Taught Programmes Board

Minutes of the meeting of the Taught Programmes Board held on Wednesday 24 October 2012 at 2.00 p.m. in the School of Science & Engineering Seminar Room, Mile End Campus.

CONFIRMED

Present:
Professor Susan Dilly (Chair)  Sam Brenton  Professor Elizabeth Davenport
Professor Omar Garcia-Obregon  Dr Theo Kreouzis  Jade Lee
Dr Lawrence Pettit  Dr Martha Prevezer  Professor Julia Shelton

In attendance:
Dr Katherine Bevan  Daniel Chandler (Secretary)  Dr Leone Leonida
Sian Marshall  Dr Lutao Ning  Dr Roger Nix
Jane Pallant

Apologies:
Dr Martin Carrier  Simon Hayter  Professor Joy Hinson
Dr Henri Huijberts  Professor Richard Ibbetson  Dr Alastair Owens
Professor Olwyn Westwood

Part 1 – Preliminary Items

1. Welcome and Apologies  N/A

2. Terms of Reference and 2012-13 Membership  TPB2012-001

   2012-001  The terms of reference and membership were noted.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting  TPB2012-002

   2012-002  The Board considered and confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 25th July 2012.

4. Matters Arising From the Previous Meeting  TPB2012-003

   2012-003  The Board received a paper on the matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting of Taught Programmes Board. The following points were noted:
i. The non-standard duration for the proposed Master of Public Administration had been approved by the University of London Collegiate Council. A Part Two proposal and more detailed programme specification would now be submitted to TPB (min. TPB 2011.107).

ii. It was noted that the Task and Finish Group on the intercalated degree regulations would produce its final recommendations in time for submission to the February 2013 TPB. It was confirmed that Dr Alan Cruchley was now the Institute of Dentistry representative on the TFG (min. TPB 2011.122).

iii. TPB was concerned that the availability of necessary clinical resources to run the MClinDent Endodontology programme had not been confirmed. It was decided that the Secretary of TPB would write to Professors Joy Hinson, Anthony Warrens, Richard Ibbetson and Farida Fortune to request that the issue be addressed immediately (min. TPB 2011.06).

iv. SMD would be asked to provide feedback to the March 2013 meeting of TPB on the idea to introduce the dissertation case reports module (developed for the MSc Gastroenterology programme) to other clinical programmes (min. TPB 2011.120).

v. It was noted that the action to develop language modules for historians by History in liaison with SLLF (min. TPB 2011.076) had now been overtaken by the general project of developing a QM-wide language strategy (min. TPB 2011.086). These issues would now be linked in the TPB outstanding actions.

vi. It was agreed that Professor Davenport would chase for a response from the Institute of Dentistry on the clarification of the mark scheme for the Diploma in Dental Hygiene and Therapy (min. TPB 2011.112).

Part 2 – For Discussion

5. Programme & Module Development Guidelines and Forms

2012-004 It was noted that ARCS had reviewed the forms and guidelines for the new academic session. The addition of extra fields on the forms to capture information for the Key Information Sets (KIS) and to flag Academic Technology Approval Scheme (ATAS) sensitivity, was noted.

TPB noted the decision to move the deadline in the ARCS calendar forward to the 27th March, for most undergraduate programme and module changes, to accommodate early module selection and other processes. It was decided however, that this had now been overshadowed by new arrangements being discussed for the SMART timetable project and deadlines would now need to be reconsidered.

There was a discussion on whether the process deadlines would need to be set earlier in the year to facilitate the SMART project. The SMART project lead would be releasing a more detailed report soon. It was noted, however, that the QM Senior Executive had received a report indicating a deadline of 14th February by which 90% of the information on modules running would be needed. Guidance would need to be developed for modules falling within the 10% not meeting the
early deadline.

Members discussed the need to balance the requirements of the technical process with the needs of Schools and Institutes to have flexibility and creativity in organising their teaching. A distinction should be drawn between the educational and academic rationale for setting process deadlines and the purely technical rationale. It was generally felt that there would be scope within the SMART project for holding measures for timetabling purposes when teaching arrangements could not be confirmed until later in the year. The nature and necessary coverage of those measures had yet to be discussed.

It was decided that a summary of deadlines, guidance and procedures necessitated by the SMART project would be presented by ARCS to the next TPB.

**Action: ARCS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 3 – Programme Amendments</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. School of Economics and Finance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc Programmes in Economics and Finance</td>
<td>TPB2012-005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012-005 Dr Leone Leonidas, School of Economics and Finance, presented the proposal to change the Master’s scheme of award to make the threshold for distinction an average greater than 65% across the taught elements in addition to a mark greater than 65% in the dissertation and an overall average of 70%. Dr Leonidas explained that this had arisen from comments made by their external examiner.

TPB was reluctant to introduce another variation on the Master’s scheme of award. It was felt that the current QM definitions of distinction were rigorous enough. It was ascertained that under the current scheme, a student who achieved 65% or less across the taught elements would need to achieve a dissertation mark of well over 80% to pass the threshold to a distinction award. This was considered to be a highly unlikely scenario. Dr Leonidas accepted this argument and would take this back to the School.

On this basis, TPB did not approve the proposed amendment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 4 – Collaborative Provision</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Stage One Partnership &amp; Programme Proposals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Articulation Agreement with Sichuan</td>
<td>TPB2012-006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012-006 Dr Theo Kreouzis, School of Physics and Astronomy, explained that the current proposal was for articulation into Physics and Astronomy programmes but further articulation in other Schools was planned. Some progress had been made on module mapping with the Sichuan programme. It was pointed out that the mapping
was primarily to assure equivalence of the students’ study at the partner institution and detect areas not adequately covered by the partner’s programme, where articulating students would need extra teaching or support at QM.

There was a query in relation to the form of articulation whereby the Sichuan student would enter the third year of the four year MSci. Such students who failed to progress to the fourth (MSci) year would not be awarded a BSc or any other qualification by QM as they would only have completed one year of study. It was unclear from the draft agreement whether Sichuan would accredit the students’ one year of study at QM towards their overall Sichuan degrees. This point should be clarified and stated.

TPB approved the stage one proposal subject to any modifications that needed to be made in relation to the point discussed on non-progression on the MSci degree. A part two proposal with complete mapping would be submitted to TPB.

Action: School of Physics & Astronomy

ii. Joint Programme with Nanchang

Dr Roger Nix, School of Biological and Chemical Sciences, presented the programme proposal. He explained that it would be based on the BUPT model with QM Staff travelling to Nanchang to deliver teaching. It was noted that the QM programme in Biomedical Science would not have any part in qualifying the student to practice medicine in China or elsewhere. The structure should be regarded as similar to a medical degree (in this case from Nanchang) intercalated with a BSc in Biomedical Science.

It was noted that the Chinese Ministry of Education had still not given formal sanction for the programme but work would need to progress now if the programme was to be ready to admit students in 2013.

TPB supported the part one proposal. A part two proposal, including individual proposals for the new modules, would need to be submitted to TPB. Whilst the programme would follow the BUPT template, bespoke programme regulations, including the scheme of award, would have to be devised and approved by both partners. It was suggested that representatives from ARCS meet with the QM programme leads to discuss these next steps.

Action: SBCS / ARCS

iii. Articulation Agreement with Renmin

Dr Lutao Ning, School of Business and Management, presented the proposal which was partly a renewal of an existing agreement with Renmin involving the School of Economics and Finance and partly the introduction of new pathways in Mathematical Finance and programmes in Business and Management.

It was pointed out that the proposal contained pathways which were genuine
articulations (the 2+2 model) and others which were not. In particular, the pathway whereby the Renmin student entered at the start of the QM Bachelor’s programme, having passed the Chinese university entrance examination (Gao Kao) and the Renmin preparation for overseas study programme, was not a genuine articulation. Such a student would do the full, three year QM degree and QM would not be accrediting any previous university level study at Renmin. It was argued that this was a non-guaranteed admissions arrangement, combined with a form of agency agreement.

The Chair suggested that such admission agreements should be considered by the Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions Group (MRAG) as this body had the expertise in this area. TPB also noted that, given the student numbers on the existing programme and the administration fee paid by QM to Renmin, the business case for the proposal did not seem particularly strong. That observation would be fed back to the HSS Faculty and the International Partnerships Office.

It was decided that the genuine articulation agreements, as defined in the Board’s discussion, should be extracted from the current proposal and submitted again to TPB. It was agreed that these articulations could be considered by Chair’s action.

**Action: SEF / SBM / Secretary**

iv. Co-operation Agreements with Beijing Foreign Studies University (BFSU) and Bahia TPB2012-008/009

TPB noted that these submissions were general agreements to co-operate without substantial collaborative programmes or articulations proposed. If institutional oversight was required, it would be mainly for strategic overview and more importantly, the monitoring of reputational risk.

It was suggested that the Vice-Principal for Research and International Affairs could take a lead on this at the institutional level. If a forum was required a new group could possibly be set up.

The Chair agreed to raise this issue at the QM Senior Executive.

**Action: Chair of TPB**

8. **Chair’s Actions on Collaborative Arrangements** TPB2012-010

2012-009 The Board noted a report of Chair’s actions on collaborative arrangements taken during the summer recess.

**Part 5 – Report of Proposals Approved by Schools/Institutes to Note** Paper

9. **Programme Amendments** TPB2012-011

**Module Proposals**

**Module Amendments**
Module Withdrawals

2012-010  The Board noted a report of decisions made by Schools/Institutes of changes to their curricula for the period from 4th July to 3rd October 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 6 – Other business</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Any other business</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-011  There was none reported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Date of next meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-012  The next meeting date of the Taught Programmes Board would be Wednesday 28th November 2012, at 2.00 p.m. The deadline for papers would be Wednesday 7th November 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>