Programme and Module Approval Board

Minutes of the meeting of the Programme and Module Approval Board held on
Wednesday 27 July 2011 at 13.00 in the Council Room.

CONFIRMED

Present:
Prof. Susan Dilly (Chair)
Peter Rosenberg Dr Mark Carroll Prof. Julia Shelton
Prof. Elizabeth Davenport Dr Theo Kreouzis Prof. Omar Garcia-Obregon
Prof. Peter McOwan Prof. Anthony Warrens Sam Brenton

In attendance:
Ken Chow (Secretary) Dr Chris Reid Prof. George Kapetanios
Dr Katherine Bevan Dr Leon Vinokur Prof. Luncinda Hall
Alana Lythgoe Dr Gabriel Gari Dr Roger Nix
Michele Branscombe Prof. Trisha Greenhalgh

Apologies:
Dr Warren Boutcher Dr Henri Huijberts Jane Pallant
Prof. Olwyn Westwood Prof. Ray Croucher Sam Brenton
Sophie Richardson

### Part 1 – Preliminary Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Minutes of the previous meeting</td>
<td>PMAB2010-282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010:239</td>
<td>The Board considered and confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 29 June 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Matters Arising from the previous meeting</td>
<td>PMAB2010-283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010:240</td>
<td>The Board received a paper on the matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting of Programme and Module Approval Board. The Board noted that there were a number of outstanding actions still to be addressed from previous PMAB meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulations Supplement for the Postgraduate Laws programme</td>
<td>TABLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010:241</td>
<td>The Board received a Regulations Supplement relating to the Postgraduate Laws programme and noted the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. The programme was run in collaboration between the University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board was unclear exactly what it was being asked to approve and requested further information from the University of London. Pending the submission of further, more detailed information regarding the nature of approval, it was agreed that Chair’s Action would be considered.

**Action:** KC / Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSci Pass Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010:242 The Board noted that Dr Theo Kreouzis and Dr Katherine Bevan had met to discuss the revision to the pass mark for level 7 modules taken by students studying the MSci Physics programmes. This would be taken forward over the summer in order to have a workable solution in place within the Student Information System for the 2011-12 academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2 – Programme Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. School of English and Drama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2010:243 MA English Studies (Part 2) and 1 associated module proposal: **Ideas and Metaphors**  
PMAB2010-284

The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal for the MA English Studies and 1 associated module proposals and noted the following:

i. The proposed programme related to the restructuring of the existing MA provision in the Department of English, and would create opportunities to develop teaching in areas that are currently under represented in the curriculum. This would enhance student learning by increasing module choice and improve the student experience by making the academic and administrative management of the MA more effective.

ii. Following the embedding of the new structure it was envisaged that a number of new pathways would be added in the future.

iii. The title for the programme would be MA English Studies, although each of the 4 designated pathways would have a dedicated pathway suffix title (English Literature, Renaissance and Early Modern Studies, Writing and Society 1700-1820, and Writing in the Modern Age).

iv. To address concerns highlighted by the external examiner regarding the modules offered on the programme, it was clarified that the majority of modules that form part of this programme had already been through the necessary approval processes.

v. The issue regarding the lack of explicit reference to students demonstrating autonomy in their studies, particularly given the weight placed upon the dissertation, had been addressed in the programme documentation. The learning outcomes now made explicit reference to the demonstration of autonomy within the programme.
vi. The study only modules that formed part of the programme were level 7 non-credit-rated modules that were not assessed, although attendance and completion of the modules was compulsory. Study only modules would appear on students' transcripts.

vii. Each of the existing programmes currently had a training element attached to it, which resulted in some duplication of provision. It was recognised that research training could be more effectively delivered through incorporating training elements into existing core modules, and that this would be reviewed within the department. This would then be considered by the Board mid-way through 2011/12 so that a solution could be in place for teaching in September 2012.

Action: CR

viii. The new MA English Studies programme was proposed to start in September 2012.

ix. The significant number of existing modules that would remain on offer would provide student choice in particular subject areas of interest and there was demand from students to sustain this offering.

x. The use of plagiarism detection software, such as Turnitin, was used on an infrequent basis on the existing MA programmes within the School of English. Given that a large proportion of modules on the programme were coursework based, the Board suggested that Turnitin should be used on a more regular basis. This should be addressed and articulated within a revised Part 2 proposal form.

Action: CR

xi. It would be useful to have information on contact hours at programme level within section 5 of the Part 2 proposal. This should also be detailed within the Programme Specification.

xii. The specified qualifying mark for the module Ideas and Metaphors: 1700-1820 did not apply.

xiii. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal for the MA English Studies and the 1 associated module proposal subject to the clarification of the points detailed above and the submission of a revised Part 2 Programme Proposal form and revised Module Proposal form. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

Action: CR / Chair

5. Centre for Commercial Law Studies

i. LLM Law and Economics (Part 1) PMAB2010-285

2010:244 The Board considered a Part 1 programme proposal for the LLM Law and Economics and noted the following:

i. The current set of MSc and LLM Economics and Legal programmes lacked an offering that was both academically rigorous and interdisciplinary.

ii. The programme would be offered both full time (one year) and part-time (two years).
iii. The proposed programme comprised a number of already existing approved modules and would be research orientated to prepare students for transfer onto a research degree.

iv. The Centre for Commercial Law Studies (CCLS) and the School of Economics and Finance (SEF) had already collaborated together to deliver a number of programmes.

v. The proposed non-standard fees had not yet been discussed at the Costing and Pricing Group and their approval was required.

   Action: LV

vi. The Board questioned the rationale for using the award of LLM and not an MSc, given that a related MSc in Finance and Economics programme had recently been approved. It was expressed that the existing MSc in Finance and Economics was specifically targeted towards finance students, and that the designation of an LLM rather than MSc would be more consistent with CCLS’s existing postgraduate provision.

vii. The Board requested that details on the use of plagiarism detection software, such as Turnitin, should be provided. This was particularly important owing to the nature of assessment on the majority of modules, which was coursework based. This should be addressed within a revised Part 1 proposal form.

viii. Due to the involvement of two schools within the delivery of the programme it was agreed that a joint working statement between CCLS and SEF should be provided to clarify the responsibilities of the respective schools.

   Action: LV

ix. The Board approved a Part 1 programme proposal for the LLM Law and Economics 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: LV / Chair

---

ii. LLM – Paris (Part 1)  

2010:245 The Board considered a Part 1 programme proposal for the LLM Paris and noted the following:

i. The proposed LLM – Paris would target practitioners and French, English and American Lawyers and would be based at the premises of the University of London in Paris (ULIP). ULIP would provide academic support to students and learning resources and Queen Mary would be responsible for the quality assurance and teaching, learning and assessment of the programme.

ii. The title of programme was discussed given that CCLS already offered a campus based LLM at Queen Mary. The Board suggested that it may be advisable for the title to distinguish this programme from the existing Queen Mary campus based programme if it is sufficiently different. However, it was expressed that the content of the LLM – Paris was essentially the same as the ‘home’ programme but that the context and delivery was different.
iii. CCLS had already made a business case for a Senior Lecturer to take forward the development of the programme.

iv. The proposed non-standard fees had been discussed at, and approved by the Costing and Pricing Group.

v. The language of delivery and assessment for the programme was confirmed as English. In terms of entry requirements and English language proficiency, the same requirements that apply for the existing LLM would apply (IELTS 7).

vi. Students would not be assessed on the same questions as on the campus based LLM programme. Instead, assessment would be tailored to students who were studying on the Paris based programme.

vii. The majority of staff who would teach on the proposed programme would be drawn from Queen Mary staff. Given the need and importance of securing commitment from Queen Mary staff to teach on this programme in Paris, the Board suggested that the Part 2 submission should expand on staff commitment to teaching in Paris. The use of a workload model was also discussed and was seen as good practice that was used on a collaborative arrangement within the School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science.

viii. The Board agreed that professional accreditation with the relevant professional organisations should be explored by CCLS, particularly as this may increase the attractiveness of the programme.

ix. It was expressed that there was already an existing relationship between ULIP and Queen Mary but that information on the precise nature of collaborative arrangements and the presence of existing documentation, such as a Memorandum of Agreement, were not available to members of the Board at this time. Consequently, it was agreed that the proposed relationship between ULIP and Queen Mary be investigated further.

Action: GG / ARCS


6. School of Economics and Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Public Administration (Part 1)</th>
<th>PMAB2010-286</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Board considered a Part 1 programme proposal for the Master of Public Administration and noted the following:

i. The proposed Master of Public Administration (MPA) represented an opportunity to expand recruitment in key areas of Economics and Politics, thus contributing to the research profile of both the School of Economics and Finance and the School of Politics and International Relations.

ii. The establishment of a MPA would be instrumental to fostering a role for Queen Mary as an educational centre of excellence but also as a centre for public debate and influence both nationally and internationally, with the aim of ultimately improving the prominence and visibility of the College.

iii. The proposed programme start date was September 2012 but this may be delayed. It was also recognised that the programme was not structured as
iv. The proposed award of MPA was currently not listed in the Queen Mary Academic Regulations. However, it was listed within the University of London Academic Regulations.

v. The proposed non-standard fees had not yet been discussed by the Costing and Pricing Group and required approval. It was expressed that the fees detailed were per annum.

**Action:** SEF

vi. The ‘capstone’ element of the programme would be integral to the MPA and would comprise internships with local and central government organisations. This was a significant undertaking.

vii. Due to the involvement of two schools within the delivery of the programme it was agreed that a joint working statement between the School of Economics and Finance the School of Politics and International Relations should be provided to clarify the responsibilities of the respective schools. This should be articulated within the Part 2 submission.

**Action:** SEF

viii. The entry requirements relating to applicants possessing work experience should be explicitly clarified within the Part 2 proposal and Programme Specification.

ix. The Board suggested that the entry requirement of an IELTS score of 6.5 should be given further consideration, particularly as an MPA is viewed as a prestige programme.

x. The Board **approved** a Part 1 programme proposal for the Master of Public Administration.

---

**School of Medicine and Dentistry**

**7. Blizard Institute**

i. **MSc, PgDip Clinical Science (Infection Sciences) (Part 2) and 8 associated module proposals:**
   - Generic Healthcare Sciences - integrating science with professional practice
   - Professional and Research Skills
   - Introduction to Clinical Microbiology
   - Molecular Biology and Pathogenesis
   - Clinical Microbiology and Infection
   - Antimicrobial Therapy
   - Epidemiology and Public Health
   - Project and Dissertation

**PMAB2010-287**

2010:247 The Board **considered** a Part 2 programme proposal for the MSc, PgDip Clinical Science (Infection Sciences) and 8 associated modules detailed above and **noted** the following:

i. The programme had been developed as a response to the NHS Modernising Scientific Careers programme through a taught Masters within the Scientist Training Programme. The NHS commissioning body had
issued a provisional contract to Queen Mary for one cohort of students, starting in 2011.

ii. The External Advisor’s comments to support the proposal had now been received and were circulated to colleagues in advance of the meeting and were supportive of the development.

iii. A number of existing courses, such as the MSc in Clinical Microbiology, would benefit from the introduction of the MSc Clinical Science programme as a significant amount of delivery would be shared between courses, providing opportunities for inter-professional learning and the sharing of teaching.

iv. The fees proposed in the original Part 1 submission were no longer valid and would require clarification. This related to the particular terms of the tender with the NHS.

v. The Research Project module was confirmed as a 60 credit module and not a 30 credit module.

vi. The use of podcasts and blended learning technologies should be added to section 11 of the Part 2 proposal.

Action: LH

vii. It was commented that the text in the proposal regarding the ‘Specific Consideration of the needs of Disabled Students’ seemed similar to that presented in other proposals and that it should be ensured that the needs of disabled students had been taken into proper consideration, and that there were detailed support mechanisms in place within the Blizard Institute, as well as access to support services offered centrally by Queen Mary.

viii. Concern was expressed in relation to the number of students who would enrol on the programme in relation to the student experience and the continuing viability of the programme. As such, the Board suggested consideration could be given to the scope for opening up the programme to a wider pool of students in the future, using distance-learning, to address sustainability issues.

ix. The Introduction to Clinical Microbiology specified a total of 200 hours of student / lecturer contact. It was expressed that a more detailed breakdown in terms of the nature of contact should be supplied within a revised module proposal form.

Action: LH

x. Turnitin would be used to scrutinise coursework assessment and ensure that plagiarism was effectively monitored.

xi. The 40% qualifying mark specified for the associated modules was confirmed as accurate.

xii. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal for the MSc, PgDip Clinical Science (Infection Sciences) and the 8 associated modules subject to the clarification of the points detailed above and the submission of a revised Part 2 Programme Proposal form and Module Proposal for Introduction to Clinical Microbiology. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.
The Board considered Part 1 programme proposals for the MSc programmes within the Blizard Institute and noted the following:

i. The three proposed programmes build on a number of previous successful postgraduate programmes run at UCL and Edinburgh University and aim to improve the quality of research, teaching and service provision in public health, primary health care, and health policy.

ii. The programmes were designed to share a number of common modules, which would promote interdisciplinary learning. There would also be a range of optional modules for students to choose from according to their particular interests. However, the particular specialism that a student was enrolled on would dictate whether a module would be taken as core or compulsory.

iii. Given that the three programmes comprised of a number of common modules, the Board asked that the differentiation between them is presented in terms of the Part 2 submissions.

iv. The range of modules on offer from a variety of schools emphasised the diverse nature of the programmes. Due to the involvement of several schools within the delivery of the programmes it was agreed that a joint working statement should be provided to clarify the responsibilities of the respective schools. This should be provided with the Part 2 submission.

v. It was evident that the programme team possessed substantial experience of distance learning delivery and that the proposed programmes would provide a model for high-quality online and blended learning.

vi. It was envisaged that a range of professionals with varying experience would be attracted to the programmes, including doctors and nurses.

vii. The Board questioned whether approval of a Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate, as dedicated entry routes, was being sought, as this was not specified within the original Part 1 documentation. It was articulated that approval of both awards would be favourable and offer students the opportunity to enrol on a lower qualification and progress to an MSc if they wished to.

viii. The decision to offer both a Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate for all three programmes should be made clear within the following Part 2 Submissions.

ix. The proposed non-standard fees had not yet been discussed at the Costing and Pricing Group and required approval. Fees for the Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate awards would also require clarification and approval.
x. The Board **approved** Part 1 programme proposals for the above MSc programmes within the Blizard Institute.

v. **MRes Clinical Research (Part 1)**

2010:249 The Board **considered** a Part 1 programme proposal for the MRes Clinical Research and **noted** the following:

i. The Part 1 submission had a different start date compared to the Part 2 submission.

ii. The programme was previously approved at Part 1 in March 2010. However, this was originally for an MRes Medical Research and the proposed title had now changed.

iii. The proposed non-standard fees had not yet been discussed or approved by the Costing and Pricing Group and required approval.

iv. The Board **approved** a Part 1 programme proposal for the MRes Clinical Research.

vi. **MRes Clinical Research (Part 2) and 4 associated module proposals:**

   - Communication and Public Engagement
   - Practical Project
   - Research from the literature
   - The Grant Proposal

2010:250 The Board **considered** a Part 2 programme proposal for the MRes Clinical Research and 4 associated modules detailed above and **noted** the following:

i. The proposed MRes Clinical Research had been developed to respond to the need of a credit-bearing research training programme for Academic Clinical Fellows. This was required for obtaining NHS National Institute for Health Research funding.

ii. Students would take a number of modules from the current clinical and drug development course. The long term plan was to introduce additional modules to make the course broader in scope and appeal to a wider range of students.

iii. All written assessments would be submitted through Turnitin.

iv. Students would be engaged in clinical work throughout the year.

v. The start date of the programme was confirmed as September 2011. There would also be an intake in January.

vi. The proposed 45% qualifying mark for the assessment on the Communication and Public Engagement module was intentional.

vii. Given that the Practical Project module comprised of experimental research and laboratory work the Board agreed that assessment by an 8,000 word project report was entirely appropriate.
viii. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal for the MRes Clinical Research and the 4 associated modules.

### Part 3 – Programme Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. School of Economics and Finance</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. MSc Economics (L1S1, L1SP)</td>
<td>PMAB2010-293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010:251 The Board considered a programme amendment to the MSc Economics and noted the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The amendment related to the removal of ECOM067 (Econometrics C), which would be replaced by ECOM032 (Econometrics B) as a core module.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. The Board approved the programme amendment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. MSc Finance and Econometrics (L1S5, L1T3) MSc Finance and Economics (L1S9, L1T4)</td>
<td>PMAB2010-294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010:252 The Board considered a programme amendment to the MSc Finance and Econometrics and the MSc Finance and Economics and noted the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. ECOM067 (Econometrics C) was a new optional module for both MSc Finance and Econometrics &amp; MSc Finance and Economics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. ECOM065 (Investments) replaced ECOM043 (Quantitative Asset Pricing).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. The Board approved the programme amendment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. MSc Banking and Finance (L1S3, L1S4) MSc Investment and Finance (L1T1, L1T2) MSc Finance and Economics (L1T3 L1T4) MSc Finance and Econometrics L1S5, L1S9) MSc Economics (L1S1, L1SP) MSc Accounting and Finance (N1S4) MSc Law and Finance (M3S7, M3S8)</td>
<td>PMAB2010-295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010:253 The Board considered a programme amendment to a number of postgraduate programmes within the School of Economics and Finance and noted the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The amendment related to removing the project progression hurdle (students must pass 90 out of 120 credits).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. The Board approved the programme amendment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. School of Business and Management</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc International Business and Politics (N120)</td>
<td>PMAB2010-296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board considered a programme amendment to the MSc International Business and Politics and noted the following:

i. The proposed amendment related to offering the programme in part-time study mode, alongside the full time programme.

ii. The Board approved the programme amendment.

Faculty of Science and Engineering

10. School of Biological and Chemical Sciences

Science & Engineering Foundation Programme (Various Codes) PMAB2010-297

The Board considered a programme amendment to the Science & Engineering Foundation Programme and noted the following:

i. The status of a number of modules from "compulsory" to "core" had been put forward for amendment.

ii. The Board approved the programme amendment.

11. School of Engineering and Materials Sciences

MEng Programmes (Various Codes) PMAB2010-298

The Board considered a programme amendment to a number of MEng Programmes and noted the following:

i. The proposed amendment would create a new developmental year three to developmental year four progression regulation.

ii. Students in developmental year three to developmental year four would now take modules to the value of 120 credits from developmental year three, have to pass 315 credits from developmental years one, two and three with a weighted 1:2:3 average mark of 60%, and achieve a pass in MAT500. The changes in comparison to the current regulations were the increase in the weighted average mark from 50% to 60% and the addition requirement of a pass in MAT500.

iii. The School operated different weighting schemes for its Engineering and Materials programmes and wished to bring these in line. It enquired whether there would be any Faculty or Queen Mary initiatives to move towards a uniform weighting scheme. If this would not be the case, a uniform weighting would be decided upon internally and the required paperwork submitted.

iv. The Board approved the programme amendment.

Part 4 – Programme Withdrawals to Note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Summary of Programme Withdrawals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institute of Dentistry:

- MSc Implant Dentistry (A4S1)
- MClínDent (Integrated) FT Paediatric Dentistry (A4S7)
- MClínDent (Integrated) FT Periodontology (A4S6)
- MClínDent (Integrated) FT Prosthodontics (A4S8)
- MClínDent (Integrated) FT Oral Surgery (A4S9)
- MClínDent (Integrated) FT Orthodontics (A4Q9)
- MClínDent (Integrated) FT Oral Medicine (A4Q8)

2010:257 The Board considered and approved the above programme withdrawals for the, which had been approved by ATRPG.

Part 5 – Module Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. School of Business Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Knowledge-based Organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010:258 The Board considered a module proposal for Managing Knowledge-based Organisations and noted the following:

i. The proposal was originally submitted to the June meeting of PMAB but was deferred to the July meeting pending the submission of a significantly revised module proposal form.

ii. The Board approved the revised module proposal.

14. School of History

Islam and the West in the Middle Ages | PMAB2010-299 |

2010:259 The Board considered and approved a module proposal for Islam and the West in the Middle Ages.

15. School of Languages, Linguistics and Film

i. Witnessing: positioning yourself in the present | PMAB2010-300 |

2010:260 The Board considered a module proposal for Witnessing: positioning yourself in the present and noted the following:

i. Synoptic reassessment was specified by means of 2 elements of coursework; however the percentage contribution of each element required clarification.

   **Action:** SLLF / KB

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

   ii. Semester Abroad – Portuguese Erasmus Study Placement | PMAB2010-301 |
### 2010:261

The Board **considered** a module proposal for Semester Abroad – Portuguese Erasmus Study Placement and **noted** the following:

1. The specified assessment for the module did not equate to 100% and this required attention.  
   
   **Action:** SLLF

2. Due to the nature of the study placement module that would take place over the course of a year, the Board questioned how the fees for the module were calculated and whether students would pay the full £9,000 tuition fee.

3. A model was currently being drafted up regarding year abroad and placement provision. Under this arrangement it was proposed that fees could be linked to how intensive the support from Queen Mary was in supporting the module and its assessment.

4. It was agreed that the issue of calculating fee levels for the year abroad and year in industry would be discussed at the ‘2012’ group.

5. The proposal stated that standard reassessment would be used and therefore students would not be reassessed abroad and this was out of line with other courses within the School of Languages, Linguistics and Film. This required further consideration.

   **Action SLLF**

6. The Board **approved** the module proposal subject to the clarification of the points detailed above and the submission of a revised Module Proposal form. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

   **Action: SLLF / Chair**

### 2010:262

The Board **considered** and **approved** a module proposal for Advanced Semantic Theory.

### 2010:263

The Board **considered** and **approved** a module proposal for Advanced Syntactic Theory.

### 2010:264

The Board **considered** and **approved** a module proposal for Research Methods in Sociolinguistics.

### Centre for Commercial Law Studies

1. **Financial Models and Derivatives in a Legal Context**  
   PMAB2010-305

2. **Intellectual Property in the Sports Industry**  
   PMAB2010-306
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010:266</th>
<th>The Board <strong>considered</strong> and <strong>approved</strong> a module proposal for Intellectual Property in the Sports Industry.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Intellectual Property Unfair Competition and Consumer Protection PMAB2010-307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010:267</td>
<td>The Board <strong>considered</strong> and <strong>approved</strong> a module proposal for Intellectual Property Unfair Competition and Consumer Protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Intellectual Property in Biotechnology, Food and Agriculture PMAB2010-308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010:268</td>
<td>The Board <strong>considered</strong> and <strong>approved</strong> a module proposal for Intellectual Property in Biotechnology, Food and Agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Intellectual Property in the United States PMAB2010-309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010:269</td>
<td>The Board <strong>considered</strong> and <strong>approved</strong> a module proposal for Intellectual Property in the United States.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School of Medicine and Dentistry**

17. **Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry**

i. **Statistics, Ethics and Research** PMAB2010-310

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010:270</th>
<th>The Board <strong>considered</strong> a module proposal for Statistics, Ethics and Research and <strong>noted</strong> the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The module should be renamed to Advanced Statistics, Ethics and Research. This should be reflected in a revised module proposal form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action: RC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board <strong>approved</strong> the module proposal subject to the clarification of the points detailed above and the submission of a revised Module Proposal form. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action: RC / Chair</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Use and Investigation of Dental Tissues PMAB2010-311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2010:271 | The Board **noted** that the module proposal for Use and Investigation of Dental Tissues had already been considered and approved outside of the meeting via Chair’s Action and was originally approved at the March meeting of PMAB. |

18. **Blizard Institute**

| 2010:272 | The Board **considered** and **approved** a module proposal for Dissertations Portfolio. |

**Part 6 – Module Updates**

| Paper |  |  |
19. Summary of Approved Module Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PMAB2010-313</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010:273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board <strong>received</strong> and <strong>noted</strong> a summary of approved module updates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 7– Module Withdrawals

#### Summary of Module Withdrawals to Approve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Centre for Commercial Law Studies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Comparative Law in non-Western Contexts (QLLM015)  
  - Constitutional Law & Constitutional Rights in the USA (QLLM019)  
  - Modern Legal History (QLLM079)  |
| N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010:272</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Board <strong>considered</strong> and <strong>approved</strong> the withdrawal of the above modules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 8 – Other business

#### Dates of meetings for 2011/12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Dates of meetings for 2011/12:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Wednesday 26th October 2011 (1-3pm)  
  - Wednesday 23rd November 2011 (11-1pm)  
  - Tuesday 31st January 2012 (1-3pm)  
  - Wednesday 29th February 2012 (1-3pm)  
  - Wednesday 28th March 2012 (1-3pm)  
  - Tuesday 22nd May 2012 (1-3pm)  
  - Wednesday 27th June 2012 (1-3pm)  
  - Wednesday 25th July 2012 (1-3pm)  |
| N/A |