Taught Programmes Board

Minutes of the meeting of the Taught Programmes Board held on Wednesday 27 June 2012 at 13.00 in the Colette Bowe Room, Mile End Campus.

CONFIRMED

Present:
Professor Susan Dilly (Chair)  
Professor Ray Croucher  
Professor Elizabeth Davenport  
Professor Omar Garcia-Obregón  
Professor Julia Shelton  
Dr Martha Prevezer  
Oscar Williamson

In attendance:
Dr Katherine Bevan  
Jane Reid  
Ken Chow  
Professor Maxine Robertson

Apologies:
Sam Brenton  
Dr Theo Kreouzis  
Dr Matthew Williamson  
Professor Joy Hinson  
Professor Olwyn Westwood  
Jane Pallant  
Dr Henri Huijberts  
Dr Alastair Owens

Part 1 – Preliminary Items

1. Welcome and Apologies  
2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting  
3. Matters Arising From the Previous Meeting

2011:085 The Board considered and confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting held on Tuesday 22nd May 2012.

2011:086 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. KIS data from the SLLF was still outstanding and was required as a matter of priority.

   Action: SLLF

ii. A number of longstanding items detailed on the matters arising action sheet had been removed following discussion with schools over the status of various proposals and amendments.

iii. The delivery of language modules for historians by the School of History was still an issue and had not been fully addressed. There had been no
input from SLLF into the proposals and colleagues were of the opinion that this was a bad precedent to set since the teaching for these modules was just being bought in.

iv. Board members questioned whether it was possible to stipulate that the responsibility for quality assurance for a particular subject area should be subsumed by the relevant school. However, it was expressed that this approach may over complicate the issue. For example in the case of engineering, maths was also taught on several modules by staff based within SEMS.

v. A more consistent and effective way of regulating language provision across Queen Mary was required. As such, it was suggested that a language strategy could be developed to better articulate a framework for language provision at degree level across different schools. This should promote a cross-disciplinary, coherent approach to the development and teaching of language modules, and embed them within programmes.

vi. Board members agreed that the development of a language strategy was a welcome step forward and suggested that this could benefit from input the Graduate Attributes Task and Finish Group. The production of a language strategy should take place within the next 9 months and be received by TPB for discussion.

Action: OG

vii. The partnership with the University of Brunei Darussalam had been approved in principle by Chair’s Action, following scrutiny of a draft MoU. The final MoU would come to a future meeting of TPB.

viii. The partnership with the University of Malaya had been approved in principle by Chair’s Action.

Part 2 – For Discussion

4. Key Information Sets 2012/13

2011:087 The Board received an oral report summarising recent progress in the area of Key Information Sets (KIS) since the May 2012 meeting. The following points were noted:

i. The School of History had raised issues where their teaching percentages were particularly low as compared to, for example, the School of Geography. This required further scrutiny to ensure that all schools made consistent use of the methodology for calculating contact hours.

Action: ARCS

5. Master of Public Administration

2011:088 The Board received a paper relating the development of a Master of Public Administration within SBM and noted:

i. The Master of Public Administration (MPA) was approved at Part 1 by Programme and Module Approval Board on the 27th July 2011. Approval was given on the basis of the MPA being a 21 month programme, however, it was understood that there was now an intention to offer the programme over the course of 12 months.
ii. Board members raised concern that other high quality providers, such as the LSE and London South Bank University, offered the extended model and in terms of marketing positioning it was suggested that Queen Mary should be aspiring for this. Specifically, it was questioned whether the MPA would be comparable and as rigorous as the extended versions of the programme that were offered at other leading institutions and that lasted longer than 12 months.

iii. It was expressed that Queen Mary would not be alone in offering a 12 month MPA programme, though some of the 12 month MPA programmes that competitor institutions offered were not considered to be very good examples of well run programmes.

iv. The MPA offered by LSE competed with American institutions and was therefore of a longer duration.

v. The development of a 12 month MPA could have significant reputational implications for Queen Mary, particularly as a proposal to offer the programme over 12 months instead of 21 had to be presented to the University of London Collegiate Council.

vi. It was unclear if there would be any entry requirement for the MPA that related to the length and nature of potential applicants previous work experience.

vii. The academic coherency and rigour of the MPA programme was difficult to ascertain in the absence of seeing all of the relevant programme documentation.

viii. The integration of work experience within the programme was particularly important.

ix. The Board agreed that a Programme Specification for the MPA should be submitted to the July meeting of TPB.

Action: SBM

x. Permission would need to be sought from the University of London Collegiate Council for the award to be made after 12 months (for full-time study) and 24 months (for part-time study) rather than the existing 21 months (or equivalent) that is specified in the University of London Regulations.

---

**Part 3 – Programme Proposals**

**Faculty of Science and Engineering**

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

MSc Computer Vision

TPB2011-069

2011:089 The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal for the MSc Computer Vision. The following points were noted:

i. The programme would build on the expertise of research staff within SEECS.
ii. Comparable programmes from competitor institutions were more focused in nature whilst the proposed MSc Computer Vision aimed to provide a more generic curriculum that would appeal to a wide range of students and thus differentiate itself from similar programmes.

iii. A revised Programme Specification was circulated via email and submitted to TPB.

iv. Members questioned whether there was appetite within SEECS to run a part-time version of the programme. This had been briefly considered but it was thought prudent to establish the full-time version in the first instance.

v. The MSc Computer Vision was likely to be particularly appealing to Chinese students and would also capitalise on Queen Mary’s links with BUPT.

vi. In terms of the progression hurdle for the programme, students at first have to pass the taught component before they could progress onto the research element.

vii. The proposal was supported by several external advisors and their comments were highly positive.

viii. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal for the MSc Computer Vision.

### 7. School of Engineering and Materials Science

MSc Polymer Science and Technology and six associated module proposals

TPB2011-070

2011:090

The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal for the MSc Polymer Science and Technology and six associated module proposals. The following points were noted:

i. There was sufficient interest within SEMS to warrant the development of the MSc Polymer Science and Technology, and the staff were already in place to teach the various modules.

ii. All programmes offered within SEMS were accredited by the relevant professional body and it was envisaged that there would not be an issue obtaining accreditation by the Institute of Materials Mining and Minerals.

iii. The Research Project module was detailed as compulsory rather than core and this was correct.

iv. A number of the module proposals submitted contained several elements of assessment that were all detailed as the final element of assessment. However, it was confirmed that in all cases the final element of assessment was the examination.

v. SEMS was in the process of changing the progression hurdles for its programmes and this was in part linked to visa issues associated with international students. These changes needed further clarification within SEMS to ensure the consistency of progression rules.
vi. The progression arrangements for PGT provision required wider discussion, particularly in terms of where overseas students had undertaken resits and had issues with extending their visa. This issue would be discussed further at the October meeting of TPB.

**Action:** TPB / ARCS

vii. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal for the MSc Polymer Science and Technology and six associated module proposals.

**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**

8. **School of Business and Management**

MRes Business and Management  
TPB2011-071

2011:091 The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal for the MRes Business and Management and one associated module proposal. The following points were noted:

i. The MRes Business and Management related to the Goldsmiths/Queen Mary ESRC Doctoral Training Centre application that had recently been approved.

ii. The programme was based on compulsory taught research methods modules in Semesters 1 and 2, optional subject-based modules in Semesters 1 and 2 and a thesis finishing towards the end of September.

iii. The MRes Business and Management would capitalise on staff expertise within the school and students would focus their studies on one specific subject area, such as human resource management.

iv. Particularly successful graduates would be able to use the qualification as an entry into PhD research and it was likely that the MRes Business and Management would feed into SBM’s doctoral programmes. This would also provide SBM with much better qualified individuals for PhD study, although the MRes would not be a prerequisite to doctoral study.

v. One of the particular benefits of offering an MRes was that it would allow students to apply for a +3 ESRC scholarship. It was also suggested that the MRes was a more desirable qualification than an MSc.

vi. It was apparent that the module list detailed within the Programme Specification was not up to date and this required further clarification.

vii. The quantitative and qualitative modules offered on the MRes would be set at an advanced standard that was aligned with the demands and expectations of the programme.

viii. Students studying modules offered on the MRes Business and Management would be taught alongside students enrolled on modules that were offered as part of other MSc programmes within SBM.

ix. Student module choice on the MRes programme would be overseen by a senior member of academic staff within SBM to ensure that students were well informed and supported when making their decisions. This oversight would also ensure that students had an academically coherent experience.
x. The associated compulsory module Introduction to Social Science Research Methods was proposed to be delivered in collaboration with Goldsmiths through the Doctoral Training Centre. However, it was not clear who would teach on the module from Goldsmiths.

xi. The Qualifying Mark of 50% that was specified for both elements of assessment for the Introduction to Social Science Research Methods module was correct.

xii. Professor Gill Kirton was identified as the nominated Programme Director. The Board agreed that it would be desirable if Professor Gill Kirton could attend the next TPB meeting on the 25th July 2012 to give further background to the development of the MRes programme.

**Action: SBM**

xiii. The Board did not approve the Part 2 programme proposal for the MRes Business and Management and the associated Introduction to Social Science Research Methods module. The Part 2, Programme Specification and associated Introduction to Social Science Research Methods module proposal would be reconsidered at the July meeting of TPB.

**Action: ARCS**

**School of Medicine and Dentistry**

2011:092 The Board considered a Part 2 programme proposal for the Postgraduate Diploma in Advanced Clinical Periodontology and six associated module proposals. The following points were noted:

i. The Postgraduate Diploma in Advanced Clinical Periodontology was only available for students who had successfully completed the MClinDent course at QMUL.

ii. The rationale for the programme was to consolidate, to a specialist level, the academic and clinical expertise of successful graduates of the two year MClinDent programme.

iii. All three programmes had been reviewed externally and the advisors were broadly supportive in their comments.

iv. Three of the modules (Completion of Clinical Treatment and Cases; Research Consolidation and Manuscript Preparation from MClinDent Project; and Clinical Governance and Audit) would be across all three Postgraduate Diploma programmes. As such, it was likely that these modules would be delivered jointly and comprise of students from the three different programmes.

v. Students on the 2nd year of the MClinDent could now be transferred onto one of the three Postgraduate Diploma programmes.

vi. A number of minor issues were identified in the accompanying coversheet and by Board members and would be addressed in revised documentation. This including clarifying the final element of assessment for a number of modules.
vii. The Board approved the Part 2 programme proposal for the Postgraduate Diploma in Advanced Clinical Periodontology and six associated module proposals, subject to clarifying the points above and the submission of revised documentation.

**Action: IoD**

10. Postgraduate Diploma in Advanced Clinical Paediatric Dentistry and five associated module proposals TPB2011-073

2011:093 The Board considered and approved a Part 2 programme proposal for the Postgraduate Diploma in Advanced Clinical Paediatric Dentistry and five associated module proposals, subject clarifying the points in minute 2011:092 above and the submission of revised documentation

**Action: IoD**

11. Postgraduate Diploma in Orthodontics and five associated module proposals TPB2011-074

2011:094 The Board considered and approved a Part 2 programme proposal for the Postgraduate Diploma in Orthodontics and five associated module proposals, subject to clarifying the points in minute 2011:092 above and the submission of revised documentation

**Action: IoD**

### Part 4 – Programme Amendments

**Faculty of Science and Engineering**

12. School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science

BUPT BSc(Eng) Programmes (H6N2, H6NF, H6NI) TPB2011-075

2011:095 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 amend the length of examinations for all technical modules (apart from law modules) for QM from 2.5 hours to 2 hours. This was designed to reduce the examining load for students and improve consistency by making QM modules the same length as BUPT modules.

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

**School of Medicine and Dentistry**

13. William Harvey Research Institute

MSc /PgDip Endocrinology and Diabetes (AS34) TPB2011-076

2011:096 The Board considered a programme amendment for the MSc /PgDip
Endocrinology and Diabetes. The following points were noted:

i. The MSc /PgDip Endocrinology and Diabetes programme was now entering its third year of operation.

ii. The programme amendment presented a proposal to amend the assessment weighting for all modules on the programme. This would give equal weighting to the 2 components of assessment (coursework and exam) compared to the previous weighting of 25% coursework and 75% exam.

iii. The change in assessment weighting better reflected the demands of the cohort of students who were studying at a distance and who were in employment. However, the substantive contents of all modules remain the same.

iv. Given that the amendment was relatively straight forward Board members questioned whether the amendment required consideration and approval by TPB.

v. It was acknowledged that all programme amendments relating to collaborative provision had to be submitted to TPB for consideration and approval. This would also present an opportunity to share good practice and the experiences of colleagues involved in learning, teaching and assessment to other areas of QM.

vi. The Board agreed that there should be a dedicated member of ARCS who would liaise with the E-Learning Unit regarding programme and module developments for the 2012/13 academic session. An annual report of all programme and module developments would be created by ARCS and submitted to TPB for consideration and discussion. It was suggested that such an approach would enable elements of good practice to be drawn out

ACTION: ARCS

vii. The Board approved the programme amendment for the MSc /PgDip Endocrinology and Diabetes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 5 – Module Proposals</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Medicine and Dentistry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Institute of Dentistry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDS Year 1 Module (to follow)</td>
<td>TPB2011-077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board considered a module proposal for BDS Year 1 Module and the associated Programme Specification for the BDS. The following points were noted:

i. There had been a change in emphasis on learning outcomes to align with the new learning outcomes from the GDC.

ii. Further refinement of the learning outcomes had been made to the documents that were previously considered at the May meeting of TPB. This including matching all learning outcomes with the various assessment tasks.

iii. Discussion was taking place within the GDC in relation to the achievement
of learning outcomes by students.

iv. Standard setting was used on the BDS and it was expressed that further discussion was required within the Institute of Dentistry regarding the principles of assessment that are expected to be applied by the GDC. This discussion would take place by the end of the summer.

v. The outstanding modules for years 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the BDS would be submitted together as a matter of priority.

vi. Students who enrol on the programme in September 2012 would be subject to the academic regulations from 2012-13.

vii. The programme structure and progression rules would remain the same, although the assessment records would change in line with what is proposed in the module specification.

viii. The number of hours for written exams would remain the same as the number of hours for practical exams.

ix. It was not clear whether Student Selected Components (SSCs) were detailed within the submitted documentation. This required further clarification and attention.

x. An oral feedback report on developments on the BDS programme would be presented to the first meeting of TPB in October 2012.

xi. The Board approved the module proposal BDS Year 1 Module and associated Programme Specification.

Part 6 – Collaborative Provision

15. New Partner Due Diligence

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro

TPB2011-078

The Board considered the due diligence information regarding proposals to form a new partnerships with Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro. It was noted that:

i. Approval of the partnership was being sought before the end of month otherwise students would have to pay for undertaking a student exchange.

ii. The number of students involved in the proposed partnership arrangement was expected to be very low.

iii. The Board endorsed the proposal to establish a new partnership with Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro.

Part 7 – Report of Proposals Approved by Schools/Institutes to Note

16. Programme Amendments

Module Proposals
Module Amendments
Module Withdrawals

TPB2011-079
The Board noted a report of decisions made by Schools/Institutes of changes to their curricula for the period 02/05/2012 - 06/06/2012.

### Part 8 – from the Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions Group (MRAG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPB2011-080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 17. Programme Withdrawals

The Board noted that no programme withdrawals had been made during the period 02/05/2012 - 06/06/2012.

---

### Part 9 – Other business

#### 18. Any other business

**N/A**

**Module Amendments – Postgraduate Diploma Clinical Dermatology (Blizard Institute)**

The Board noted that module amendments to all distance learning modules for the above programme had been submitted for consideration. The amendments all related to assessment weightings changes for the Postgraduate Diploma Clinical Dermatology and to modify the module assessment from being 50% EMQ plus 50% data handling to being 40% EMQ plus 40% data handling plus 20% MCQ.

The Board approved the module amendments.

#### 19. Date of next meeting

The next meeting date of the Taught Programmes Board is Wednesday 25th July 2012 (1-3pm).

The deadline for papers for this meeting is Wednesday 4th July 2012.

#### 20. Dates of meetings for 2012-13

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