Taught Programmes Board

Minutes of the meeting of the Taught Programmes Board held on Tuesday 31st January 2012 at 13.30 in the Colette Bowe Room at Mile End Campus

CONFIRMED

Present:
Professor Susan Dilly (Chair)
Professor Omar Garcia-Obregon
Dr Theo Kreouzis
Professor Peter McOwan

Dr Alastair Owens
Professor Julia Shelton
Professor Olwyn Westwood

Dr Matthew Williamson
Oscar Williamson

In attendance:
Dr Katherine Bevan
Ken Chow
Professor Trisha Greenhalgh

Professor Joy Hinson
Dr Simon Joel
Dr James Lancaster

Dr Falco Pfalzgraf
Alana Lythgoe (Secretary)

Apologies:
Dr Warren Boutcher
Sam Brenton
Dr Martin Carrier

Professor Ray Croucher
Professor Elizabeth Davenport
Dr Henri Huijberts

Jane Pallant
Dr Martha Prevezer
Professor Anthony Warrens

Part 1 – Preliminary Items

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

TPB2011-019

2011:025 The Board considered and confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 23rd November 2011.

3. Matters Arising From the Previous Meeting

TPB2011-020

2011:026 The Board received a paper on the matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting of Taught Programmes Board. It was noted that there were a number of actions still to be addressed.

Part 2 – For Discussion

4. Key Information Sets 2012/13

TPB2011-021

2011:027 The Board received a paper summarising recent progress in the area of Key Information Sets (KIS) since the November 2011 meeting. The following points were noted:

i. Data would be collected from Schools in two parts during a period between January to mid-February 2012. Part 1 requested information from Schools at a course level to determine whether a KIS dataset was required to be
published. With the exception of two Schools, the deadline for returning this information had been met. The process had generated a number of queries which had been resolved.

ii. Part 2 requested information at a modular level which would be used to calculate year of study data, such as the proportion of time spent in different learning and teaching activities and assessment types. The request had been circulated to all Schools with the exception of the MBBS. This approach was due to the different modular structure of the programme, which required careful consideration in relation to KIS parameters. It was anticipated that the data collection request would be circulated shortly, in consultation with the MBBS KIS contacts.

iii. The School of Geography had provided course and module level data as part of a pilot exercise. The pilot had revealed an issue in that the assessment method types, previously specified by Schools and captured on SIS, did not always map onto the assessment method categories defined by the QAA for the KIS return. Schools currently had some flexibility in defining assessment method categories, as complete granularity was not enforced in the SITS set-up to allow flexibility for pedagogical and discipline-specific reasons.

iv. However, the KIS process required assessments to be disaggregated according to QAA categories, and the Part 2 exercise would collect this data from Schools. There would be a need to ensure that module amendments processed following the Part 2 deadline met KIS requirements. The Board agreed that the schedule for making changes to programmes and modules for 2012 entry should be re-circulated to Schools. ARCS would also give further consideration as to whether proposal forms needed to be revised in light of KIS requirements.

Action: KB and AL

v. On a related but different point, a request had been received to make changes to the programme withdrawal form. This was following a query about programmes withdrawals in EECS. It was agreed that this would be discussed further outside the meeting.

Action: PM and KB

5. Integrated Masters Programmes

TPB2011-022

2011:028 The Board received a paper reporting the outcome of a consultation to make changes to the regulations for integrated masters programmes, including some issues for further consideration and suggested recommendations. The following points were noted:

i. That there was support for the first two proposals: to amend the QM Academic Credit Framework to require 120 credits at level 7; and to amend the pass mark so that it was linked to the level of the module. It was agreed that it would be feasible to implement the new regulations for students starting the first developmental year of their programme in September 2012.

ii. Other than the comments from SBCS, there were no further views, at this time, regarding introducing common year weightings for the classification of integrated masters awards.
iii. The Board agreed with the proposal that students who started the Science and Engineering Foundation Programme combined route in September 2011, entering developmental year one of their programme in September 2012, should be subject to the new regulations. The applicability statement would be amended to reflect this.

iv. Students from partner organisations entering integrated masters programmes through articulation agreements would follow the regulations for the cohort that they joined. Students on these arrangements would sign up to the detail of the programme and academic regulations when they join the QMUL programme.

v. The MSci Environmental Science in Geography was due to start in September 2012, however there was the option for current students meeting the requirements to transfer onto the programme. The Board agreed that it would be preferable for the new regulations to apply in these instances, and that cases should be considered through the request for suspension of regulations process.

vi. Some Schools allowed undergraduate students to take level 7 modules as part of their bachelors degree. The Board discussed whether this practice should continue given that the pass mark would be linked to the level of module. It was noted that if it did, it would raise issues of parity for level 6 students choosing to take them should they fail. The Board agreed that Schools should have the option to allow students to study the content of modules that were currently at level 7; however they should be assessed at level 6 with commensurate learning outcomes and assessment methods. This would require Schools to create new versions of those modules at level 6 and it was agreed that this action should be clearly identified as a task in the implementation procedure.

vii. Students studying on the BUPT/QM Joint Programme, whilst not on an integrated masters programme, did take level 7 QM modules as part of their bachelors programme. This was to ensure that the programme had the technical content compatible with a Chinese degree. Joint Programme (JP) students also had the option to come to QMUL and take level 7 modules as part of their programme. These modules needed to remain in the programme with a 40% pass mark. The Board felt that it should be feasible to identify a solution to retain the content of these modules with the undergraduate pass mark. It was agreed that ARCS would liaise with the JP Director to identify a way forward.

viii. There was discussion about whether to embark on a review of the College Mark for a pass degree for integrated masters programmes, which currently sat in the undergraduate classification scheme as opposed to the postgraduate. It was suggested that progression hurdles were used to maintain higher standards and should students wish to receive a masters classification they would take a separate masters programme following a bachelors degree. The Board agreed not to pursue this issue further.

ix. The use of progression hurdles had also been recently raised in the context of student performance. The standard academic regulations simply required that students must pass a minimum number of credits each year to progress, however there were special regulations in place for integrated masters programmes in all Schools with the exception of Maths. There was some variability across and within Schools in the progression hurdles used.
The Board agreed that it was desirable to have a minimum progression requirement in place for all integrated masters programmes and that the rationale within Maths should be explored with a view to implementing a minimum.

x. The Board agreed to recommend to Senate the proposal to amend the QM Academic Credit Framework to require 120 credits at level 7; and to amend the pass mark for postgraduate modules so that it is linked to the level of the module. This was subject to the caveats detailed in points vi and vii. A revised implementation plan and procedure would be circulated to all relevant Schools for action.

Action: AL and all relevant Schools

6. Programme and Module Proposals: signatures for forms

2011:029 At the November 2011 meeting of the Deans for Taught Programmes Group, it was agreed that the Head of School/Institute could delegate sign off for programme and module proposal forms to the Director of Taught Programmes, if desired. The Board ratified this proposal.

Action: ARCS


2011:030 The Board received a report from the Vice-Principal (Humanities and Social Sciences) on QMSE’s relationship with the University of London Institute in Paris (ULIP). The Board noted the progress made by Consortium partners to develop a strategy and business plan for the future of ULIP. A contract was being developed that would detail the facilities and services to be provided to support the delivery of the LLM programme. It was anticipated that this would be submitted to the February meeting of TPB.

Part 3 – Programme Proposals

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

8. School of Language, Linguistics and Film

MA Language Teaching and nine associated module proposals

2011:031 The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal for the MA Language Teaching and nine associated module proposals. The following points were noted:

i. The programme was designed to exploit the demand for a general language teaching qualification that would be recognised in the EU and beyond. It was intended to appeal to home and international students who wanted to study to teach any foreign language. It was proposed that the programme would provide a thorough theoretical foundation to students who wished to teach languages.

ii. The comments from the external adviser had duly been considered by the programme proposers. In particular it was recognised that there should be further practical elements to the programme, these would be built into modules as the programme evolved.
iii. In the ‘Teachers as Learners - Learners as Teachers’ module students would learn an additional language and receive a certificate for this module. It was clarified that this was not a credit-bearing certificate and would be administered within the School.

iv. The Board queried whether there would be any additional named awards with the MA that students could register on directly as the target award e.g. PGCert and PGDip. Whilst students would be able to exit the programme with a lower qualification should the circumstances arise, offering additional target awards were preferable from a student perspective. Should the programme proposers decide to offer dedicated entry routes they should specify the named awards and the curriculum structure in revised paperwork.

v. That attention should be paid to the documentation in the following areas:

- There was no applicable QAA benchmark statement; instead descriptors were available to inform curriculum design. The programme specification should be amended to reflect this.
- It should be made absolutely clear that the programme was different to a PGCE and was not recognised as such. It was noted that the programme team intend to look into the options for other kinds of professional accreditation/recognition in the future.
- The entry requirements for the programme should be amended to also include a degree in language education as an entry route.
- In addition, a number of other minor documentary issues were highlighted by the Board and would be followed up outside of the meeting.

vi. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal for the MA Language Teaching and nine associated module proposals, subject to the items detailed above in points iv-v. The School was required to submit a revised Programme Specification and Module Proposal forms. The revised documentation would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

Action: SLLF / Chair

School of Medicine and Dentistry

9. Blizard Institute

BSc (Intercalated) Global Public Health and Primary Care and ten associated module proposals

TPB2011-026

2011:032 The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal for the BSc (Intercalated) Global Public Health and Primary and Care and ten associated module proposals. The following points were noted:

i. That this programme had been developed alongside three postgraduate taught programmes; they were designed to be intellectually coherent interdisciplinary provision. It was intended that some core content would be shared between the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes; however the learning outcomes and assessment methods would be distinct according to the academic level of the module. The programme team was mindful of the potential risks in sharing content across levels. Adequate student support
would be put in place to ensure that the arrangement was weighted towards benefiting both levels of students. The team would also engage with ongoing student evaluations of the programmes to ensure this.

ii. The programme team had scrutinised every module to delineate the learning outcomes between level 6 and 7. The Board recognised this work, but advised about potentially underestimating level 6 outcomes as there was some variability across module assessment loads. It was accepted that the assessments had been designed to reflect the relative effort required from the differing content of modules.

iii. Whilst the minimum numbers of student registrations appeared low on some modules (due to undergraduate student number controls), there would be a critical mass as the teaching would be shared with postgraduate students.

iv. The Board discussed whether students taking the intercalated BSc should be allowed to go on and study one of the other Masters programmes in the suite. It was agreed that the programme team should set a rule and provide guidance in both sets of programme documentation.

v. It was queried whether the BDS should be mentioned in the programme specification under the entry requirements. In addition, some other minor issues were highlighted by the Board that would be followed up outside of the meeting.

vi. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal for the BSc (Intercalated) Global Public Health and Primary Care and ten associated module proposals, subject to the items detailed above in points iv-v. The Institute 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: Blizard Institute / Chair

Part 4 – Programme Amendments

School of Medicine and Dentistry

10. Barts Cancer Institute

MSc Cancer Therapeutics

TPB2011-027

2011:033 The Board considered a programme amendment for the MSc Cancer Therapeutics to: extend the period of registration to up to 5 years for part time students; have 2 intakes per year (to include a new intake in January); and to allow students to register for a PGCert or PGDip as an alternative to a full MSc.

The following points were noted:

i. The programme was offered both on campus and in part time distance learning modes. The rationale for the proposed changes was the demand from students for flexible modes of study, where they could accommodate their professional development whilst undertaking clinical training elsewhere.

ii. That the request to extend the period of registration was not deemed to be a
concern because of the high quality of the students. It was clarified that the proposal was to offer the distance learning mode of the programme with a variable duration, which would be up to a maximum of five years.

iii. The Board agreed that a typical structure for the maximum period of registration should be defined for the distance learning modes of each named award. Where students would be expected to complete the taught element within three years and the dissertation in two for an MSc award, and the taught element within two years and three years for the PGCert and PGDip awards respectively.

iv. The Board discussed the rationale for introducing a January intake, and noted that it would be offered in a part time mode only. As the January intake would join the programme with an alternative order in their module diet, these students would be assessed for their suitability and previous experience. The Board agreed that the recommended module diet for students in the January part-time intake should be specified in an updated programme specification.

vii. The Board approved the programme amendment to the MSc Cancer Therapeutics subject to the items detailed above in points iii-iv. The Institute should submit a revised Programme Specification which would be considered outside of the Board by Chair’s Action.

Action: Institute of Cancer / Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 5 – Academic Regulations</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of History</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. MA History of Political Thought and Intellectual History (joint award with UCL)</td>
<td>TPB2011-028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011:034 The Board considered and approved a proposal to publish special regulations for 2012/13 for the collaborative programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011:035 The Board considered and approved a proposal to change the 2012 Postgraduate Laws regulations. It had also been agreed that the November meeting of Taught Programmes Board would be the annual point for QMUL approval of the Postgraduate Laws regulations going forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 6 – Collaborative Provision</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. New Partner Due Diligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. University of Western Australia – study abroad partnership</td>
<td>TPB2011-029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011:036 TPB considered the due diligence information regarding a proposal to form a new partnership with the University of Western Australia. It was agreed that no further</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
information was required on the good standing of the partner, and no risks were identified. The Board endorsed the proposal to establish a new partnership with the University of Western Australia.

ii. University of Illinois at Urbana – study abroad/exchange partnership

2011:037 TPB considered the due diligence information regarding a proposal to form a new partnership with the University of Illinois at Urbana. It was agreed that no further information was required on the good standing of the partner, and no risks were identified. The Board endorsed the proposal to establish a new partnership with the University of Illinois.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 6 – Report of Proposals Approved by Schools/Institutes to Note</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Programme Amendments&lt;br&gt;Module Proposals&lt;br&gt;Module Amendments&lt;br&gt;Module Withdrawals</td>
<td>TPB2011-031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011:038 i. The Board noted a report of decisions made by Schools/Institutes of changes to their curricula for the period 03/11/2011 – 10/01/12. This comprised eight module amendments, three module proposals, sixteen module withdrawals, and eleven programme amendments.

ii. The Board also noted that the code assigned to a new SLLF module needed to be revised.

Secretary’s Note: the School had been recorded incorrectly in the report. The code was correct and referred to a new module in the School of English and Drama.

Action: ARCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 7 – Report from the Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions Group (MRAG) to Note</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Programme Withdrawals</td>
<td>TPB2011-032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011:039 The Board noted that a decision had been taken by MRAG to approve the withdrawal of four programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 8 – Other business</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Any other business</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Dates of next meeting

2011:040 The meeting date of the Taught Programmes Board is Wednesday 29th February 2012 (1-3pm).

The deadline for papers for this meeting is Wednesday 8th February 2012.