kiely
Dr. Julia Hornle
Dr. Nick Croft
Dr. Roger Nix
Sam Brenton
Dr. Nigel Abreo

Apologies:
Prof. Ray Croucher
Prof. Anthony Warrens
Prof. Elizabeth Davenport
Vraj Domalip
Prof. Warren Boutcher
Prof. Peter McOwan

Part 1 – Preliminary Items

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

PMAB2010-032

2010:023 The Board considered and confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 20th October 2010.

3. Matters Arising from the previous meeting

PMAB2010-033

2010:024 The Board received a paper on the matters arising from the minutes of the previous (October) meeting of Programme and Module Approval Board and noted that there were a number of outstanding actions still to be addressed.

Action: CCLS / EECS

Part 2 – Programme Proposals

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

4. School of Geography
MSci Environmental Science (Part 1)

The Board considered a Part 1 programme proposal for the MSci Environmental Science and noted the following:

i. The proposed MSci builds upon existing undergraduate and postgraduate provision within the School of Geography.

ii. A number of QM competitors offered similar MSci Environmental Science programmes and it was clear that there was demand from students for such a course.

iii. The International Office had been consulted regarding the development, particularly as it was envisaged that the programme was likely to appeal to international students.

iv. A number of the modules that would form part of the MSci Environmental Science had already been approved and formed part of other programmes within the school.

v. Due to the occurrence of different marking schemes used at QM a number of the postgraduate modules specified for the MSci Environmental Science programme would require undergraduate versions to be created.

vi. The Board questioned how the QM Statement of Graduate Attributes had informed the development of the programme. The School was currently considering how the QM Statement of Graduate Attributes would impact on a number of programmes and agreed that this issue would be considered within the Part 2 proposal.

vii. The Board approved the Part 1 programme proposal.

5. School of Languages, Linguistics and Film

MA Linguistics (Part 2 and associated module proposals x19)

The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal and associated module proposals for the MA Linguistics and noted the following:

i. The recent achievement in the Research Excellence Framework by the School of Languages, Linguistics and Film had in part prompted the development of a new MA Linguistics programme.

ii. The main aim of the programme was to provide training for graduate students who wished to pursue a doctorate but it would also be appropriate for other students with an interest in the subject area.

iii. Comments from the external advisor had been received and these were included in the PMAB papers.

iv. Within a number of the module proposal forms, a qualifying mark was specified even though there was only one piece of assessment. In such cases the module pass mark would apply by default.

v. The learning outcomes for a number of modules could benefit from further work and refinement, particularly in order to fully reflect that modules are
vi. The learning outcomes for the modules detailed below, in particular, would benefit from further attention:

- Qualitative Research Methods
- Dissertation Proseminar
- MA Dissertation Linguistics
- From Morpheme to Meaning, Formal Methods and Theory
- Youth Language
- Language Style and Stylization
- Research Practicum
- Topics in the Grammar of a Language
- Family or Group
- Understudied Languages and Linguistic Theory
- Bilingualism

vii. The rationale for sharing teaching provision with existing level 6 modules was well articulated. This strategy would allow students to engage with topics that were not available elsewhere, as well as improve the usage of existing staff resources.

viii. The assessment and learning outcomes for modules where teaching would be shared would be different to ensure that there was a clear differentiation in terms of academic level.

ix. The module aims for the MA Dissertation Linguistics module required enhancement and further detail.

x. The reading list for Applied Sociophonetics and Phonology module did not contain the publication dates of materials. These details were required in order that the Board could gauge how current the reading materials were.

xi. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal and associated module proposals subject to the clarification of the points detailed above and the submission of revised module proposal forms to address the above issues. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

Action: SLLF / Chair

6. School of Politics and International Relations

MSc International Business and Politics (Part 1) PMAB2010-036

2010:027 The Board considered a Part 1 programme proposal for the MSc International Business and Politics and noted the following:

i. The proposed programme builds on expertise within the School of Politics and International Relations and School of Business and Management.

ii. There was a clear demand for the programme, particularly internationally.

iii. Two new core modules would be created for the MSc International Business and Politics programme.

iv. The programme structure suggested that the dissertation element within the
programme would be a business module. This was because it had been provisionally specified as a ‘BUS’ code and as the School of Business and Management was the responsible cost centre. Given that the programme would involve two different QM schools this required clarification.

v. The programme learning outcomes required further work, particularly in order to fully reflect that the programme was a level 7 programme.

vi. The entry requirements stated that “professional experience and expertise would also be taken into consideration and welcomed” but the process for considering such applicants was not explained.

vii. Where necessary applicants with professional experience and expertise would be considered on a case-by-case basis through discussion with the programme organiser. Candidates would be interviewed to ascertain their suitability for entry onto the programme. Where necessary overseas applicants would also be interviewed by phone.

viii. At the meeting it was suggested that the programme would follow the standard Academic Regulations, particularly in terms of progression and classification of the final award (including pass, merit and distinction). However, this issue required further clarification given that two separate QM schools were involved in the programme and because the two schools may operate different award calculation methods.

ix. The Board approved the Part 1 programme proposal subject to the clarification of the points detailed above and the submission of a revised Part 1 Programme Proposal form. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

Action: SBM / Chair

Faculty of Science and Engineering

7. School of Biological and Chemical Sciences

MSci Chemistry (Part 2 and associated module proposals x3) PMAB2010-037

2010:028 The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal and associated module proposals for the MSci Chemistry and noted the following:

i. The proposed introduction of the MSci Chemistry was viewed as a significant development within SBCS and would serve as a key programme to attract students.

ii. There was a clear demand for an MSci Chemistry programme and a number of competitors already offered successful comparable programmes.

iii. The structure of the programme would be similar to that of the existing MSci Pharmaceutical Chemistry. Consequently, there would be extensive overlap with the first three years of teaching.

iv. The UCAS entry tariff for the programme was specified as 300 points.

v. The programme learning outcomes required further work in order to fully reflect that the programme was a level 7 programme.
vi. A programme-specific regulation regarding progression for the programme was requested within the Part 2 proposal. This related to a 55% pass mark to enable progression onto subsequent years of the MSci programme. The 55% pass mark had been adopted from the MSci Pharmaceutical Chemistry programme but had been increased from 50% following discussion within SBCS.

vii. The Chemistry MSci Research Project module was stated as a compulsory module. However, as the module appeared to be a key component of the MSci programme the Board questioned whether it should be a core module. This matter required further discussion within SBCS.

viii. The module proposal for Advanced Analytical Chemistry required attention in order to clarify the minimum or maximum number of students specified for the module to run. The learning outcomes for the module needed further work and enhancement in order to fully reflect that the module was a level 6 module. The duration of the Lab Report/workshops element of assessment was also not specified and should be detailed.

ix. The learning outcomes for the Chemistry MSci Research Project module needed further work and enhancement in order to fully reflect that the module was a level 7 module. The module rationale stated that the Chemistry MSci Research module would replace the existing 45 credit module Advanced Chemistry Project (CHE742). The Board noted that a module withdrawal form should be submitted if CHE742 was to be formally withdrawn.

x. The learning outcomes for the Project Skills in Chemistry module needed further work and enhancement in order to fully reflect that the module was a level 6 module.

xi. Any subsequent Royal Society of Chemistry accreditation for the programme should be made clear in the revised programme specification and communicated to PMAB for information.

xii. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal and associated module proposals subject to the clarification of the points detailed above and the submission of a revised Part 2 programme proposal form and associated module proposal forms to address the above issues. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

Action: SBCS / Chair

School of Medicine and Dentistry

8. The Blizard Institute of Cell and Molecular Science

MSc/PgDip Trauma Science and MSc/PgDip Trauma Science (Military & Austere) (Part 1)

2010:029 The Board considered a Part 1 programme proposal for the MSc/PgDip Trauma Science and MSc/PgDip Trauma Science (Military & Austere) and noted the following:

i. The programme proposal presented to PMAB had been revised and resubmitted in response to issues highlighted at the October PMAB meeting.
ii. The area of trauma had recently seen an upsurge in interest, both locally and globally, and was seen as a priority area for both SMD and the Trust.

iii. The revised proposal addressed a number of queries from the Head of E-Learning regarding the materials and platform that would be used to deliver the programme.

iv. The postgraduate diploma element of the programme was specified as part-time over 1 year. However, equivalent part-time postgraduate diploma programmes typically consisted of 2 years of study.

v. Through discussion it was understood that the postgraduate diploma element of the programme would be delivered full-time over 1 year, whereas the MSc would be delivered part-time over 2 years. This issue required clarification on the Part 1 proposal form.

vi. The main target audience for the programme was students who possessed a medical degree, although through discussion it was understood that students with a non-medical degree might also be considered.

vii. The entry requirements required clarification for students with a non-medical degree.

viii. Given that the programme could attract international applicants the Board agreed that the level of a student’s English language proficiency for the programme needed to be clear and should be addressed. This included details of any required IELTS / TOEFL score.

ix. The precise fee proposed for the MSc and postgraduate diploma element was a non-standard fee and required further clarification and approval from the Fees Office and Costing and Pricing Group outside of the Board.

x. The Board approved the Part 1 programme proposal subject to the clarification of the points detailed above and the submission of a revised Part 1 Programme Proposal form. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

Action: BICMS / Chair

9. Institute of Health Sciences Education

MSc/PgDip/PgCert International Primary Health Care (Part 1) PMAB2010-039

2010:030 The Board noted that the Part 1 programme proposal for the MSc/PgDip/PgCert International Primary Health Care had been deferred due to a request to further develop the proposal from IHSE.

Part 3 – Programme Amendments

School of Medicine and Dentistry

10. Blizard Institute of Cell and Molecular Science

Postgraduate Diploma in Aesthetic Surgery PMAB2010-040
The Board considered a programme amendment to apply to the Postgraduate Diploma in Aesthetic Surgery and noted the following:

i. The Postgraduate Diploma in Aesthetic Surgery would be replaced by an MSc in Aesthetic Plastic Surgery.

ii. A programme withdrawal form for the Postgraduate Diploma in Aesthetic Surgery had already been submitted and approved by ATRPG.

iii. Associated module proposal and withdrawal forms and a revised programme specification were required and should be submitted to the next meeting of PMAB.

iv. The Board approved the programme amendment to the Postgraduate Diploma in Aesthetic Surgery programme.

---

### Part 4 – Programme Withdrawals

**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**11. School of Law**

> MA Medical Law and Ethics

PMAB2010-041

The Board considered and approved a programme withdrawal for the MA Medical Law and Ethics programme subject to clarification from the Dean for Taught Programmes (Humanities and Social Sciences) that it had been considered by the Faculty Executive.

**Action:** Academic Secretariat

---

### Part 5 – Module Proposals

**12. The Language and Learning Unit**

i. Academic Skills Seminars for LLM Students

PMAB2010-042

The Board considered a module proposal for Academic Skills Seminars for LLM Students and noted the following:

i. The module was specifically designed for LLM students as a study only module and contained no formal assessment.

ii. The module aimed to develop students’ English language skills.

iii. The scheme specified in the proposal form was taught postgraduate but following discussion it transpired that the scheme should in fact be non-award bearing.

iv. All modules must be assigned a level under the QM Academic Credit Framework.

v. The LLU intended for this module to be visible on a student’s transcript.
vi. The module was proposed to start from January 2011.

vii. The Board questioned the academic credibility of the module given that it focused on student support and since the aims and learning outcomes should determine the level of the module.

viii. The Board did not approve the module, as further work and discussion was needed to address a number of points detailed above. It was agreed that the Chair would take forward these issues outside of the meeting in order to find a solution.

Action: LLU / Chair

ii Proofreading and Editing Skills

2010:034 The Board considered a module proposal for Proofreading and Editing Skills and noted the following:

i. The module was a study only module with no formal assessment.

ii. The module aimed to develop students’ academic skills, particularly their proofreading and editing skills.

iii. The LLU intended for this module to be visible on a student’s transcript.

iv. The module was proposed to start from January 2011.

v. The Board questioned the academic credibility of the module given that it focused on student support and since the aims and learning outcomes should determine the level of the module.

vi. The Board did not approve the module, as further work and discussion was needed to address a number of points detailed above. It was agreed that the Chair would take forward these issues outside of the meeting in order to find a solution.

Action: LLU / Chair

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

13. Centre for Commercial Law Studies

i Broadcasting Regulation

2010:035 The Board considered a module proposal for Broadcasting Regulation and noted the following:

i. The specified JACS code for the module was clarified as M221 (Business and Commercial Law).

ii. Broadcasting Regulation would be offered as an optional module within the International Computer and Communications Law Postgraduate Certificate, Postgraduate Diploma and LLM in Computer & Communications Law by Internet programmes.

iii. The Programme Specification(s) for the programmes where Broadcasting Regulation would be offered should be updated to include it as a viable
option module and submitted to the Academic Secretariat.  

Action: CCLS

iv. The Board approved the module proposal.

14. School of Politics and International Relations

Representative Democracy in Practice

Action: CCLS

The Board considered a module proposal for Regulation of Cross-border Online Gambling and noted the following:

i. Feedback and interest from students in this area of law had prompted the development of this new module.

ii. The module would be delivered by distance learning.

iii. Regulation of Cross-border Online Gambling would be offered on the Postgraduate Certificate, Postgraduate Diploma and LLM in Computer & Communications Law.

iv. The Programme Specification(s) for the above programmes required updating to include Regulation of Cross-border Online Gambling as a viable option module.

The Board approved the module proposal.

14. School of Politics and International Relations

Representative Democracy in Practice

The Board considered a module proposal for Representative Democracy in Practice and noted the following:

i. The module built on an existing level 4 module that was already offered within the school.

ii. The aim of the module was to develop students’ interest in governmental politics.

iii. The module was a ‘semi-core module’ that would be offered on the BA Politics or BA International Relations where students would take this module from a pool of 3 options.

iv. The learning outcomes required further work and enhancement in order to fully reflect that the module was a level 5 module.

v. Section 3 of the module proposal form had been incorrectly filled in and did not apply in this instance. Section 3 only applied where the module would exclusively be made available to associate students in Semester 1, and included an examination in the May/June period.

vi. Representative Democracy in Practice was a 30 credit module but would also be offered over Semester 1 and Semester 2, as two separate 15 credit modules. This issue required clarification within the module proposal form.

vii. The Board approved the module proposal subject to the clarification of the
points detailed above and the submission of revised module proposal form to address the above issues. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

Action: SPIR / Chair

**School of Medicine and Dentistry**

15. **Institute of Health Sciences Education**

Sports Injury Management PMAB2010-047

2010:038 The Board **considered** a module proposal for Sports Injury Management and **noted** the following:

i. A further revised module proposal had been circulated via email to take into account comments regarding the detail of learning outcomes.

ii. The module specified a qualifying mark of 50% but this issue required clarification.

iii. The Board **approved** the module proposal subject to the clarification of the points detailed above.

**Part 6 – Module Withdrawals**

16. **Consideration of Module Withdrawals at Programme and Module Approval Board**

2010:039 The Board **discussed** the process for considering module withdrawals at Programme and Module Approval Board and **noted** the following:

i. Under the current arrangements, the Board received completed module withdrawal forms for consideration and approval.

ii. All module withdrawals should be approved by the Faculty Executive before they are considered at PMAB.

iii. The Board **agreed** that in future a summary of module withdrawals should be considered by the Board. Records of all module withdrawals would be kept by the Academic Secretariat, including completed module withdrawal forms.

**Action: Academic Secretariat**

**Part 7 – Other Business**

17. **Any other business**

**31st March Meeting of PMAB**

2010:040 The Board **noted** that the 31st March meeting of PMAB had been rescheduled to 12-2pm in GO Jones 602 due to room availability.

18. **Date of next meeting**
The next meeting date of the Programme and Module Approval Board is Wednesday 23rd February 2011 (1-4pm).

The deadline for papers for this meeting is Wednesday 2nd February 2011.