Taught Programmes Board

Minutes of the meeting of the Taught Programmes Board held on Wednesday 25 July 2012 at 13.00 in the Colette Bowe Room, Mile End Campus.

CONFIRMED

Present:
Professor Susan Dilly (Chair)  Sam Brenton  Dr Martin Carrier
Professor Elizabeth Davenport  Professor Omar Garcia-Obregon  Professor Joy Hinson
Dr Henri Huijberts  Dr Theo Kreouzis  Professor Julia Shelton
Professor Olwyn Westwood

In attendance:
Nick Bernard  Dr Katherine Bevan  Tessa Cornell
Dr Alicia Green  Professor Martin Laffin  Sian Marshall (Secretary)
Raluca Vasiliu-McIver

Apologies:
Dr Warren Boutcher  Jade Lee  Professor Peter McOwan
Dr Alastair Owens  Jane Pallant  Dr Martha Prevezer
Professor Anthony Warrens

Part 1 – Preliminary Items

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome and Apologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011:104</td>
<td>The Board <strong>considered</strong> and <strong>confirmed</strong> the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 27th June 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Matters Arising From the Previous Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011:105</td>
<td>The Board <strong>received</strong> a paper on the matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting of Taught Programmes Board. The following points were <strong>noted</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. KIS data had been provided by the SLLF to ARCS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. The optional one year full-time associate training programme offered to suitable graduates from the MClinDent programmes had been replaced by three Postgraduate Diploma programmes, which had been approved at the meeting of the Board in June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. The start date for the LLM Paris, which was approved at the November meeting of the Board, had been delayed until January 2013 to allow for adequate time to market the programme. It was proposed that the programme would have two intakes, in September and January, to attract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
both legal practitioners and graduate students applying to the Paris Bar for a licence to practise.

iv. The Board agreed that the start date of the LLM Paris programme should be delayed until January 2013 with two intakes.

### Part 2 – For Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011:106</td>
<td>The Board received an oral report summarising recent progress in the area of Key Information Sets (KIS) since the June 2012 meeting. The following point was noted:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>All the KIS data had been received and institutional sign off would be sought from the Principal on August 14th.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>Master of Public Administration</th>
<th>TPB2011-083</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011:107</td>
<td>The Board received the Programme Specification for the Master of Public Administration within SBM and an additional document regarding the development of the programme. The following points were noted:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>A Part 1 Programme Proposal had originally been submitted for the Master of Public Administration (MPA) programme led by the School of Economics and Finance in collaboration with the School of Business and Management. A review of the original proposal had highlighted that the length and focus on Economics of the proposed programme was not appropriate for an MPA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>A one year MPA programme was now proposed, which reflected what was already offered in the sector. Whilst the LSE offered a two year programme, it was marketed in the USA, and it was felt to be difficult to market a two year programme in the UK. Other Russell Group institutions already offered a one year programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Two members of staff had been appointed through the PAR to develop and teach on the MPA programme but they were not yet in post.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>The fees would be set in the region of £15,000 for international students, which was similar to other Masters programmes. The fees for home students were still to be set. A meeting would be held in the afternoon to consider the recruitment of home students to the programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Comments received from the Vice President for Education and Welfare (QMSU) were that other UK MPA programmes did not appear high quality and charged fees in the region £4,500-5,000. However, it was understood that these fees were for home students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Concern was noted that it was usual for proposals submitted to the Board to have already set fee levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>The MPA award was understood to be more suitable than the award of MSc given that it was the accepted title of the degree and the currency already used by other institutions. European accreditation would be sought in due course and from the Public Administration Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>Board members raised concern that the learning outcomes had not been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mapped to the requirements of the accrediting bodies. This was important to ensure that the programme was high quality, and could be successfully marketed. The Board felt it would be helpful to have an overview of how the programme would meet the requirements of the accrediting bodies.

ix. It was clarified that the accrediting bodies for Public Management and Business did not operate in the same way as other bodies and would not normally require the learning outcomes to be mapped in the way suggested.

x. The approval process was out of sync due to the need for Senate to approve the request to seek permission from the University of London Collegiate Council for the introduction of a 12 month MPA award. The Programme Specification had been requested to provide additional information, which could be requested by the University of London Collegiate Council. The Programme Specification would need to be further developed should permission be given and support would be provided by ARCS to achieve this.

xi. A robust case would need to be presented to the University of London Collegiate Council. It would be important to highlight that the 21 month MPA offered by the University of London may not be in line with MPA degrees offered elsewhere in the sector.

xii. The Board agreed that contact should be made with the University of London Collegiate Council to determine the likelihood of permission being given for the 12 month award and the nature of the information that would be required in order to seek permission. Permission should be formally sought if the initial feedback was positive.

Action: ARCS

xiii. A Part 2 Programme Proposal and more detailed Programme Specification would be submitted should permission be received.

6. BA French Studies

TPB2011-084

2011:108 The Board considered a paper regarding a proposed update to the current BA French Studies programme within the SLLF. The following points were noted:

i. It was proposed that the current R101 BA French Studies programme should be amended to introduce two additional 15 credit modules at the end of semester two of the second year. The additional credits would not affect the tuition fees charged.

ii. The 390 credit programme would be different to the existing 360 and 480 credit programmes offered by the SLLF. The two modules would form the basis of a Year 2 accelerated programme, whereby students would spend semester 2 and the vacation period at the University of London Institute in Paris (ULiP). This would allow students to study in Paris without spending a full year abroad.

iii. It was proposed that the additional 30 credits would contribute to the classification of the award.

iv. It was intended that the programme would recruit for the 2013-14 academic year, with the first intake studying in Paris in 2014-15.

v. The Arts Faculty Board had previously approved the arrangement with ULiP
vi. The Board agreed that the two additional 15 credit modules should be compulsory but not weighted so that they would not contribute to the classification of the award.

2011:109 The Board approved in principle the amendment to the BA French Studies programme and agreed that a Programme Amendment form with an updated Programme Specification should be submitted to ARCS in due course for consideration by the Board under matters arising.

Action: SLLF

7. Revised Marks Conversion Scheme for QM Students Studying Abroad in the US

2011:110 The Board received a paper regarding the revised marks conversion scheme for QM students studying abroad in the USA. The following points were noted:

i. The current approach to marks conversion at QMUL was based on an assumption of grade inflation across US institutions and meant that QMUL students were not accurately awarded for their achievements. Following discussions with staff with experience of the US system and a meeting of a Task and Finish Group, a new conversion scale was proposed.

ii. There was a lack of understanding about the credit system used in US institutions and how this converted into UK credits. As a result, there had been a large number of suspensions of regulations for study abroad students who were considered not to have taken sufficient credits whilst they had taken the equivalent of a full time load in the US. It was proposed to allow some flexibility to permit study abroad students to take modules equivalent to 120 credits during the year abroad.

iii. Study abroad students were required to agree a study plan and sign a contract prior to leaving for the US, which detailed the number of credits they were expected to take. The number of credits varied by institution but was typically 12-14 or 14-16 credits, which was considered to be a full time load and was agreed by the International Office with individual institutions. A number of students required to take 14-16 credits failed to take the correct number.

iv. There was a need for Schools to work with the International Office to ensure that the study plan and contract detailed the appropriate number of credits.

v. The proposed changes to the marks conversion scale would mean that QMUL was more generous in comparison to other institutions.

vi. For Science and Engineering, there was evidence that some students were penalised for study abroad as they were capable of achieving 90-95 per cent, which was not possible for study abroad due to the maximum mark of 80. Where a transcript gave an A+ grade, it was not normally possible to award greater than 80 per cent because no other information was given.

vii. It was proposed that a revised framework for marks conversion should be introduced with discretion for Schools to award marks based on the appropriate range of scale used by individual Departments.

viii. The Board agreed that the revised conversion scale should include an
additional column with the full range of marks that could be awarded for each grade depending on the range of scale used by individual Departments.

**Action:** OG/ARCS

- **ix.** The Board agreed that Schools should have flexibility in deciding the appropriate conversion scale. Schools should be given the opportunity to review the proposed scheme and to put together a proposal for approval by the relevant DEB in time for the International Office to apply the approved conversion scale.

  **Action:** Schools/IO

- **x.** The Board agreed that guidance should be provided to Schools on applying the conversion scale.

  **Action:** ARCS/OG

- **xi.** The Board agreed that the revised conversion scale should apply to both incoming and outgoing study abroad students.

**2011:111** The Board approved the change to the wording of the regulations with respect to the number of credits and the revised marks conversion scale subject to the clarification of the points listed above.

**8. Diploma in Dental Hygiene and Therapy Mark Scheme**

- **2011:112** The Board considered the mark scheme for the Diploma in Dental Hygiene and Therapy and noted:

  i. The mark scheme had been in operation since September 2009 and had been approved by the Dental Education Committee. The mark scheme had not been submitted to ARCS and accordingly the award rules for the programme had not been set up in the SIS.

  ii. Concern was noted that the scale used for the classification of the award was rounded to two decimal places, whereas only one decimal place was used in the SIS, as required by the regulations. It was agreed that clarification should be sought as to whether the award would be classified to only one decimal place.

  **Action:** IoD/ARCS

- **2011:113** The Board approved the mark scheme for the Diploma in Dental Hygiene and Therapy subject to clarification of point iii above.

---

### Part 3 – Programme Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**9. School of Business and Management**

- **MRes Business and Management**

- **2011:114** The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal for the MRes in Business and Management and one associate module proposal within SBM. The following point was noted:

  i. The compulsory module Introduction to Social Science Research Methods would be delivered in collaboration with Goldsmiths through the Doctoral
Training Centre. The module would be led by Professor Les Back.

2011:115 The Board approved the MRes in Business and Management and one associated module proposal.

### Part 4 – Programme Amendments

#### Faculty of Science and Engineering

10. **School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science**

BUPT BSc (Eng) Programmes (H6N2, H6NF, H6NI)  
TPB2011-088

2011:116 The Board considered a programme amendment for the BUPT BSc(Eng) programmes within SEECS. The following points were noted:

i. Under the current approval arrangements all programme amendments relating to collaborative provision had to be submitted to TPB for consideration and approval.

ii. The programme amendment presented a proposal to introduce a number of new modules, which had already been approved, and to change the timing of certain modules.

iii. All modules were listed as core to satisfy the Chinese award rules that required every module to be passed for the degree to be awarded.

2011:117 The Board approved the programme amendment for the BUPT BSc (Eng) programmes within SEECS.

#### School of Medicine and Dentistry

11. **Blizard Institute**

Postgraduate Diploma Clinical Dermatology (A3ES)  
TPB2011-089

2011:118 The Board considered a programme amendment for the Postgraduate Diploma in Clinical Dermatology. The following points were noted:

i. The programme amendment presented a proposal to change the definition of a distinction to requiring greater than 70 in the dissertation module in addition to achieving 70 overall. Where students scored 70 overall but below 70 in the dissertation, they would be awarded a merit. This was intended to identify the outstanding students.

ii. The approval of the proposal would require a non-standard special regulation for the programme.

iii. Subsequent to the submission of the programme amendment, the Programme Organiser had indicated her consent to introduce the degree classification listed as a special regulation in the Academic Regulations with a distinction awarded for achievement of 70 in both the dissertation and overall and a merit awarded for achievement of 65 in both the dissertation and overall.

2011:119 The Board approved the programme amendment for the Postgraduate Diploma in Clinical Dermatology subject to the submission of revised documentation in line
The Board considered a programme amendment for the MSc/PgDip in Gastroenterology and one associated module proposal. The following points were noted:

i. The programme amendment presented a proposal to introduce an alternative module to the Research Project in Gastro-Intestinal Science, with a requirement for students to complete four patient case reports of 2-3000 words instead of the research project. This would enable clinically oriented students, particularly those on the distance learning programme, to achieve competence in writing case reports in the fields of Gastroenterology, Nutrition or Hepatology. It would also address the issue of distance learning students who were unable to find an appropriate supervisor for a research project. Students would be appointed a supervisor for the completion of the case reports.

ii. The creation of a new award of MSc/PgDip in Gastroenterology and Hepatology was also proposed for students completing the Dissertation - case reports module in the field of Hepatology.

iii. The programme amendment presented a proposal to amend the entry criteria to the Gastroenterology programmes to allow the admission of allied health professionals who work as specialists in the field and who had a science based degree with a 2:1 or above.

iv. Case reports were a form of peer reviewed publication, which reported advances in clinical practice that a junior doctor would more typically have published rather than a lab based research paper.

v. The Board expressed concern that the paperwork was rather too defensive of the issue with finding supervisors for distance learning students and agreed that it should be amended to highlight the validity and pedagogic value of the case reports.

   **Action: Blizard**

vi. The title of the final award would be determined by the subject area of the research project or the case reports, which would be Gastroenterology, or Gastroenterology and Hepatology. All students would initially be registered on the PGDip in Gastroenterology.

vii. The word limit of the case report was considered to be appropriate and equivalent to around 150 notional study hours.

viii. The Board agreed that other clinical programmes should consider introducing similar case report modules.

   **Action: SMD**

ix. The suggested code for the case reports module was thought to be in use already and may need to be changed.

   **Action: ARCS**

x. The Research Project and the Dissertation modules were listed as compulsory but should be elective.
The Board **approved** the programme amendment for the MSc/PgDip in Gastroenterology and one associated module proposal subject to the clarification of the points listed above.

**Part 5 – Academic Regulations**

**School of Medicine and Dentistry**

**12. Intercalated Degree Programmes**

2011:122 The Board **considered** revised regulations for the intercalated degree programmes. The following points were **noted**:

i. The proposed regulations were originally considered at the May meeting of the Board and had been revised in light of comments from the Board.

ii. Board members questioned whether much of the information proposed for inclusion in the regulations was required, with particular reference to the procedures for selection, appeal and the exit with grace. It was felt that the comments made at the May meeting had not been fully considered.

iii. Concern was noted that separate regulations were proposed for the programmes in SMD, which could result in conflicting award regulations. Furthermore, colleagues in SEMS and Dentistry had not been consulted on the changes.

iv. It was desirable for there to be only one Subject Examination Board for the Intercalated Degree programmes.

v. It was not appropriate for the Head of the Intercalated Degrees’ nominated deputy to consider appeals where there was a conflict of interest.

vi. A review of the exit with grace procedure was required with a view to introducing an optional transfer to an intercalated degree or the award of a Certificate of Higher Education or a Diploma in Higher Education.

vii. The regulations for the MBBS and BDS programmes should include the transfer to an intercalated degree or the award of a Certificate of Higher Education or a Diploma in Higher Education.

viii. The Board **agreed** that an SMD-led Task and Finish Group should be convened to review and agree the proposed intercalated degree regulations and the points listed above. The group should include representatives from Medicine, Dentistry and SEMS, and be serviced by ARCS. The Group may also wish to consider the development of intercalated Masters degrees.

**Action: SMD/ARCS**

2011:123 The Board **did not approve** the amendments to the regulations for the intercalated degree programmes.

**13. LLB Regulations**

2011:124 The Board **considered** the revised academic regulations for the LLB programme. The following points were **noted**:
i. The LLB regulations had been reviewed and one substantive change was proposed in addition to a number of minor changes.

ii. The major change proposed to reduce the number of attempts to a maximum of three, which would bring the LLB in line with the professional accrediting body.

iii. The regulations for the final year of the LLB had been amended to require all exams to be passed in one sitting, which would bring the final year in line with other years and remove the inconsistency in the regulations.

iv. At present students could be awarded the LLB with a fail in some elements but the regulations did not permit students with extenuating circumstances who missed final exam(s) to receive the award where they missed thirty credits in the final year. On a number of occasions the regulations had been suspended.

v. The regulations required students to pass all exams in one sitting but this was problematic for modules assessed by coursework. In practice students were required to resubmit the dissertation in order to prevent unfair advantage by achieving a better mark.

vi. It was also proposed to change the regulation regarding late summer resits. Students were prevented from sitting late summer resits where they failed to attend one or more of the exams in the main exam period without good reason. This was deemed to penalise students who had performed badly in one examination who would have to sit the rest of the exams though they would not be able to achieve a pass of all exams in one sitting.

2011:125 The Board approved the amendments to the LLB regulations.

Part 6 – Report of Proposals Approved by Schools/Institutes to Note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14.</th>
<th>Programme Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module Withdrawals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011:126 The Board noted a report of decisions made by Schools/Institutes of changes to their curricula for the period 07/06/2012 – 04/07/2012.

Part 7 – Other business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15.</th>
<th>Any other business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011:127 There was no other business.

16. Date of next meeting

2011:128 The next meeting date of the Taught Programmes Board would be Wednesday 24th October 2012 (2-4pm).

The deadline for papers would be Wednesday 3rd October 2012.