Taught Programmes Board

Minutes of the meeting of the Taught Programmes Board held on Wednesday 23 November 2011 at 11.00 in the Colette Bowe Room.

CONFIRMED

Present:
Professor Susan Dilly (Chair)
Dr Warren Boucher
Professor Omar Garcia-Obregon
Professor Olwyn Westwood

Dr Warren Boucher Professor Ray Croucher Professor Peter McOwan
Professor Omar Garcia-Obregon Dr Alastair Owens Dr Martha Prevezer
Professor Olwyn Westwood Oscar Williamson

In attendance:
Dr Katherine Bevan Ken Chow (Secretary) Dr Gabriel Gari
Alana Lythgoe Jane Pallant

Apologies:
Sam Brenton Dr Martin Carrier Professor Elizabeth Davenport
Professor Joy Hinson Dr Henri Huijberts Dr Theo Kreouzis
Professor Julia Shelton Dr Matthew Williamson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1 – Preliminary Items</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Minutes of the previous meeting</td>
<td>TPB2011-014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011:015 The Board **considered** and **confirmed** the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 26th October 2011, subject to a number of amendments to minute 2011:006 relating to Key Information Sets.

| 3. Matters Arising from the previous meeting | TPB2011-015 |

2011:016 The Board **received** a paper on the matters arising from the minutes of the previous (October) meeting of Taught Programmes Board. It was **noted** that there were a number of actions still to be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 2 – For Discussion</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2011:017 The Board **received** an oral report and tabled paper regarding the Key Information Sets initiative. The following points were **noted**:
i. Key Information Sets (KIS) were comparable sets of standardised information about undergraduate courses, which Higher Education Institutions were required to make available to students and other interested third-parties.

ii. A KIS would be required for each undergraduate course that was delivered full-time or part-time and that had a total duration of more than one year. However, there were a number of exceptions to this requirement, including: intercalated degrees; part-time courses that were also offered on a full-time basis; courses that were mainly offered overseas; and closed courses.

iii. KIS data would comprise the following areas of information that students had identified as useful: student satisfaction (derived from the NSS); course information; employment and salary data (from the DLHE survey); accommodation costs; financial information; and information from the Students’ Union.

iv. Information would be published by course stage, for example, 1st Year BSc Geography.

v. The data collection period would be run by ARCS from January to mid February 2012 to collect the course data (e.g. contact hours) which was not already captured in SIS.

vi. ARCS would develop further school/course-specific information including a draft template (based on KIS requirements) for use in the data collection exercise, which would be issued by Tuesday 13th December 2011. This would also detail how the information supplied for the KIS fitted together with existing data that was provided for the Student Information System (SIS) and for Taught Programmes Board.

    **Action:** ARCS

vii. HEFCE guidance stated that institutions could opt to use either actual 2011/12 data or predicted 2012/13 data for all course learning and teaching assessment activities. There was also scope to submit both actual and predicted data for different disciplines provided that there was not a mix of data for the same programme.

viii. Three categories of learning and teaching methods had been developed by the Quality Assurance Agency: scheduled learning and teaching activities; guided independent study; and placement/study abroad. Further information was available in the tabled paper, and in references contained within.

ix. Collection of the KIS was mandatory and would be reviewed on an annual basis.

x. Members of the Board questioned how other institutions would respond to the KIS and wider discussion within the sector regarding contact hours. Such detailed information from competitors was hard to obtain.

xi. A consistent and rational application of contact hours for different discipline areas should be adopted by Queen Mary.

xii. Information relating to contact hours and costs for competitor provision had been collated by the 2012 Group and revealed a number of notable differences.
xiii. The nature of teaching and learning methods and the proportion of time spent in such activities would be collected from Schools on a module basis.

xiv. The Year Abroad programme with the School of Languages, Linguistics and Film could present issues with regards to contact hours, which might vary according to different educational systems operating within countries.

xv. Queen Mary was currently exploring the purchase of the SITS component that was being developed by Tribal for the KIS. Using the Tribal KIS component would complement the existing SIS framework at QMUL and present a number of advantages for the collection and validation of data. The acquisition of the SITS component was being explored with IT Services and was fully supported by the Board.

xvi. HEFCE were reserving the right to audit any of the information and data that would be used to support the KIS and intended to carry out audits at a selection of institutions to assess the accuracy of the information used in the KIS.

xvii. HEFCE had provided a provisional timetable concerning the creation and publication of the 2012 KIS. The submission system for data collection would open during March 2012 with the final deadline for the submission of KIS data set as August 2012. Institutions would be able to preview the new official website with KIS and associated widgets from September 2012. The data can be viewed and signed-off by the institution in August prior to the system going live in September.

xviii. Board members acknowledged the importance of embedding KIS widgets and data onto Queen Mary web pages, particularly as this would allow Schools to put information relating to contact hours into context of the discipline. It was understood that Queen Mary Senior Executive Group would agree the institutional approach for this information.

xix. The further school/course-specific information, including the draft template for data collection that would be produced by ARCS by Tuesday 13th December 2011 should be considered by the 2012 Group before it was circulated to schools.

xx. Following discussion with representatives from Science and Engineering, Humanities and Social Sciences, and the School of Medicine and Dentistry it was suggested that it would be favourable to use actual, rather than predicted data. The process for verifying predicted data was debated, as this was currently unclear.

xxi. There was a consensus from Board members that the decision to use actual or predicted data should be informed by the consideration of actual data and whether the information relating to contact hours appeared acceptable.

xxii. Using predicted data could have implications on shifting forward the timescales for the collection of data from schools, although there was a fallback position if predicted data was used.

xxiii. ARCS was intending to email the Head of School and School Administration Managers to nominate a member of staff to act as a key contact for KIS data. This nominee would need to be familiar with undergraduate course provision within the respective school and possess an understanding of SIS. The tabled KIS paper presented to the Board would also be circulated by the
### Integrated Masters Programmes

**Oral Report**

#### 2011:018

The Board **received** an update regarding the internal standardisation of integrated masters awards. The Board **noted** the following:

- **i.** The paper produced by ARCS relating to Integrated Masters Programmes had been circulated for comment to colleagues within the Faculty of Science and Engineering.

- **ii.** Both the School of Geography and Mathematical Sciences had expressed support for the proposals made.

- **iii.** Feedback from all schools affected by the proposals would be considered at the January meeting of TPB and, following, further comments by the Board would go to the March meeting of Senate.

**Action:** ARCS

### Collaborative Provision Proposals: draft guidance and forms

**TPB2011-016**

2011:019

The Board **considered** draft guidance and forms relating to proposals for collaborative provision and **noted** the following:

- **i.** The processes for the approval of new collaborative provision proposals had been revised for 2011/12, in order to harmonise them with the new arrangements for programme and module approval introduced this year.

- **ii.** Board Members debated where the responsibility for approval of the partner should rest.

- **iii.** Under the proposed arrangement QMSE would receive a summary of information relating to the partnership with no senior institutional committee having considered, scrutinised and approved the detailed level information. Consequently, it was agreed that TPB should receive and approve the more detailed due diligence information for Stage 1 proposals. This would be made following QMSE consideration of the reputational aspect of an institution in terms of strategic level approval.

- **iv.** The brief summary that is to be submitted to QMSE, including the identification of risks, must be considered in advance of TPB scrutinising the due diligence information provided in Stage 1 and Stage 2 approval being considered. However, Stage 1 and Stage 2 approval could be considered in parallel at TPB.
TPB would be able to commission expertise from other departments as necessary to look at particular areas that may require specialist advice e.g. finance and health and safety.

ARCS would amend the draft guidance and forms to take into account of feedback from Board members. **Action: ARCS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 3 – Programme Proposals</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Centre for Commercial Law Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLM Paris (Part 2) and 24 associated module proposals</td>
<td>TPB2011-017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board **considered** a Part 2 programme proposal for the LLM Paris and 24 associated module proposals detailed above. The following points were **noted**:

i. The LLM Paris was a new initiative that involved collaboration with the University of London in Paris (ULIP). However, the LLM award would still be a Queen Mary (QM) award and as such QM would retain overall responsibility for the quality assurance of the programme and management of academic standards. The programme would be taught and assessed in English.

ii. Success of the LLM programme in London had, in part, prompted the development of the LLM Paris. In addition, there was a reasonable belief that a large number of French and other European practitioners would want to develop expertise in a niche area but did not have the time to study full time in London. The programme would therefore not be exclusive to British students and would have more of an international focus. The programme had broader strategic importance to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and Queen Mary as a whole.

iii. There would be four areas of specialisation offered on the LLM Paris: Banking and Finance Law; Intellectual Property Law; Comparative and International Dispute Resolution; and International Business Law.

iv. Teaching would be concentrated in the evenings and/or weekends.

v. Comments from both external advisors were extremely positive and the issues identified by externals relating to language support and support for module selection had now been addressed. The programme team had also been in touch with the Careers Service and was exploring the possibility of setting up a system of alumni ambassadors who would give advice and support to colleagues from their own jurisdictions.

vi. There were ongoing discussions with the French Bar to ascertain whether they would endorse the LLM Paris programme.

vii. The Board sought clarity as to whether there was support from staff to deliver modules in Paris within CCLS. This was confirmed as accurate and a number of module proposals from current staff had been put forward to TPB. The Director of CCLS had also encouraged staff to become involved in the delivery of modules.
viii. The business case for a Programme Director had been made and it was highly likely that this appointment would go ahead. Given the key nature of this role the Board stipulated that a condition of approval was that a Programme Director should be appointed.

ix. The LLM Paris would have an IELTS score of 7 as an entry requirement and this should be made clear within the Programme Specification. The Programme Specification should also be revisited and amended to ensure that it was appropriately tailored towards students. Currently, there were certain sections, such as the programme structure section that were more tailored towards academic and professional staff. In addition, a number of other minor documentary issues were highlighted by the Board and would be followed up outside of the meeting.

   **Action:** CCLS

x. Documentation relating to the partnership arrangements with ULIP was required to formally detail the resources and support that would be provided for the programme. This documentation should come to the January meeting of TPB.

   **Action:** CCLS

xi. The learning outcomes for the modules detailed below would benefit from enhancement to reflect level 7 learning outcomes:
   a. Banking Law I (International and Comparative Banking Regulation)
   b. Banking Law II (Banking Services Law)
   c. Ethics in Business and Finance
   d. Legal Aspects of International Finance I (Syndicated Lending)
   e. Legal Aspects of International Finance II (Securitisation and Bonds)

   **Action:** CCLS

xii. The Board **approved** the Part 2 programme proposal for the LLM Paris and 24 associated module proposals, subject to the items detailed above in points ix-xi and receipt of documentation relating to the partnership arrangements with ULIP. The School should submit a revised Programme Specification, and Module Proposal forms. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

   **Action:** CCLS / Chair

---

**Part 4 – Report of Proposals Approved by Schools/Institutes to Note**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Programme Amendments</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Suspensions</td>
<td>TPB2011-018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module Withdrawals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2011:021** The Board **noted** a report of decisions made by Schools/Institutes of changes to their curricula for the period 05/01/2011 – 02/11/2011. This comprised four module amendments and one programme amendment.

---

**Part 5 – Other business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011:022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action:** IoD / ARCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011:023</th>
<th>The Board <strong>discussed</strong> the mechanism used for the conversion of marks for study abroad programmes <strong>noted</strong> the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Marks for the study abroad element of a programme were converted at a local level within schools with the final converted mark then entered on SIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. There was some disparity in terms of the conversion scale currently used whereby a pass mark at Queen Mary equated to a fail mark in France. This had led to discussions within the French Department and a proposal was being developed to change the marking scheme used. It was expressed that external examiners should be consulted and that a report on the proposed new marking scheme could be submitted to TPB to ensure that the process would operate effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action:** SMD / ARCS
| 2011:024 | The meeting date of the Taught Programmes Board is Tuesday 31st January 2012 (1-3pm). The deadline for papers for this meeting is Tuesday 10th January 2012. |