Taught Programmes Board

Minutes of the meeting of the Taught Programmes Board held on Tuesday 22 May 2012 at 13.00 in the SEMS Seminar Room, Engineering Building.

CONFIRMED

Present:
Professor Susan Dilly (Chair)
Sam Brenton
Professor Ray Croucher
Professor Elizabeth Davenport
Professor Joy Hinson
Dr Henri Huijberts
Professor Anthony Warrens
Professor Omar Garcia-Obregon
Dr Theo Kreouzis
Professor Alastair Owens
Dr Martha Prevezer
Professor Julia Shelton
Professor Olwyn Westwood
Dr Matthew Williamson
Oscar Williamson

In attendance:
Dr Katherine Bevan
Dr Thomas Dixon
Dr Yue Chen
Dr Gabriel Gari
Ken Chow
Professor Greenwald
Dr Alan Cruchley
Jane Pallant
Professor Peter McOwan

Dr Roger Nix
Professor Morag Shiach
Professor Mike Watkinson
Emma Yates

Apologies:
Dr Warren Boutcher
Professor Peter McOwan

Part 1 – Preliminary Items

1. Welcome and Apologies
N/A

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
TPB2011-049

2011:065 The Board considered and confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 28th March 2012.

3. Matters Arising From the Previous Meeting
TPB2011-050

2011:066 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. A number of outstanding actions detailed in the matters arising action sheet had now been completed (minutes 2011:023 and 2011:047-48).

ii. There were a number of longstanding items that had yet to be resolved and where revised documentation from proposing schools had not been submitted. These items would be investigated further and removed from the actions summary sheet where necessary.
Part 2 – For Discussion

4. **Key Information Sets 2012/13**

The Board *received* an oral report summarising recent progress in the area of Key Information Sets (KIS) since the March 2012 meeting. The following points were *noted*:

i. SLLF had not yet provided a response to the data request made from ARCS. This matter would be investigated further outside of the meeting so that the required data was obtained.

*Action: SLLF / ARCS*

Part 3 – Programme Proposals

School of Medicine and Dentistry

5. **Institute of Dentistry**

MClinDent Endodontontology (Part 2) and 9 associated module proposals

The Board *considered* a Part 2 programme proposal for the MClinDent Endodontontology and nine associated module proposals. The following points were *noted*:

i. The Master of Clinical Dentistry in Endodontontology, would be offered in both full time and part time modes of study.

ii. The full-time programme was a two year specialised clinical programme and it was envisaged that the programme would prove very popular, especially with international applicants.

iii. A premium fee rate would be charged to students for this programme. This was because of the cost and intensity of delivery associated with the programme.

iv. Although the programme was proposed for a September 2012 start it would effectively not start recruiting until September 2013.

v. There was some dependence on the Barts and London Hospital Trust in terms of providing clinical support and access to resources for the programme. This was a potential area for concern and a decision would be taken by December 2012 regarding the necessary resources to support the programme. If the clinical resources were not in place then the programme would not run.

vi. TPB would receive clarification and an update from the Institute of Dentistry at its November 2012 meeting as to whether the necessary clinical resources were in place to enable the programme to run.

*Action: IoD / ARCS*

vii. A number of modules, such as Clinical Endodontic Practice 2, had a coursework element of assessment detailed that was assigned a
percentage weighting of zero. This was understood to be formative assessment that was assessed on a pass / fail basis.

viii. The standard of documentation was commendable and the programme objectives and learning outcomes clearly aligned with relevant internal and national reference points and guidelines.

ix. The commentary provided by external advisor was very thorough and detailed and these recommendations and suggestions have actively been addressed.

x. The Board approved the MClinDent Endodontology and nine associated module proposals.

Part 4 – Programme Amendments

6. School of Biological Sciences

i. MSci Chemistry (F103)
MSci Pharmaceutical Chemistry (F152)
MSci Pharmaceutical Chemistry with a Year in Industry (F153)

2011:069 The Board considered a programme amendment for the above MSci programmes within SBCS. The following points were noted:

i. The proposed amendment to the MSci Chemistry and MSci Pharmaceutical Chemistry related to changing the year 3 to year 4 progression criteria to: 315 credits passed, with a minimum overall average (based on a 1:2:3 weighting of all modules from years 1, 2 and 3) of 60%. These amendments would give more consistent progression criteria across the suite of MSci programmes offered across SBCS.

ii. Board members were of the opinion that the changes were logical and supported the rationale behind them.

iii. The MSci Pharmaceutical Chemistry with a Year in Industry was a slightly different programme compared with other Year in Industry programmes at Queen Mary. This was because the credit for the Year in Industry was assessed and counted towards a student’s degree classification.

iv. The proposed amendment to the MSci Pharmaceutical Chemistry related to amending the progression criteria to year 1 to year 2, and the year 3 to year 4.

v. Pharmaceutical companies would only normally consider interviewing "first-class "candidates for possible placements.

vi. SBCS wanted to ensure that students going out on placements were the very best students, so as to build up the reputation of Queen Mary as a university which can be trusted as a source of good placement students.

vii. Students who were not successful in obtaining a placement were transferred onto the standard MSci programme. However, students doing the Year in Industry programme were typically higher calibre students.
viii. Admission criteria for the Year in Industry MSci programme were more stringent than for the standard MSci programme and placements for the programme were very competitive.

ix. The proposed amendment would serve to emphasise to students how important their first-year performance was to obtaining a placement.

x. The Board approved the programme amendments for the above MSci programmes.

ii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSc Chemistry (F100)</td>
<td>TPB2011-053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSci Chemistry (F103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc Chemistry with Biochemistry (F1C7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSci Pharmaceutical Chemistry (F152)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSci Pharmaceutical Chemistry with a Year in Industry (F153)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc Pharmaceutical Chemistry (F154)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011:070 The Board considered a programme amendment for the above undergraduate programmes within SBCS. The following points were noted:

i. The changes concerned the review of first-year chemistry degree programmes and aimed to improve students’ practical training and their experience of practical chemistry during the first year of their studies. It would also provide a mechanism for meeting the Royal Society of Chemistry accreditation requirements.

ii. The first year curriculum had evolved since the Periodic Review of SBCS and there was some overlap between modules that this amendment would address. Delivery of certain topics had been reorganised, although there had been no substantial change in module content.

iii. Within SBCS there was a general perception that students were being over assessed. At the moment, each first year student was required to sit eight 2 hour 30 minute examinations in May. The proposed consolidation of modules, along with other proposed changes (would effectively reduce the examining load to two 3 hour examinations (for the 30 credit modules), and two 2 hour examinations (for the 15 credit modules). In effect the exam load would be reduced from 20 hours to 10 hours.

iv. Practical training in chemistry was currently provided as a component of a number of first-year modules, with 3-4 practicals being carried out and assessed as part of the "coursework" component of a normal chemistry module. This fragmentation of practical training did not facilitate a coherent and consistent approach to the training of first-year students in the essential practical techniques of chemistry.

v. The introduction of a dedicated practical chemistry module would provide students with a more coherent learning experience and better practical training. This approach was very much support by Board members.

vi. The Board approved the programme amendments for the above undergraduate programmes within SBCS and the five associated module proposals and three associated module amendments.

7. School of Engineering and Materials Science
The Board considered a programme amendment for the BEng and MEng programmes within SEMS and thirteen associated module proposals. The following points were noted:

i. The proposed amendment related to the second phase of restructuring the undergraduate programmes within SEMS and mainly focused on the 2nd year of the programmes. This was linked to the periodic review of SEMS where it was recommended that the engineering programmes be reviewed in order to integrate and enrich materials more fully.

ii. A number of modules would have their title changed to more accurately reflect the contents and subject of the module.

iii. SEMS was currently looking at years 3 and 4 of its undergraduate programmes and was planning to have any changes completed and approved by the end of the calendar year. However, it was expressed that there would be less changes associated with years 3 and 4.

iv. The Board approved the programme amendment for the BEng and MEng programmes within SEMS and the thirteen associated modules proposals.

---

The Board considered a programme amendment for the LLM and Postgraduate Diploma and seven associated module proposals. The following points were noted:

i. The amendment concerned creating a new route specialism and award title in Insurance Law for both the LLM and Postgraduate Diploma.

ii. There were already ten specialisations offered through the LLM programme, including specialisations in Banking and Financial Law, Commercial and Comparative Law, and Competition Law.

iii. Few UK universities offered a specialisation in insurance law and this was seen as a niche area that CCLS wanted to capitalise upon.

iv. The Board approved the programme amendment for the LLM and the seven associated module proposals.

---

The Board considered a programme amendment for the BA German and Russian (European Studies) and one associated module proposal. The following points were noted:

i. The change related to introduction of a five year variant of the
programme, allowing for preliminary year entry students to also undertake a year abroad.

ii. Ab initio students did not presently have the opportunity to undertake a year abroad. This had been seen as undesirable as it extended the degree to five years. However, there were no pedagogical reasons to prevent students from having the option to take the year abroad, either in Russian or, for joint honours students, in their other language.

iii. The Board approved the programme amendment for the BA German and Russian (European Studies) and one associated module proposal.

School of Medicine and Dentistry

10. Learning Institute

Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice and 3 associated module proposals

TPB2011-057

The Board considered a programme amendment for the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice and 3 associated module proposals. The following points were noted:

i. The Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP) was an accredited qualification, nationally recognised through the Higher Education Academy and worth 60 credits at level 7. The aim of the programme was to develop the knowledge, skills and principles required to be effective in academic practice.

ii. Staff who had undertaken the PGCAP but who had left the programme early, despite successfully completing a number of modules, did not receive any formal recognition for their achievements. This was seen to unfairly disadvantage staff.

iii. The proposed amendment related to restructuring the PGCAP to embed the Certificate in Learning and Teaching (CILT) within PGCAP as a lower qualification. Both PGCAP and CILT will continue to be offered as separate qualifications.

iv. The change would apply from September 2012.

v. The Board approved the programme amendment for the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice and three associated module proposals.

Part 5 – Module Proposals

11. School of Physics and Astronomy

Group Project for Physicists

TPB2011-058

The Board considered a module proposal for Group Project for Physicists. The following points were noted:

i. The module was being put forward to the Board as it involved external collaboration through projects with industrial organisations and the NHS.
ii. Physics students did not generally undertake group work as part of their programme of studies and this made students less employable. This module was therefore designed to address the lack of group work within the curriculum and at the same time enhance students' employability.

iii. The Institute of Physics had provided some funding for the module and discussions were taking place over the involvement of potential external collaborators. If there was a shortfall of external collaborators to provide projects these projects would be supplemented by internal projects where necessary.

iv. All assessment associated with the module would be carried out by Queen Mary staff. As part of the assessment students would submit both group and individual assessments.

v. The oral group presentation was listed as the final element of assessment and it was understood that all students had to be present for this. Members of the Board suggested that having the oral group presentation as the final element of assessment may disadvantage individual students to some extent. As a result members suggested that the final element of assessment should be altered to individual report. This suggested change was welcomed by the school.

vi. Members of the Board suggested that the module was likely to be challenging to students given the assessment load for the module and taking into account that it was worth 15 credits.

vii. The Board approved the module proposal Group Project for Physicists, subject to amending the final element of assessment as detailed above. 

Action: SoPA

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

12. School of History

Various undergraduate module proposals across levels 4-6 TPB2011-059

2011:076 The Board considered various undergraduate module proposals across levels 4-6 within the School of History. The following points were noted:

i. The above module proposals were put forward to the Board for consideration and approval since they constituted a significant development for the School of History’s undergraduate curriculum.

ii. The School of History had undertaken a review of its entire curriculum. At level 4 the aim of this review was to offer the students a number of broad chronological courses that would prepare them for the more focused and detailed courses which they would pursue at levels 5 and 6 and also remedy the situation arising from the fragmented nature of A level history. In addition the new courses were designed to offer a more global approach to European and British history than was the case in the existing modules.

iii. A number of the level 5 modules were completely new whilst others had been created to adapt existing level 4 modules.
iv. The new level 6 modules had been developed to address the previous shortage of level 6 modules that students could choose. This included a number of new special subject modules, which formed a key part of the School’s level 6 provision.

v. The School as in progress of completing the necessary module withdrawal forms stemming from the curriculum review and the development of the above new modules.

vi. The new 1st year curriculum would be delivered for the first time in September 2012.

vii. All of the programme specifications within the School of History had been amended to reflect the changes to the curriculum.

viii. Board members commended the high standard of documentation that had been received.

ix. The amount of assessment for some of the first year modules was fairly substantial. This was intentional and the assessment load had carefully been considered and was consistent with the current practice within History.

x. Further changes at level 5 would not be significant, although at level 6 there would be a number of new supplementary modules developed.

xi. Members of the Board sought clarity on the delivery of language modules for historians, specifically in terms of the quality assurance arrangements.

xii. The School of Languages, Linguistics and Film would liaise with the School of History outside of the meeting to clarify the arrangements for the delivery of language modules for historians. An update on this matter would be presented to the Board at its June meeting.

   Action: SLLF / SoH / ARCS

xiii. The Board approved the various undergraduate module proposals across levels 4-6 within the School of History.

School of Medicine and Dentistry

Institute of Dentistry

13. BDS Year 1 Module TPB2011-060

2011:077 The Board considered a module proposal for BDS Year 1 Module. The following points were noted:

i. The proposal related to the revision of the content of year 1 of the BDS in response to the General Dental Council’s (GDC) review of learning outcomes that the newly qualified dentist and other members of the dental team must achieve in order to be eligible for registration. This included the integration of professionalism, teamwork and management within curriculum.

ii. The new module would start in September 2012 and accounted for 120 credits.
iii. In developing the new module student feedback and the results from the recent NSS had actively been taken into account. There was also a desire to incorporate more modern teaching techniques.

iv. The curriculum of the BDS had now been organised around five key themes. However, it was not clear how these themes had been incorporated into the latter years of the programme or how they aligned with the assessment for modules.

v. It was originally planned to implement changes to years 1 to 5 of the BDS programme in one go but due to a number of mitigating factors this had not been possible. Consequently, a fall-back position had been suggested as the end of the calendar year for implementing changes across years 2-5 of the programme. In line with these changes a review of the regulations would also be required, although it was unlikely that there would be any significant need for amendments.

vi. Due to the nature of the new module spanning a whole academic year Board members questioned why a revised programme specification had not been submitted. Colleagues from the Institute of Dentistry acknowledged that providing a revised programme specification needed addressing in order to present the new overall structure for the programme in a coherent and holistic manner.

vii. The number of face-to-face contact hours that students would receive on the programme would be increased. As this change would affect the KIS data that would be submitted to HEFCE it would be desirable to have the overall curriculum structure clearly documented.

viii. A qualifying mark of 46.5% had been specified for a number of elements of assessment. This was a result of continuing discussion with the external examiners where issues related to compensation had been raised. However, given that examinations were standard set the Board queried the use of a 46.5% qualifying mark. There was a need for compensation but this was limited so in effect students could only be compensated for one paper.

ix. Further discussion over the use of a qualifying mark for assessments was required and subsequent changes made could fall in line with the approach of standard setting examinations that was employed on the MBBS.

x. The Board approved the module proposal BDS Year 1 Module, subject to responding to the points detailed above and submitting a revised programme specification and module proposal. This documentation would be formally considered at the June meeting of TPB.

Action: IoD

Part 6 – Academic Regulations

School of Medicine and Dentistry

14. Intercalated BSc programmes

2011:078 The Board considered new academic regulations for the intercalated BSc programmes. The following points were noted:
i. About 40% of medical students had the option of doing an extra year to acquire a BSc or a BMedSci intercalated degree.

ii. There had not previously been a dedicated set of regulations for the intercalated degree programmes.

iii. Board members questioned whether everything presented in the paper to the Board should be subsumed within the formal regulations since a number of details essentially related to internal processes and procedures.

iv. The selection procedure for students intending to take intercalated degrees was detailed on the School of Medicine and Dentistry's web pages but had not been formally approved other than by the intercalated degrees committee.

v. Section 1.2 of the proposed intercalated degree regulations that stated students returning to the MBBS or BDS programme after the intercalated year must undertake a late summer re-sit was not clear. This was intended to account for students who failed their final exam.

vi. Students opting to take the intercalated degree programme should be made aware that not taking the programme seriously may jeopardise their studies for the next academic year. This mainly applied to exit with grace students.

vii. If there were grounds for extenuating circumstances then these were duly taken into account.

viii. Section 1.6 required clarification as the first and last bullet point appeared somewhat contradictory. It was suggested that these points should be amended to state that: students should take modules to a total value of 120 credits and pass modules to the value of 90 credits.

ix. The section detailing the arrangements for exit with grace (section 2.5) treated intercalated students differently to other students and gave them unfair hurdles to satisfy. Further guidance on the arrangements for exit with grace were required.

x. The intercalated degree programme regulations detailed the procedure that would apply for student appeals. Whilst the Head of Intercalated Degrees was a member of the appeals committee they would play no active in the decision making process of whether to uphold or dismiss an appeal. The Board suggested that the involvement of the Head of Intercalated Degrees even in an advisory capacity to the appeals committee amounted to a conflict of interest.

xi. Students who wished to intercalate at other higher education institutions were, according to the proposed regulations, required to satisfy a number of conditions that were linked to their programme of study. Specifically, it was stated that: the proposed programme must be a recognised intercalated degree programme for medical and/or dental students and must be acceptable to The SMD.

xii. The Board questioned the rationale for having such stringent conditions and it was understood that this was to account for certain situations, such as where a programme that was delivered by another institution overran.
xiii. Where students were transferring in an out of programmes the Board asked how the tuition fees were calculated. This had not been considered and required clarification.

xiv. The proposed regulations had not been considered by the Intercalated Degrees Committee or the Medical Education Committee. This was due to the fact that there had not been a meeting of both committees prior to the meeting of TPB.

xv. The Board did not approve the academic regulations for Intercalated BSc programmes in their current format. Further revisions were necessary to take into account the discussion from the meeting and the points detailed above. The revised regulations would be presented to the June meeting of the Board.

**Action: SMD**

School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science

15. BUPT JP Regulations

The Board considered revised academic regulations for the BUPT Joint Programmes. The following points were noted:

i. The current regulations dated back to 2007 and this revision was intended to clarify various wording and consolidate the regulations by adding in material from other documents.

ii. The changes to the regulations were relatively minor and had been approved by the BUPT & QMUL Joint Programme Academic Committee at its March 2012 meeting.

iii. The Board approved the academic regulations for the BUPT Joint Programme.

Part 7 – Collaborative Provision

16. New Partner Due Diligence

The Board considered the due diligence information regarding proposals to form new partnerships with the above universities. It was noted that:

i. More background should be provided to the partnership proposals in general, including more detail into the actual risks of each respective partnership.

ii. The Board deferred the decision to endorse the proposal to establish a new partnership with the University of Malaya. This would be reconsidered at the June meeting of TPB and should be supported by a brief overview the relevant member of staff from Queen Mary.

iii. Queen Mary Senior Executive had approved the partnership with the
University of Brunei Darussalam. The form stated that Queen Mary had no previous links with the institution but this was inconsistent with the details provided in the documentation. Specifically, SBCS had links with the University of Brunei Darussalam through using its Kuala Belalong Field Studies Centre KBFSC. This required further clarification.

iv. The Board deferred the decision to endorse the proposal to establish a new partnership with the University of Brunei Darussalam. This would be reconsidered at the June meeting of TPB and should be supported by a brief overview the relevant member of staff from Queen Mary.

v. International Medical University Kuala Lumpur provided students with basic science education and a number of its students had progressed onto programmes at Russell Group universities. The proposed partnership with Queen Mary would function as an articulation arrangement whereby around 5 students per year would progress to Queen Mary and study towards an MBBS degree with the School of Medicine and Dentistry. Queen Mary would be the second London-based university involved in such an arrangement.

vi. Students coming from International Medical University Kuala Lumpur would generally be high quality students.

vii. It was agreed that no further information was required on the good standing of International Medical University Kuala Lumpur, and no risks were identified. The Board endorsed the proposal to establish a new partnership with International Medical University Kuala Lumpur.

17. University of London Institute in Paris: Memorandum of Agreement

TPB2011-064 2011:081 The Board received the revised final draft Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) relating to the relationship with the University of London in Paris (ULIP). The following points were noted:

i. The MoA was previously considered at the Board's February 2012 meeting but was at an early draft stage with key information missing relating to the detailed arrangements for examinations, awards, and student discipline. An Academic Director had also now been appointed who had ownership of this project.

ii. As the development of the LLM Paris has evolved it has become clear that Queen Mary was taking the responsibility for delivery and quality of the student learning experience. As a result previous concerns regarding resource issues had been addressed.

iii. The LLM Paris would open up the programme to a new market.

iv. Exams for the programme would run at the same time as the exams for the Queen Mary based LLM. It was envisaged that there would be two exam periods: one in January and one in July.

v. ULIP would provide administrative support for the programme and CCLS would have the overall responsibility for its management.

vi. The official launch of the programme was on the 28th June 2012.
vii. The Board thanked Professor Shiach, Vice Principal and Executive Dean (HSS) for attending the meeting.

viii. The Board endorsed the Memorandum of Agreement with the University of London Institute in Paris.

### Part 8 – Report of Proposals Approved by Schools/Institutes to Note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18.| Programme Amendments  
Module Proposals  
Module Amendments  
Module Withdrawals | TPB2011-065 |

2011:082 The Board noted a report of decisions made by Schools/Institutes of changes to their curricula for the period 08/03/2012 - 01/05/2012.

### Part 9 – from the Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions Group (MRAG) to Note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Programme Withdrawals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011:083 The Board noted that no programme withdrawals had been made during the period 08/03/2012 - 01/05/2012.

### Part 10 – Other business

20. Any other business

21. Date of next meeting

2011:084 The next meeting date of the Taught Programmes Board is Wednesday 27th June 2012 (1-3pm).

The deadline for papers for this meeting is Wednesday 6th June 2012.

22. Dates of meetings for 2012-13

2011:085 The provisional meeting dates for the 2012-13 academic session are detailed below. All meetings are proposed to take place from 2-4pm and will be held in the Colette Bowe Room, Mile End Campus.

- Wednesday 24 October 2012
- Wednesday 28 November 2012
- Wednesday 27 February 2013
- Wednesday 27 March 2013
- Wednesday 29 May 2013
- Wednesday 26 June 2013
- Wednesday 24 July 2012*

*Room TBC