

Programme Development Update

This paper provides details of:

- University Programme Approval Committee Dates 2016/17
- Planned Programme Development for 2016/17

- Reflections on Outcomes in 2015/16
- Reflections on Activity in 2015/16
- Conditions arising from Programme Awards in 2015/16

Education and Student Committee are asked to **note** the contents of the paper

Programme Development Update

University Programme Approval Committee Dates 2016/17

Stage 1

Stage 1 University Programme Approval Committee	Time	Deadline for Papers (2 weeks before the meeting)
Wednesday 26 th October 2016 (for UG and PG programmes due to commence in 2018/19)	10:00-12:00	Wednesday 12 th October 2016
Wednesday 30 th November 2016 (for UG and PG programmes due to commence in 2018/19)	10:00-12:00	Wednesday 16 th November 2016
Thursday 26 th January 2017 (for PG programmes due to commence in 2018/19 and UG programmes due to commence in 2019/20)	15:00-17:00	Thursday 12 th January 2017
Wednesday 1 st March 2017 (for UG and PG programmes due to commence in 2019/20)	15:00-17:00	Wednesday 15 th February 2017
Wednesday 7 th June 2017 (for UG and PG programmes due to commence in 2019/20)	15:00-17:00	Wednesday 24 th May 2017

Stage 2

Stage 2 University Programme Approval Committee	Time	Deadline for Papers (3 weeks before the meeting)
Wednesday 5 th October 2016 (for programmes due to commence in 2018/19)	10:00-13:00	Wednesday 14 th September 2016
Wednesday 14 th December 2016 (for programmes due to commence in 2018/19)	10:00-13:00	Wednesday 23 th November 2016
Wednesday 15 th February 2017 (for programmes due to commence in 2018/19)	14:00-17:00	Wednesday 25 th January 2017
Wednesday 15 th March 2017 (for programmes due to commence in 2018/19)	14:00-17:00	Wednesday 22 th February 2017
Wednesday 12 th April 2017 (for programmes due to commence in 2018/19)	14:00-17:00	Wednesday 22 nd March 2017
Wednesday 21 st June 2017 (for programmes due to commence in 2019/20)	14:00-17:00	Wednesday 31 st May 2017

Planned Programme Development for 2016/17

Programme	School	Type
UG programme (restructure)	Cass (pilot process)	Major amendment
Masters Medical Leadership	Cass (pilot process)	New programme
Articulation Agreement UNIST (S. Korea)	Cass	Partnership provision
PG Cert Anti Money Laundering	Cass	
Nursing Associate Programme	SHS	New programme
PG/UG Speech and Language Therapy	SHS (via accreditation approval)	Major amendment
BA History	SASS	New programme

E&SC is asked to note that at this time there are only a very small number of proposals highlighted for approval in 2016/17; Schools are asked to confirm at the earliest possibility their plans for this academic year in order that the activity can be managed in an efficient way.

Stage 1 and 2 Programme Approval Reports

Reports from Stage 1 and Stage 2 of University Programme Approval Committee (UPAC) can be found on the staff intranet at the following link: <http://www.city.ac.uk/about/education/academic-services/academic-committees/university-programme-approval-committee>

Board of Studies Amendments

A separate report will be presented to E&SC on BoS amendments.

Reflections on Outcomes in 2015/16

A significant volume of programme approval activity took place over the past academic year; proposals were received from all Schools with Cass and SHS submitting the highest numbers.

Stage 1:

- 17 proposals were considered
- 2 submissions were not approved, one has subsequently addressed the requirements of Stage 1
- An average of 5 conditions were set per proposal
- 3 proposals received more than 8 conditions

Several themes were evident in the conditions set at Stage 1:

- Too many proposals were submitted in an under-developed state. In particular, the quality of programme information was frequently below the expected standard. Key issues included:
 - Proposals that failed to align with the Senate regulations and did not propose any rationale to support this variance.

- Failure to demonstrate consideration of the potential for and/or the requirements for the professional accreditation of programmes.
- Lack of alignment with the FHEQ and under developed learning outcomes.
- On several occasions the quality of the marketing information was insufficient to demonstrate demand. Conditions were set for programmes to undertake more detailed competitor analysis and to provide further detail about statements about the distinctiveness of the proposals.
- Major amendments were submitted without full consideration of how current students would be transitioned to the new programmes. This was especially evident when programme had a link to a foundation year/degree or other programmes that articulated to a City award.
- Admissions requirements often needed further clarification.
- Programmes that involved elements of partnership activity were particularly underdeveloped at Stage 1.

Stage 2:

- 10 proposals were considered
- On average 3 conditions were set per proposal
- All Stage 2 proposals were approved

Two main themes were evident in the conditions set at Stage 2:

- The majority of conditions related to the quality of programme information. Key issues included:
 - Accuracy and completeness of programme specifications.
 - Insufficient information in learning outcomes, including outcomes that did not fully align with the FHEQ.
 - Unsatisfactory information on assessment strategies, particularly how the assessment would enable students to demonstrate explicit learning outcomes (the development of 'soft skills', for example).
 - Incomplete careers information.
 - Partial reading lists.
- Too often the student-facing information (in addition to the points above) was not of a high enough quality and in particular it was not always tailored to suit particular student cohorts.

Other conditions were specific to individual proposals.

Commendations

At Stage 2 UPAC commended a small number of programmes for their proposals. These commendations included recognition of a small number of programme teams for developing:

- Innovative new programmes that were designed to meet market demands and exploit new opportunities.
- Well-developed and highly appropriate teaching and learning strategies.
- A programme that would be jointly delivered across two Schools (BSc Health and Social Care).

In particular, UPAC commended proposals and programme information when it was of a particularly high quality. These examples might be usefully shared with programme teams looking at developing new provision.

A report summarising the status of conditions arising from programme approvals in 2015-16 is included as Appendix 1.

Programme Terminations

An update report on programme terminations will be uploaded on to the website in due course.

Reflections on Activity on 2015-16

Programme Approval Committee members, PARC members, Programme Directors and professional staff were invited to provide feedback on their experience of the operation of programme approval process in 2015/16. Many responses were received and key themes are reflected in the analysis below. A small number responses received related to specific proposals; these are not detailed here but will be considered by the Assistant Director (Quality and Academic Development) in planning for 2016/17.

The year 2015/16 was a particularly busy year for programme development at City and a large number of proposals were considered; some of these were very complex involving the major amendment of large programme groupings. The expertise of staff contributing to the process was invaluable both in enabling the volume of activity to be processed, but more importantly in ensuring the development of strong provision. UPAC members are commended for enabling a robust level of peer scrutiny of proposals. It is reassuring that UPAC demonstrates it is robust in setting conditions and, where required, not approving proposals. UPAC members must be able to act impartially to recommend the approval of provision, or otherwise, on the basis of their academic judgement. Members of PARCs must also be encouraged to contribute to the critique of proposals and suggest enhancements to be undertaken before documentation is submitted to UPAC.

There is increasing frustration about the quality of many proposals; both UPAC and School PARC members noted the number of proposals that were progressed in an underdeveloped state. The poor quality of proposals causes delays and additional workload for staff involved in the later stages of the process. The number of conditions set for proposals, particularly at Stage 1, and the number of these conditions that relate to the quality of programme specification information and basic errors raises questions about the quality of peer scrutiny at PARCs and the action of PARCs to set conditions for improvements at an earlier stage.

There is a desire for the programme approval to be more agile and quicker. Some staff, whilst acknowledging that outcomes are useful, question whether the process is too slow. However, it will not be possible to achieve greater efficiencies in the programme approval process until School-level scrutiny and resulting actions are strengthened to improve the quality of proposals. Currently, the role of UPAC is essential in ensuring the robust consideration of the quality and standard of provision. When the standard of submissions improves, further options can be explored.

Related to this, it has been proposed that stronger guidance is required on the appropriate use of Chair's Action in the development of proposals. Chair's Action is sometimes necessary in order that deadlines for other meetings/committees can be met, but it cannot be a substitute for proper peer review of proposals.

While the quality of programme specifications is improving, amendments are frequently required at a very late stage. Programmes should be reminded and encouraged to engage with LEaD at the first stage of development as professional support and guidance materials are available.

This year the University has piloted a joint programme approval process in Cass which has offered some opportunities to streamline the system (although it should be noted that this is not an accelerated process). The joint process enables consideration of the proposal at Stage 2 by a single panel (rather than PARC and UPAC), that includes representation by an external, staff from within the School and from other Schools. This meeting is chaired by one of the approved UPAC chairs from another School. As outlined above, the ability to streamline the process is dependent on the quality of proposals. This pilot will be reviewed fully in due course, in the meantime the feedback is that the process is working fairly well.

Other suggestions provided for consideration included:

- Better advance planning and notice of committee dates. The challenge of scheduling approvals through several committees – Programme Committees, SSLCs and PARCs – was considered to cause additional delays.
- The introduction of a method for UPAC to review the success of newly approved provision (student intake in the first few years, for example) to support the decision-making process in subsequent years.
- Revision of the approval forms so that they might better capture the information needed to support consideration of the approval and the technical information needed to set the programme up on the system. Some suggestions have been provided for consideration.
- Enhancement of programme approval guidance to be more user-friendly and to include best practice examples to assist academic staff developing new proposals.
- UPAC outcomes might usefully align with the outcomes of other quality processes (Periodic Review, for example) to ensure that the expectations are consistent and so that programme teams do not need to duplicate certain work.

Summary: Quality Assessment 2016 and Beyond

Under the revised operating model for quality assessment, it will be necessary for Senate to confirm annually to Council that key quality processes are effective and guarantee the educational quality and standard of City's provision. The analysis above highlights a small number of areas for consideration; the key issue being the quality of scrutiny of proposals at the School stages and the subsequent submission of under-developed proposals.

Conditions arising from Programme Approvals in 2015/16

Programme	Date of event	Conditions(s)	Deadline	Status
BSc Criminology and Psychology	S1 28/10/2015	<p><u>Conditions to be met before marketing for 2017 can take place:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To clarify whether BPS accreditation for the programme has been confirmed. If this has not yet been confirmed, to clarify the anticipated timescale for achieving accreditation, and to ensure that programme documentation and marketing materials clearly reflect that accreditation is not yet in place. To provide revised minutes containing full details of the discussion relating to the Stage 1 approval of the programme at the School PARC held on the 18th June, to provide assurance that appropriate peer scrutiny within the School has taken place. <p><u>Condition to be met within Stage 2 documentation:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To liaise with LEaD to enhance the programme specification, ensuring that previous comments (appendix 5 of the Stage 1 proposal) are incorporated into the revised version, and to make distinctiveness and attractiveness of the programme clearer within the programme summary. <p><u>Condition to be met if the School wishes to proceed with a 2016 start:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the above, to provide a rationale for seeking approval for 2016 rather than 2017 given the likely reliance on Clearing for a 2016 start and the importance of BPS accreditation for the programme, the status of which is currently unclear. 	Prior to marketing	Conditions met (for marketing)
MSc Temporary Works and Construction Method Engineering	S1 02/12/15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To clarify the financial and market rationale for the proposal including clarification of student numbers, staff costs and the proportion of visiting lecturers. To consider whether modules should conform to the University Credit Framework, i.e. multiples of 15. If not, to provide a rationale for the exception, taking into consideration the implications for the potential sharing of modules with other programmes. 	S2 documentation	Complete

		3. To amend the programme specification and publicity materials to reflect that accreditation is currently being sought.		
Joint PhD in Cognitive Neuroscience with Sapienza University of Rome	S1 02/12/15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supervision: to clarify arrangements for primary and secondary supervision. 2. Degree title: Sapienza refers to the programme as 'Psychology and Social Neuroscience' and City refers to it as 'Psychology and Cognitive Neuroscience'. Both institutions should be consistent as a joint award would mean one award and certificate from both institutions. 3. Fees: to clarify the financial arrangements between Sapienza and City including which institution students will pay fees to, as this is inconsistent within the documentation. 4. Modules: to clarify which MSc modules students will need to undertake in the first year and how this requirement will work for students hosted by Sapienza. 5. Sign-offs: needed from Marketing and Finance sign-off (to confirm that the Finance Department is satisfied that there will be no additional cost implications or to provide the approved financial spreadsheet). 6. Confirmation that the due diligence form has been considered and approved by School ExCo. 7. Regulations: to clarify the proposed regulatory framework for the joint award as this is unclear from the documentation; both City's and Sapienza's regulations are referred to. 		Complete
BSc/Postgraduate Diploma/Graduate Diploma/ MSc Public Health (Health Visiting, School Nursing or District Nursing)	S1 02/12/15 (Major amendment)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To revisit programme specifications to ensure that there is sufficient differentiation between the aims and learning outcomes for each award and level. 2. To consider whether the Postgraduate Diploma should be an exit award within the Masters programme. If it remains as a stand-alone award, a rationale should be provided to outline the reasons for this. 3. To outline the transitional arrangements for current students. 	29 January 2016	Complete

Postgraduate Diploma/MSc Primary Care	S1 02/12/15 (Major amendment)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To address the following within the programme specifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To revisit the assessment regulations to ensure that formatting and language is clear for students. e.g. page 6 of the Postgraduate Diploma programme specification states that all modules will be weighted equally...so a 15 credit module would be given equal consideration as a 30 credit module. • To revise all programme specifications for accuracy e.g. the BSc programme specification states that applicants will require an undergraduate degree to enter the programme. 	23 December 2015	Complete
BSc Health and Social Care	S1 02/12/15 (Major amendment)	<p>Condition to be met before marketing takes place:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To highlight the significant differences of the programme against similar (similar in title or content) at competitor institutions. This may be those who offer a similar programme in the UK (Bradford, Lincoln, Swansea, Kent, LSE, Bedfordshire), but should also show what is also offered by our major competitors according to UCAS: Greenwich, Kings, Kingston, LSBU, Middlesex, Queen Mary. 2. <p>Conditions to be met in the Stage 2 documentation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To consider how the delivery and assessment of existing modules offered by SASS would be adapted to reflect the Health and Social Care context. e.g. Contemporary Issues in Media Studies. 2. To amend the programme specification to ensure that the weightings of each year within the awards tables are correct. 	29 January 2016	Complete
BSc Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging) & BSc Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology)	S1 02/12/15 (Major amendment)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To outline the transitional arrangements for current students. 2. To reconsider the weightings of each year to align with Senate UG regulations, which state that Part 1 of a UG degree should not count for more than 15% of the degree mark. As Part 1 currently counts for 20% of the degree mark, rationale for an exception will need to be approved if the School wishes to keep the proposed weighting. 	29 January 2016	Complete

MSc Entrepreneurship	S1 10/12/15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To reflect on how student retention might be affected, given the aims and purpose of the programme and to consider whether flexible modes of study would be viable, for example pausing and resuming studies to focus on a business idea. 2. To ensure that the option of a Dissertation module is included within student facing documentation. 3. To include Framework for Higher Education Qualifications statement in the programme specification. 4. To include specific information on careers in the Careers section of the programme specification. 	15 December 15	Complete
UG Engineering	S1 10/12/15 x5 Major amendment & x2 approvals)	<p><u>Conditions for inclusion within the 2017/18 undergraduate prospectus:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To reduce the entry requirements for intake in 2017/18, raising this incrementally with the aim of reducing the risk associated with recruitment. <p><u>Conditions to be met by 15th February 2016:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. To consider the transitional arrangements for current students, as well as the impact on students joining the new degrees from the Foundation Years delivered by Westminster Kingsway College and City & Islington College or through a 2+2 articulation. For example, provide clarification on whether any changes would be required to the Foundation Years or articulation arrangements to align with the changes being made to the provision. 3. To clarify why the entry requirements for students entering via a Foundation Year are the same for the BEng and MEng, when they are different for students entering with other qualifications. In addition, to clarify why the Foundation Year entry requirements are different for the different degree titles, e.g. 65% for BEng Civil Engineering and 75% for Biomedical Engineering. 4. To clarify why some programmes include no planned international student numbers. 	Stage 2 documentation	Complete

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. To undertake student consultation with current students, alumni and/or prospective students on the proposed changes through proposition testing. 6. To expand the competitor analysis to provide all the information required within the Stage 1 form. 7. To confirm whether the School is in a position to guarantee summer internships for students achieving 60% overall at the end of Part 2. 8. To ensure that comments from LEaD are addressed within the programmes specifications, for example articulating the differentiation between learning outcomes for BEng/MEng provision. 9. To clarify the arrangements for students transferring between the BEng and the MEng, in particular the impact of the absence of a project in Part 3 of the MEng in relation to gaining accreditation for students exiting the MEng programme early with a BEng award. 10. To expand the rationale for the introduction of a general Engineering degree, including evidence that there will be demand for the programme given that City will be the first to offer this amongst competitors. 11. To expand the rationale for the introduction of a Structural Engineering degree, including evidence that there will be demand for the programme given that City will be the first to offer such a programme in England. 12. To provide Stage 1 sign-offs from the Programme Directors and PARC Chair. 13. To provide details of the external advisors for Stage 2 and to ensure that a sufficient number are appointed for the range of programmes under consideration. 		
Academic Bridge Programme Articulation Agreement, Qatar	S1 13.01.16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To provide the outstanding Due Diligence form and Finance Letter from ABP. As part of the due diligence checks, to confirm which institutions have formal articulation agreements in place and to obtain a reference from the highest ranking two. It is recommended 		Pending

		<p>that this include details of how many students are accepted and their progression through their chosen degree programmes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. To obtain sign-off from Deans of the participating Schools. 3. To clarify whether ABP students will be required to apply through UCAS, considering the implications of not using this system. To communicate the agreed process with the Admissions team and to ensure that if UCAS is not used, that arrangements are in place to include APB students in relevant offer-holder communications. <p>To obtain full transcripts for students applying to City to gain an overview of their progression through the Academic Bridge programme.</p>		
Solicitors' Apprenticeship (Law)	S1 20.04.16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To clarify the level of the award and length of the programme, and ensure that this is accurately reflected in all publications, using consistent terminology. 2. To provide clarity around the potential implications for a student's employment if they fail the programme, as well as their place on the apprenticeship route if employment with the participating firm ceases. This should be clearly articulated to students to manage expectations. 3. To provide clarity around the admissions process, in particular; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • articulate how the programme team will work with employers to ensure that students have the academic capabilities to complete the programme. • provide further information on the mechanisms in place to aid social mobility. 4. To provide KIS information, given that the modules taken are different to the approved LLB programme. 	27 May 16	Completed
Foundation Year Actuarial Science/Accounting with Finance	S1 20.04.16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To clarify the implications on teaching and library resources in light of the Actuarial Science Foundation being taught in house, as well as the addition of the new Accounting & Finance route. 2. To liaise with LEaD to further enhance programme specifications. 3. To revise the intention to use Wednesday afternoon slots for teaching as this 	6 May 2016	Complete

		<p>contradicts the University timetabling policy. Alternatively, a rationale should be provided to take into account that the University is required to avoid scheduling teaching activity on Wednesday afternoons to enable students to participate in team sport without any resulting detriment to their studies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. To provide a rationale for the exception to the University Credit Framework. 5. To provide KIS information, which is required for an integrated Foundation that continues on to a Degree. 		
Postgraduate Certificate in Anti-Money Laundering	S1 20.04.16	<p>The proposal was approved with conditions to be met before marketing can take place:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To clarify the nature of the partnership with Lysis in order to determine the requirements of the approval process and arrangements for ongoing management and oversight of the programme. In particular; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clarify whether the School can source VLs from somewhere else if it chooses, or if it is dependent on Lysis either contractually or due to availability of subject expertise. • confirm if the University wholly owns the IP for the programme, or if it is jointly owned with Lysis. • clarify whether the programme will be marketed as a jointly delivered programme with Lysis and if Lysis will have any responsibilities for marketing the programme. • confirm whether the income and costs of delivery will be shared with Lysis, and if so to clarify the nature of the contract which will underpin the agreement with Lysis. 2. To clarify the entry requirements for the programme, in particular, whether 'successful completion of any associated exams' refers to exams related to the Lysis courses mentioned and, if not, what other courses these exams relate to. 3. To provide a rationale as to why the School has chosen to develop an award-bearing programme rather than delivering this as CPD. 	22 April 2016	Complete

MSc Airport Management	S1 07.06.16	<p>The proposal was not approved and would therefore need to be revised and resubmitted for further consideration by the Stage 1 University Programme Approval Committee. The following points would need to be addressed within a revised proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student numbers: to clarify inconsistencies in relation to student numbers throughout the documentation. For example, the course costing assumes 207 FTE by year 4 (2019-20), which is inconsistent with p1 of the documentation. • Resources: to clarify the level of investment required in terms of staff resources. • Dubai/Frankfurt modules: to clarify arrangements for the delivery of modules in Dubai/Frankfurt. • Airports Council International: to provide further information from the ACI in support of the programme and to provide further evidence of demand for the programme. To clarify whether the ACI will be involved in the delivery or support for the programme or if the partnership relates to off-site partnership delivery. To clarify the nature of the MoU with ACI mentioned on p7. • Accreditation: to clarify accreditation arrangements-the Stage 1 Form states that there will be no accreditation but the programme specification states Airports Council International & Royal Aeronautical Society as the accrediting body (P21). • External Advisor: to reconsider the External Advisor for the programme given that University Regulations state that External Advisors cannot be affiliated with the University. The documentation indicates that he will be teaching on the programme. • Programme Specification: To provide the most up to date version of the Programme Specification with input from LEaD. 	Not approved	N/A
Executive Masters in Healthcare Leadership & Enterprise	S1 07.06.16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To provide a joint statement which highlights the dialogue that has taken place between Cass Business School and School of Health and Social Sciences, including commentary from the School of Health 	09 June 2016	Complete

		Sciences on the market and how the separate programmes will benefit the University.		
BSc Business Management-Major Amendment	S1 07.06.16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To undertake further qualitative market research with prospective students. 2. To revise the Programme Specification to ensure that the pathway core and elective modules are clear to students and that the information on league table positions is not misleading. 3. To confirm the collaborative arrangements across pathways, in particular whether an overseas experience is compulsory for students on the International Pathway and ensure that this is clearly articulated in student facing documentation. 4. To clarify the timescales involved in the re-accreditation of the programme to ensure that this is in place prior to advertising the programme. 5. To consider the transitional arrangements for students taking a year out of the programme and communication of the changes to students on Foundation Years at INTO and Kaplan. 	09 June 2016	Pending resubmission
BSc Speech and Language Therapy, MSc Speech and Language Therapy, MSc Speech and Language Therapy (Integrated)	S1 25.08.16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To fully articulate what the benefits would be for students in undertaking the Integrated Masters rather than the BSc, given that students exiting with the 3 year BSc will still meet the requirements for professional registration. Furthermore to demonstrate how the 'innovative' nature of the Integrated Masters route would be reflected in the marketing of the programme and the likelihood of students remaining for the fourth year after completing their BSc. Given the small number of students predicted to progress to the Integrated Masters, the response to this condition should also address the potential impact on the student experience of a small cohort. 2. To consider whether the proposed start date of September 2017 is realistic given that the School will not be able to make offers until Stage 2 approval is achieved including meeting any Stage 2 conditions. 	2 September 2016	Complete

		<p>Further details of the timeline involved in offer making for both the BSc/Integrated Masters and the standalone MSc should be provided.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. To change the award title for the Integrated Masters route from 'MSc' so that there is sufficient differentiation between this route and the standalone 2 year MSc. The standard practice at City, which is also common practice within the sector, is for the award title of an integrated masters to reflect the subject area. Current examples at City are MEng, MMath, MOptom and MSci Computer Science. If the School wishes to retain the MSc title, a rationale would need to be provided which would require approval by Senate prior to marketing. Previous discussions by Senate suggest that Senate approval of MSc as a title for an Integrated Masters would be highly unlikely. 4. To confirm which professional accreditations are offered on each degree and to ensure this is reflected in the accreditation section of all programme specifications. Currently the Integrated Masters and the MSc do not appear to list recognition by the Royal College of SLTs. 5. To conform to the standard maximum periods of registration stated in the University Assessment Regulations (6 years for BSc, 7 years for Integrated Masters) unless there is a valid reason for exemption. If this is the case then a written rationale should be provided for inclusion in the Programme Regulations if approved. 6. To ensure that within the calculation of the overall aggregate mark for the degree and exit awards, that the weightings of each Part of the BSc and Integrated Masters programmes conform with the requirements in Senate Regulation 15 (UG Programmes). Please refer to Paragraph 13b of Senate Regulation 15 for the requirements. 7. To review and revise the aims and learning outcomes within each programme specification to ensure that they reflect the level of the programme (FHEQ Level 6 or Level 7), and that there is appropriate differentiation of the aims and outcomes between the programmes reflecting the different levels. Additionally, to expand the aims of the BSc within the programme specification. 		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>8. To liaise with LEaD to further enhance programme specifications to provide additional information to students on teaching, learning and assessment in the relevant sections of the specifications.</p> <p>9. To review and revise the content of the Integrated Masters programme to include learning at Level 6 in the 3rd year. The Committee was concerned that students would not be adequately prepared to undertake Level 7 study after the second year which is at Level 5, and agreed that the programme should be restructured to show clear academic progression through the programme.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the programme as currently structured did not meet the national guidance on Integrated Masters provision in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and the Masters Degree Characteristics statement. In particular, that “integrated masters degrees involve learning across levels 4-7 of the FHEQ”, that “study at bachelors level is integrated with study at masters level and the programmes are designed to meet the qualification descriptors in full at Level 6 of the FHEQ and level 7 of the FHEQ”.</p> <p>It was noted that the University’s credit framework in line with national guidance requires a minimum of 120 credits at Level 7 for an Integrated Masters programme. The proposed programme had significantly exceeded this with 240 credits at Level 7.</p> <p>10. To provide further clarity within the programme specifications for the BSc and Integrated Masters as to how students enter the Integrated Masters. The Committee considered that it was not sufficiently clear that admission would only be by transfer from the BSc after the second year with an overall aggregate mark of at least 60%.</p> <p>11. To confirm whether current students and those commencing their programmes in 2016/17 will remain on the current SLT programmes or whether it is proposed that they transfer to the new provision. If they will transfer, to provide full details of the proposed transitional arrangements.</p> <p>12. To address the additional list of revisions provided in programme specifications.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

LLB Legal Practice (in partnership with CILEx)	S2 07/10/15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specify whether the programme will be offered to international students and if so, articulate how assessment methods would be adapted to meet the needs of international students (due to visa restrictions) and how time differences would be taken into account when scheduling synchronous activity. 2. Ensure timeframes for direct contact time with tutors are clearly communicated to students in advance, taking into account the likelihood of students' working hours; clarify that the 48 hour response time to e-mail queries is two <i>working</i> days. 3. Revisit and revise the student handbook and module specifications to ensure that all information is appropriately positioned and relevant to distance learning students. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • signposting who students should contact at each institution for specific support matters • providing information on how students access support services within the University in a way that reflects their mode of study (e.g. disability support) • specifying which modules are practice-based and which are academic, and clarifying the link between the practice-based and academic modules • repositioning detailed student support information from the module specification to the student handbook and considering the level of detail provided in order to manage student expectations • revising the number of scheduled contact hours in module specifications in liaison with Student and Academic Services 	30 November 2015	Complete
BSc Finance	S2 07/10/15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a response to the Stage 1 condition relating to learning outcomes and make associated changes to the module specifications. 	20 November 2015	Complete

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Clarify to students that where an assessment is either an essay or a class test, this is decided by the module leader as opposed to the student. 3. Confirm whether the partnership with Beijing Normal University will be terminated and amend the programme specification as appropriate. 		
MSc Global Finance	S2 15/12/15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To revisit and revise the learning outcomes within the programme and module specifications to ensure that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of study is clearly reflected, in line with University and sector guidelines; • All outcomes are measurable, particularly in relation to the values and attitudes sections ; • The 'How will I learn' sections reflect the online nature of the programme. 2. To articulate clearly within the Programme Handbook who students should contact for specific learning support, personal tutorials and pastoral matters and ensure that the implications of 'sitting out' a module from the usual sequence are clear. 3. To revise the programme and module specifications to ensure that the global nature of the programme is reflected, for example through module summaries/content outline, formative/summative assessment activities and reading lists. 	1 February 2016	Complete
BA English	S2 15/12/15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To revise the programme specification to ensure that the following sections are included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what kind of career might I go on • What placement opportunities are available • How do I enter the programme • AP(E)L 	1 February 2016	Complete
MSc Research Methods	S2 17/02/16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To consider the overall assessment strategy of the programme and ensure that assessment specifications and criteria are clearly articulated. 	30 April 2016	Complete

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. To review and respond to the comments made by LEaD and Student and Academic Services by providing relevant sign-offs and revising student facing documentation as required. 		
MSc Entrepreneurship	S2 25/02/16	<p>The Committee agreed the following commendations, conditions and recommendations.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To provide further clarity on the Business Research Project within the module specification, including an indicative reading list to cover research methods and guidance on the expectations for projects based on a business plan. 2. To clarify, and articulate to students, the organisation and assessment of group work and how parity will be ensured. For example, to clarify if different assessment criteria are used for individual and group work within the same module and to reconsider the use of different word lengths for individual and group submissions for certain assessments. 3. To consider the progression of students from term two to term three if re-sits are required and to articulate this within the programme specification. 4. To undertake final enhancements to programme and module specifications. A list of recommended enhancements will be provided to the programme team. 	14 April 2016	Complete
BSc Criminology and Psychology	S2 16/03/16	<p><u>Programme Level:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To require students to take a minimum of three elective Criminology modules at level 6 and to ensure that this is reflected in the programme specification. 2. To ensure that students are made aware through programme documentation that they may undertake a project in criminology for the Psychology Project module to accommodate their preferences. 	29 April 2016	Pending

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. To complete the year weightings for the award calculations in the programme specification. 4. To proof read programme and module specifications and remove any typographical and grammatical errors. <p><u>School Level:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. To revise all module specifications within the programme to ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • learning outcomes are measurable • assessment descriptors and weightings are included • language is student facing throughout 		
MSc Temporary Works and Construction Engineering	S2 13/04/16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To review all module specifications in liaison with the School LEaD representative to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that that learning outcomes are measurable; • Clarify the assessment methods for each module to ensure transparency for students. 2. To provide further clarity on the Dissertation module, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employer involvement in providing a project, and the implications if this does not happen; • Revise the number of contact hours and ensure that this is accurately reflected in student facing documentation. 3. To articulate within the programme specification that there are no formal progression points for this award. 	27 May 2016	Complete
BSc Health and Social Care	S2 13/04/16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To revise the weightings for each year of the programme to align with the UG Senate regulations. 2. To provide the revised level 6 module specification for the Technology Enabled care module. 3. To address the specific comments from LEaD to ensure that language is student facing and learning outcomes are measurable. 	6 July 2016	Complete
BEng/MEng Engineering Grouping:	S2 24/08/16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To articulate more clearly the differentiation between learning outcomes for BEng/MEng awards within all programme 	Conditions 1,5 & 6 - 08/09/16	Pending

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BEng/MEng Aeronautical Engineering • BEng/MEng Mechanical Engineering • BEng/MEng Electrical and Electronic Engineering • BEng/MEng Civil Engineering • BEng/MEng Biomedical Engineering • BEng/MEng Structural Engineering • BEng/MEng Engineering 		<p>specifications. Consideration should be given both to shared learning outcomes and those that are distinct for each award level, including specifying the specific characteristics expected of students at master's level.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. To state clearly on all module specifications, the number of assessment components within the module and their type and weighting. Additionally to review and, where appropriate, revise the amount and size of assessment in each module to ensure appropriateness for the amount of credit. Furthermore to outline resit arrangements. Note: Assessment Regulations from 2016/17 require a resit for only those components failed at the first attempt. 3. To articulate within each module specification the opportunities available to students for formative assessment, including feedback that should help them to prepare for later assessment. 4. To standardise the referencing system in all reading lists (e.g. to use Harvard referencing), and to ensure all module specifications include up to date texts where appropriate 5. To finalise and publicise the requirements for Foundation Year entry in light of the fact that students will be applying imminently for Foundation Year entry 2017/18 for progression to City in 2018/19. 6. To address the additional list of revisions provided in relation to both programme and module specifications. <p>It was advised that revised programme specifications and module specifications should be submitted with the responses to the conditions with the changes clearly highlighted, and would require sign-off by LEaD.</p>	<p>Conditions 2, 3 & 4 - 28/10/16</p>	
---	--	---	---	--