Programme Development Update – Programme Approvals

This paper provides details on the following:

- University Programme Approval Committee Dates 2018-19
- Reflections on Outcomes in 2017-18
- Reflections on Activity in 2017-18
- Conditions arising from Approvals in 2017-18

Recommended Actions:

Educational Quality Committee is asked to

- note this report
- consider the actions within
## University Programme Approval Dates 2018-19

### Stage 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 UPAC Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Deadline for Papers (2 weeks before the meeting)</th>
<th>Marketing Guidance and EARLIEST possible UG programme September Start</th>
<th>Marketing Guidance and EARLIEST possible PG programme September Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday 26 September 2018</strong></td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>12 September 2018</td>
<td>2020/21 Last date for Stage 2: 5 June 2019 Will be included in the UG Prospectus 2020/21</td>
<td>2019/2020 Last date for Stage 2: 7 November 2018 Will NOT be included in PG Prospectus 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday 24 October 2018</strong></td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>10 October 2018</td>
<td>2020/21 Last date for Stage 2: 5 June 2019 Will be included in the UG Prospectus 2020/21</td>
<td>2019/2020 Last date for Stage 2: 7 November 2018 Will NOT be included in PG Prospectus 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday 21 November 2018</strong></td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>7 November 2018</td>
<td>2020/21 Last date for Stage 2: 5 June 2019 Last chance to be included in the UG Prospectus 2020/21 – if information is provided promptly</td>
<td>2019/2020 – very late / only if Stage 1 and 2 can happen at the same time (only in consultation with S&amp;AS). Last date for Stage 2: 28 November 2018 Will NOT be included in PG Prospectus 2019/20 Will NOT be represented at the PG Open evening – 14 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday 5 December 2018</strong></td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>21 November 2018</td>
<td>2021/2022 Last Stage 2: June 2020 – tbc Will be included in the UG Prospectus 2020/21 (very tight)</td>
<td>2020/2021 Last Stage 2: 5 June 2019 Will be included in the PG Prospectus 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday 24 January 2019</strong></td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>10 January 2019</td>
<td>2021/2022 Last Stage 2: June 2020 – tbc Will not be included in UG Prospectus 2020/21</td>
<td>2020/2021 Last Stage 2: 5 June 2019 Will be included in the PG Prospectus 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday 27 February 2019</strong></td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>13 February 2019</td>
<td>2021/2022 Last Stage 2: June 2020 – tbc Will not be included in UG Prospectus 2020/21</td>
<td>2020/2021 Last Stage 2: 5 June 2019 Will be included in the PG Prospectus 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 UPAC Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Deadline for papers (3 weeks before the meeting)</td>
<td>Marketing Guidance and EARLIEST possible UG programme September Start</td>
<td>Marketing Guidance and EARLIEST possible PG programme September Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 12 September 2018</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>22 August 2018</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 10 October 2018</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>19 September 2018</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 7 November 2018</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>17 October 2018</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 28 November 2018</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>7 November 2018</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 16 January 2019</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>12 December 2018</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13 February 2019</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>23 January 2019</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 6 March 2019</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>13 February 2019</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 17 April 2019</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>27 March 2019</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 5 June 2019</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>15 May 2019</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*January or other start dates for PG courses to be agreed with Marketing and the Committee

**Stage 2**

| Wednesday 27 March 2019 | 14:00-17:00 | 13 March 2019 | 2021/2022
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Stage 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2020 – tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will not be included in UG Prospectus 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 19 June 2019</td>
<td>14:00-17:00</td>
<td>5 June 2019</td>
<td>2021/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Stage 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2020 – tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will not be included in UG Prospectus 2020/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday 26 March 2019**

- 14:00-17:00
- 13 March 2019
- 2021/2022
- Last Stage 2: June 2020 – tbc
- Will not be included in UG Prospectus 2020/21
- 2020/2021
- Last Stage 2: September 2019 - tbc
- Last chance to be included in the PG Prospectus 2020/2021 – if information is provided promptly (very tight)
Notes / Guidelines

Please note that the deadlines and guidance about starting UG and PG programmes is dictated by CMA requirements and follow the Marketing and Recruitment Cycle in order to give sufficient time to promote each new course. **UG programmes are promoted almost two years before they start** to meet prospectus production, UCAS fairs and City’s Open days. PG programmes need at least one year to be promoted via prospectus, website and City’s open evening. **International students will consider UG and PG courses with a lead time of almost 2 years.**

It is important to understand that programmes that have been approved at UPAC Stage 1 with no conditions, can be advertised with the caveat ‘subject to approval’ only after the Marketing & Communications Department has received an official notification from Student and Academic Services.

**Applications for UG and PG programmes will only be opened after they have received approval at UPAC Stage 2 and Student and Academic Services have notified the relevant departments**
Stage 1 and 2 Programme Approval Reports

Reports from Stage 1 and 2 of University Programme Approval Committee (UPAC) for 2018-19 will be made available on the staff intranet shortly.

Boards of Studies Amendments

A separate report will be presented to Education and Student Committee on Board of Studies Amendments.

Reflections on Outcomes in 2017-18

A very significant volume of programme approval activity took place in the past academic year, encompassing both the standard process and the joint UPAC process being piloted by Cass Business School.

Stage 1

- 14 proposals were considered (some encompassing more than one programme)
- 3 submissions were not approved. 1 proposal was resubmitted and is now approved, 1 proposal was postponed for further development, and 1 proposal is still under discussion
- An average of 8 conditions were set per proposal
- 4 proposals received 8 or more conditions.
- 2 proposals received no conditions.

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

- A number of proposals were submitted without the requisite sign-offs, or with ambiguous approvals from Professional Services colleagues, particularly regarding Finance and Marketing approvals.
- On several occasions Programme Teams were required to address the Stage 1 comments from LEaD, which had been received prior to Stage 1 submission, as a condition of approval. Teams are encouraged to work with LEaD as early in the development process as is possible.
- There were repeated instances of proposals failing to demonstrate a strong rationale for development, which often related to a lack of clarity around programme identity. This frequently led to questions regarding the relationship between the submission and the University Vision and Strategy.
- A number of proposals were asked to reconsider their risk-management strategy, and in some cases, were asked to submit a risk-management plan. This was particularly relevant to proposals with a high percentage of Visiting Lecturer delivery.
- There were several proposals which required greater clarity on the PSRB/accreditation arrangements in terms of what was being offered and how this was communicated to students in the documentation.
- Many of the proposals lacked the required, detailed operational information such as clarity on the administrative management of the proposal(s), timetabling and space requirements, and any hidden costs which students may incur. Programme Teams are encouraged to consider operational developments to support academic development simultaneously.
Commendations

A number of formal commendations were noted by the Committee. These included:

- The commitment to improving the student experience through innovative and engaging development.
- The quality and clarity of the documentation submitted.
- The agility and flexibility of proposal development in response to sector needs and requirements.

Stage 2

- 10 proposals were considered (5 standard process, 5 joint process)
- 1 proposal was rejected but has since met the conditions and been approved at resubmission.
- An average of 5 conditions were set per approval
- 1 proposal received more than 8 conditions

There were a number of themes, collated from the outcomes, evident in the conditions set at Stage 2, too:

- The majority of teams were encouraged to undertake further work with LEaD as part of the conditions issued. The majority of conditions were encompassed by the following:
  - Better alignment between the Learning Outcomes in both the programme and module specifications with the FHEQ statements
  - A greater degree of consistency between the Learning Outcomes in the programme and module specifications was required
  - Greater detail in the information for students around assessments.
- Information regarding assessments was often incomplete or required further detail, particularly in relation to cohesion and the assessment strategy for proposed programmes. Some of the Programme Teams were required to submit a comprehensive assessment matrix as part of their response to the conditions. Work undertaken on the University Assessment Review (UG) would support the implementation of an assessment matrix as a standard part of proposal development.
- A number of proposals were submitted with incomplete information, in particular missing module specifications and incomplete code sets. Programme Teams are reminded that all modules included in a programme, even those which are already approved elsewhere, should be included with each submission. Where this is unrealistic, submissions should be discussed with Student and Academic Services.
- Many proposals received conditions which related directly to the quality and consistency of the student-facing documentation. This included information on assessments, awards and outcomes, professional accreditations, placements and study abroad options. More specifically, information provided in the draft Student Handbooks was often found to be out of date or incorrect.
- All proposals required closer proof reading to eliminate errors as part of the conditions.

A report summarising the status of conditions arising from programme approvals in 2017-18 is included as Appendix 1.
**Commendations**

At Stage 2 UPAC offered a number of commendations on proposals. The most frequent included:

- The quality of the proposals, and the clarity of the documentation.
- The innovative use of assessment to support learning, particularly the ways in which technologies to support assessment have been introduced.
- The amount of work undertaken by the Teams involved in developing and submitting proposals.

**Programme Terminations**

There were several programme terminations in 2017-18. Approved terminations were:

- MSc Biomedical Engineering with Healthcare Technology Management
- MSc Health Informatics
- DPsych Health Psychology
- MSc Information Systems and Technology
- MSc Diagnostic Radiography
- MSc Therapeutic Radiography

The programme termination process has been revised on an ongoing basis in 2017-18, in light of the growing prominence of Competition and Market Authority (CMA) requirements. This work has resulted in a relatively smooth termination process and CMA-compliant letters for offer-holders and applicants.

Further work on both the letters and the process is required and will be undertaken by Student and Academic Services moving forwards. More detailed process guidance and template letters will be presented to the Committee, via a separate paper, in due course.

**Joint Process**

A new UPAC Process was piloted in 2016-17 and 2017-18 by Cass Business School, and used, in specific instances, to approve programmes outside of Cass in 2016-17 and 2017-18. Feedback on the process has been sought from stakeholders, and the outcomes of the pilot have been integrated into the recently approved Programme Approval policy.

As per the new policy, the Joint Process has now evolved into the Hybrid Process, which will become the standard method of approval for all submissions in 2018-19. Full details of the process can be found in the approved policy and guidance.

Support on embedding the new policy and process into practice will be provided, where necessary, by the Quality and Academic Development team in Student and Academic Services.

**Reflections on Activities in 2017-18**

The year 2017-18 was a very busy year for programme development at City and a large number of proposals were considered. A large proportion of proposals were considered as significant amendments to existing provision, rather than new programmes (9 programmes were significant amendments, as opposed to 1 in 2016-17). This demonstrated City’s ongoing commitment to provision of the highest quality, and to the maintenance of excellent relationships with PSRBs, who motivated some of the development. The new programme development represented innovative and
agile responses to rapidly developing industries, and whilst the majority of these programmes were industry-focused, the insistence on excellent academic provision was evident throughout.

It is also noted that the University Programme Approval process underwent Internal Audit in 2017-18, and was awarded green status, which indicates that risk within the process is minimal and well managed, and that the process meets the standards required by the University to ensure robust objectivity throughout.

Whilst a number of the proposals were excellent, and represented the very best development practices, many of the proposals, at both Stage 1 and 2, required significant additional work to receive approval, and this was reflected in the number of conditions programmes received, which was greater than in 2016-17. The themes, highlighted above, are representative of the continuing high standards required by UPAC, and a robust demonstration of the impartiality and objectivity required of Panel members. They also establish that an improvement in the quality of the proposals is required to maintain the standards required of new provision. Schools are encouraged to meet with Student and Academic Services, LEaD and other relevant professional services to discuss potential development early in the process to minimise the possibility of numerous conditions or proposal rejection.

Despite a greater number of UPAC meetings being arranged throughout the year, the dates for which being published in advance of the start of the year, a number of additional meetings were requested by Schools on an ad-hoc basis to consider urgent proposals. The collegiality of all parties is commended in this regard, with many UPAC Panel members agreeing to participate in less time than is usually required, and returning with thoughtful and engaged responses. In response to this, a further increase in planned meetings has been approved, with a Stage 1 and Stage 2 meeting happening each month from September to June. More detailed guidance from Marketing regarding recruitment cycles and possible programme start dates has also been issued, and Quality Teams have been advised of lead times for Professional Services colleagues involved in proposal development. It is hoped that these measures should remove the need for ad-hoc meetings in the 2018-19 cycle.

With the increased focus on the CMA guidelines, particularly as they pertain to Undergraduate developments and amendments, proposals were often subject to closer scrutiny in terms of the material information provided to students and the consistency and coherence of this information. This had the most significant impact on the assessment information available for students, and the level of detail required. In turn, this impacted on the consistency of information, especially in the area of textual information, included in the module specifications, outlining assessment requirements. It is understood that the UG Assessment Review project is in the process of developing a toolkit for assessment design and Teams are encouraged to use this as far as is appropriate once it is available.

As part of the Stage 2 approval discussions in 2017-18, many teams were encouraged to provide assessment maps for the programmes, and in some cases this formed part of the conditions for approval. Assessment maps or matrices were deemed to provide an accurate oversight of the programme, allowing Programme Teams to create coherent and consistent assessment strategies to support learning and effectively monitor progress. It is suggested that assessment matrices become an integrated part of programme development, and a required part of the submission documentation.
A further concern connected to best practice and CMA requirements, and of particular relevance to significant amendments, was the inclusion of student consultation. While there were certainly examples of excellent practice evidenced within the submissions, there were concerns raised by many Panels, at Stage 2, regarding the level and depth of consultation which had taken place. These concerns were not significant enough to warrant conditions, but this report notes these concerns. It is suggested that best practice guidance is developed by Student and Academic Services to ensure CMA compliance and support best practice in programme development.

**Future Enhancements**

The following items are suggested enhancements for Programme Approval in the coming academic year:

- To embed assessment matrices within the process, working in conjunction with School Quality Teams and subject to the appropriate consultation.
- To embed the outcomes of the UG Assessment Review in the development process.
- To create more specific guidance for best practice around student consultation, working alongside the Student Union and CMA Compliance Manager, and to establish a clear process for engaging students at all levels of development activity.
- To update the UPAC forms to incorporate the above, and in-line with the new policy documents. These should be in place by October 2018.

**Recommendations**

The UPAC Panels did not identify any risks within the key Quality processes requiring institutional consideration, however, the following recommendations are made by this report:

i. To encourage Schools to plan development activity in advance and in consideration of scheduled UPAC dates.
ii. To encourage Programme Teams to liaise with Student and Academic Services early in the development process to ensure the completeness of submissions to UPAC.
iii. To encourage teams to consider student engagement and consultation at each stage of the development and approval process.

Dr Lucy Dawkins
Academic Development and Quality Officer
Student and Academic Services
### Commendations and Conditions arising from Programme Approvals in 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPAC Stage</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Date of Event</th>
<th>Commendations</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>MSc International Business (New Programme)</td>
<td>18/10/2017</td>
<td>The Panel commended the programme team, and the School, for the strategic foresight in developing this programme. This programme is offered in response to growing numbers of students studying in the Management cluster of programmes, and with the specific aim of ensuring that student experience is maintained or improved across all programmes.</td>
<td>1. To clearly articulate the marketing strategy for the programme, including specific indications of planned activity. 2. To make explicit in both the rationale and the Programme Specification, the unique selling points of this programme (Cass reputation, faculty expertise and facilities, for example) and how these relate to the student survey data included in the proposal. 3. To address the points below from LEaD: i) Include relevant FHEQ statements on exit awards ii) Programme Specification: under the Learning Outcomes (skill number 2) – the word ‘highest’ is not measurable. Perhaps change this to ‘a range of audiences’? iii) Programme Specification: under the Learning Outcomes (skill number 3) – ‘advanced’ is not measurable in terms of who defines this. Suggest changing this to ‘innovative’ or ‘creative’. iv) Programme Specification: is the international BRP the project module? If so, could ‘project’ be in the title to make this clearer?</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSc International Business (New Programme)</td>
<td>26/01/2018</td>
<td>The marketability of the programme, and the significant level of work undertaken by the team in producing the programme.</td>
<td>1. To address the comments from LEaD (provided separately) and the concerns of the Panel, as communicated in the approval meeting, regarding the assessment information and learning outcomes in the module specifications. 2. To provide sign off from IT.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BA History and Politics (New Programme)</td>
<td>29/11/2017</td>
<td>1. The Panel agreed that the programme was not sufficiently distinct, in terms of City provision, or the wider market. There was also a concern that the proposal was too heavily reliant on existing modules and the Panel agreed that additional, whole-cohort modules could be developed to support programme identity. The programme identity needs further work as it more closely resembles History and International Politics, rather than History and Politics, and this would need to be addressed prior to resubmission. It was agreed that the proposed programme structure did not represent a true 50/50 split of disciplines, and that further work could be done to more effectively balance these. 2. Could the start date of this programme be reconsidered? It was agreed that a 2020-2021 start date would facilitate further programme development and allow the existing single honours programme to establish itself.</td>
<td>Rejected (subsequently withdrawn by School for reconsideration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>MA English (New Programme)</td>
<td>29/11/2017</td>
<td>3. The Learning Outcomes for the programme need further work to reduce the number of outcomes and to support the overall aims of the programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>MA English (New Programme)</td>
<td>04/04/2018</td>
<td>1. To reconsider the title of the award to better reflect the programme offering. 2. To clearly explain the distinctiveness of the offering, more specifically how this programme will offer students employability skills and opportunities, clarifying the relationship between the transferable skills and research elements of the programme. 3. To amend the dissertation to reflect the degree award. If English is retained as the award title, then the dissertation should only reflect this. 4. To identify the baseline numbers for modules to run, and to establish whether these modules will be available outside of the programme. 5. To reconfigure the financial models for the programme, taking account of library resources and marketing costs, and to include approvals for this. 6. To standardise the fee information in the documentation. 7. To include FHEQ statements in the programme specification. 8. To confirm LEaD sign-off in the documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii) The **range of assessments** included on the programme, and the variety of skills these will allow students to demonstrate.

outline for students the kinds of activities they would usually encounter on the module.

3. To include wording in the programme specification explaining the use of peer-review as part of the assessments.

4. To add a pass mark of 50 to the dissertation module specification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>PhD English (New Programme)</th>
<th>29/11/2017</th>
<th>No Conditions</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Stage 2

| Stage 2 | PhD English (New Programme) | 04/04/2018 | 1. The **clarity of the documentation**, considering it to be well-written, persuasive and interesting to read.

ii) The inclusion of comprehensive information on teaching opportunities, and the associated expectations, in the student-facing information. | Approved |

| Stage 1 | BSc Actuarial Science (Significant Amendment) | 29/11/2017 | 1. To address the credit value of the programme and, if no reduction in credits can be made, to strengthen the rationale for such a heavy credit load.

2. To work with LEaD to ensure the appropriate number of Learning Outcomes at programme level, and to use the correct language to express these.

3. To include FHEQ statements on awards in the Programme Specification.

4. To include confirmation from SMCSE that changes to modules affecting their students have been discussed and agreed.

5. To clarify when professional accreditation is expected and what will be required to achieve this. | Approved |
| Stage 2 | **BSc Actuarial Science**  
(Significant Amendment) | 25/04/2018 | 1. To work with LEaD to review the teaching and learning information and the assessment text in the module specifications, with a view to including more exact detail of the requirements for students.  
2. To work with LEaD to review the Learning Outcomes, specifically those under the Knowledge and Understanding headings.  
3. To review the student-facing documentation for consistency of terminology, in-line with IFoA preferences, and to ensure that the language is student-facing.  
4. To include absolute clarity in the programme specification around the outcomes following failure at resit. | Awaiting responses from Programme Team |
| Stage 1 | **MSc Actuarial Science**  
(Significant Amendment) | 24/01/2018 | Commended the Programme Team on the **quality and clarity of the documents.** | Approved |
| Stage 2 | **MSc Actuarial Science**  
(Significant Amendment) | 25/04/2018 | The **clarity and quality of the documents** submitted which, because of this, were a pleasure to read. | Approved |
| Stage 1 | **PG. Cert in Professional Practice**  
(New Programme)  
*Stage 2 not required at the agreement of Deputy President* | 24/01/2018 | i) Commended the Programme Team on the **quality and clarity of the documents.**  
ii) Commended the Programme Team and the School, **recognising the hard work and agility** required to respond quickly and flexibly to a rapidly changing sector environment. | No Conditions |
| Stage 1 | **LLB Maritime Law**  
(Dubai Delivery) | 24/01/2018 | 1. To provide greater clarity on the staffing arrangements for this programme. Specifically, to provide information on who | Approved |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Cass Foundation Programmes (Significant Amendment)</th>
<th>21/02/2018</th>
<th>1. To work closely with the Dean of Cass to clarify the strategic position of the programmes in terms of the target demographic. Specifically, to identify whether these programmes respond to the Widening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Panel was agreed that these conditions should be explicitly approved by the Deputy President, due to the strategic and financial implications.

**Approved**
Participation remit, or are responding to a recruitment opportunity. If there is an intention that this be a WP initiative, and there is evidence that WP students will be attracted and admitted, please liaise with relevant colleagues in S&AS (Emily Thornton) in relation to inclusion of the initiative in our future Access Agreements.

2. To include the specific pass mark in each module specification (include in Stage 2 submission).

3. To provide clarity on the arrangements for assessments and resits, progression to BSc and potential movement between programmes, the required exceptions, and to include this in the student-facing documents (programme specification).

4. To action the feedback from LEaD and to provide their approval.

5. To provide clarity around the proposed delivery of teaching and who will be responsible for this. A plan to manage the risk associated with significant VL delivery should be included within this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Cass Foundation Programmes (Significant Amendment)</th>
<th>11/05/2018</th>
<th>The development of a Project Diary to support development and learning in the module BM0003.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                        |                                        |            | 1. LEaD should see, and approve, all programme and module specifications. Specific attention should be paid to assessment equivalence information, and oversight and adjustment of the Learning Outcomes.  
2. To provide a written plan to manage the risks around VL provision. This should include consideration of the responsibilities and accountabilities of the VLs, both to the School and to the students. |
|                        |                                        |            | Approved |
| Stage 1 | MSc Artificial Intelligence (New Programme) | 21/02/2018 | i) Commended the Programme Team for responding to the increasing interest in, and demand for education in this subject area. | 3. To clarify the role of the Foundation Year in the programme specifications, and to better integrate the aims of the Foundation Year within the overall programme structure.  
4. To standardise the pass mark for the modules (in the module specifications) to ensure that students who pass all of the modules will pass the programme.  
5. To make the changes to AS0005, as discussed.  
6. To clarify the financial implications for BM0004, specifically to include a detailed breakdown of costs and whether the visits are compulsory or not. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>MSc Artificial Intelligence (New Programme)</td>
<td>27/04/2018</td>
<td>i) The innovative use of the pre-application, self-assessment tests for students as a useful and supportive tool.</td>
<td>1. To make the information on internships, specifically their availability and how students might access these, absolutely clear in the programme specification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stage 2 | Introduction to Optometry (Stage 1 in 16/17) | 13/12/2017 | The quality and clarity of the paperwork submitted, and thanked the Programme Team for their considerate responses. | 1. That students should be required to complete, and pass, the DBS check in advance of registering for the programme, due to the contact with members of the public via the Clinical Skills module.  
2. To include some information in the programme specification on the potential difficulty of obtaining a Tier 4 visa for those potential international applicants. | Approved |
| Stage 2 | MSc Airport Management (New Programme) (Stage 1 in 16/17) | 13/12/2017 | The quality of the documentation and the clarity and coherence of the answers from the Programme Team.  
iii) The innovative and timely nature of the programme, and the obvious awareness of the cultural importance and context of its development.  
3. To address the document-specific conditions. | 1. The documentation included for consideration was significantly incomplete, with a substantial number of module specifications missing from the packet.  
2. There were a number of essential sign-offs missing from the documentation, particularly those of PARC and the Programme Director, and the signatories required as part of the responses to Stage 1 conditions (Marketing, Finance etc). | Rejected (Programme Team intend to resubmit) |
| Stage 2 | MSc Airport Management (New Programme) (Resubmission) | 07/02/2018 | i) The Committee **commended the Programme Director** on the significant amount of work which had been done to develop the programme.  
   ii) The Committee were impressed by the **intention to stratify the responsibilities for the VLs**, creating a senior hierarchy for those VLs with greater City experience, and producing a **VL handbook** to support and guide them.  
   iii) The Committee commended the commitment to the **principles of business and industry provision**, and the **innovation** of developing a programme which responded to a direct business need.  
 | 1. To align the programme with the University Personal Tutoring policy.  
   2. To clarify the relationship with Cass Business School, and to provide acknowledgement from the Dean of Cass that they are satisfied with the arrangements.  
   3. To obtain final sign-off from LEaD, following any amendments arising from these conditions.  
   4. To include the assessment component weightings in the EMP860 Project module.  
   5. To amend or remove the statement regarding the ACI and professional exemptions in the programme specification.  
 | Approved |
| Stage 2 | MSc Internet of Things with Entrepreneurship (New Programme) (Stage 1 in 16/17) | 13/12/2018 | 1. To address the document-specific conditions below:  
   i) To provide module codes for all new modules.  
   ii) To provide IT sign-off (even though the Panel acknowledge that no additional resources are required).  
   iii) To provide Finance sign-off as it pertains to the conditions of the Stage 1.  
   iv) To provide signatures of approval for the Stage 2 documents from the PARC Chair, the Programme Director and the Dean.  
   v) To update the wording of the assessment regulations in the programme specification. The current wording can be found in the in the up-to-date programme specification template.  
   2. To provide the student programme handbook.  
   3. To provide the dissertation handbook.  
   4. To work closely with LEaD to:  
 | Approved |
| Stage 1 | BPTC (New Programme and Significant Amendment) | 21/03/2018 | 1. Obtain explicit approval for the proposed amendments from the Dean (by signature or email).  
2. Provide greater detail, specifically additional market research and more information regarding marketing strategy. (Please contact colleagues in Marketing for support with this.)  
3. Improved financial modelling, including provision of a marketing budget and the cost implications of resourcing the proposed increase in technology support.  

| Significant Amendment Approved / Deferred approval of New Programme subject to further discussion |
| Stage 1 | MSc Business Systems Analysis and Design  
(Significant Amendment, agreed by circulation)  
*Stage 2 not required at the agreement of Deputy President* | 06/06/2018 | 4. Finalisation of Programme Specifications to ensure that they ready for marketing (see editorial comments below).  
1. To obtain sign-off from Finance. Although this is a Significant Amendment, UPAC still requires approval from Finance.  
2. To obtain approval from Timetabling (as above).  
3. Clarify the relationship between the modules imported from the terminated MSc Information Systems Technology (IST) and the reconfigured MSc Business Systems Analysis and Design (BSAD) in the student-facing documents. Specifically, demonstrating how students may maintain and IST-type route within the new BSAD.  
4. To make explicit in the programme specification the arrangements for accreditation of the programme and to include full information for students on how they can obtain CITP registration.  
5. To make explicit any potential hidden costs associated with undertaking this programme (SAP TERP10 registration, for example) in the programme specification.  
6. To better represent the interdisciplinarity of the programme in the student-facing documents, specifically the programme specification. | Approved |
| Stage 1 | MSc Advanced Clinical Practice  
(New Programme) | 10/07/2018 | The quality and detail of thought demonstrable within the proposal.  
1. To clarify the entrance arrangements. The proposal suggests that there are both MSc and PG Dip. entrance routes. If students may register for a stand-alone PG Dip. (with the PG Dip as the completion qualification) this will require a separate programme specification. | Approved |
| Stage 1 | MSc Advanced Clinical Practice (Apprenticeship) (New Programme) | 10/07/2018 | The quality and detail of thought demonstrable within the proposal. | Approval Subject to:  
1. The provision of full approval from Finance.  
2. The provision of a detailed plan for how this will be resourced and supported within the School | Awaiting responses to Stage 1 |

2. To clarify the ‘How Will I Learn’ section of the programme specification, including more granular detail of how students will spend their time (for example: include details of hours spent on-site, hours spent in practice). It is a CMA requirement that we clearly explain our expectations of students and what is required of them.  
3. To confirm that arrangements for the 500 protected hours have endorsement from the Trusts.  
4. To clarify the status of, and arrangements for, professional accreditation in the student-facing documents. Any response to this should explicitly state what accreditations students will exit with and how they may apply this, if appropriate.  
5. To clarify the entry requirements for the programme. The response to this condition should specifically address the arrangements for the modular learning required of students prior to commencement, and how this will be managed and assessed within the School.
- a strong business case for the introduction of a new apprenticeship framework
- explicit evidence from HEE/the Trusts that the Level 7 apprenticeship framework will be supported and endorsed.

**Conditions**

3. To confirm how Level 7 apprenticeships support the School plan.
4. To provide a detailed plan of how the School will facilitate and support the University in becoming approved for End Point Assessment. Any response to this should detail resource requirements that will fall outside of the School.
5. To identify any possible ‘hidden’ resources associated with the provision of a Level 7 apprenticeship. This should consider both academic, pastoral, administrative and institutional responsibilities. [For support in responding to this condition please contact Student and Academic Services.]
6. To correct the credit weightings in the documentation – these add up to 185 in certain places, but are stated as totalling 180.
7. To correct the fees for the programme and to outline the specific cost to the institution of the End Point Assessment.
8. To clarify the information in the ‘How Will I Learn’ section of the programme specification.
9. To include information on the End Point Assessment in the ‘What Award Will I Get’ section of the programme specification, as the outcome of the EPA has a direct bearing on the overall award classification.
| Stage  | BSc Nursing (RN/Pre-Reg) (Adult) (Child) (Mental Health) (Significant Amendment) | 10/07/2018 | i) The extraordinary amount of work done by the Programme Team and wider School team in response to the NMC changes. ii) The quality and detail of thought demonstrable within the proposal. | 1. To clarify the relationship between practice and teaching hours in the student-facing documents. Specifically, this should detail the total number of hours students will spend in Simulated Practice versus theoretical (classroom) teaching. 2. To clarify the relationship between practice hours and placement hours, including more detailed information on how credits attached to placement will be assessed and awarded. 3. To provide a mapping document to support the transitional arrangements for students. This should map the 2012 curriculum against the 2019 curriculum, and clearly demonstrate how students requiring reintegration will be managed (this can be submitted as part of the Stage 2 documentation). 4. To address the issue of timetabling Simulated Practice with a view to confirming with central timetabling that the required allocation (across all programme stages) is possible. | Awaiting responses to Stage 1 |

| Stage  | MSc Nursing (RN/Pre-Reg) (Adult and Mental Health) (Significant Amendment) | 10/07/2018 | i) The extraordinary amount of work done by the Programme Team and wider School team in response to the NMC changes. ii) The quality and detail of thought demonstrable within the proposal. | 1. To strengthen the rationale for the provision of this programme, highlighting the benefit of dual registration and its associated desirability in terms of employment. 2. To clarify the relationship between practice and teaching hours in the student-facing documents. Specifically, this should detail the total number of hours students will spend in Simulated Practice versus theoretical (classroom) teaching. 3. To clarify the relationship between practice hours and placement hours, including more detailed information on how credits attached | Awaiting responses to Stage 1 |
1. To clarify the relationship between practice and teaching hours in the student-facing documents. Specifically, this should detail the total number of hours students will spend in Simulated Practice versus theoretical (classroom) teaching.
2. To clarify the relationship between practice hours and placement hours, including more detailed information on how credits attached to placement will be assessed and awarded. [please see BSc outcomes for guidance]
3. To provide a mapping document to support the transitional arrangements for students. This should map the 2012 curriculum against the 2019 curriculum, and clearly demonstrate how students requiring reintegration will be managed (this can be submitted as part of the Stage 2 documentation).
4. To provide a mapping document to support the transitional arrangements for students. This should map the 2012 curriculum against the 2019 curriculum, and clearly demonstrate how students requiring reintegration will be managed (this can be submitted as part of the Stage 2 documentation).
5. To clarify the RPL requirements for this programme in relation to credits and how these will be assessed and applied.
6. To correct the credit weightings in the ‘What Award Can I get’ section, and to ensure that these are consistently presented throughout the student-facing documentation.

| Stage 1 | MSc Nursing (RN/Pre-Reg) (Adult) (Child) (Mental Health) (Significant Amendment) | 10/07/2018 | i) The **extraordinary amount of work done by the Programme Team** and wider School team in response to the NMC changes.  
ii) The **quality and detail of thought** demonstrable within the proposal. |   |   | Awaiting responses to Stage 1 |
|   |   |   |   | 4. To address the issue of timetabling Simulated Practice with a view to confirming with central timetabling that the required allocation (across all programme stages) is possible.
|   |   |   |   | 5. To correct the credit weightings in the ‘What Award Can I Get Section’ and to ensure that these are correctly noted throughout the documentation.
|   |   |   |   | 6. To include the increased credit weighting for the PG Dip in the requested exception to the credit weighting of the programme.
|   |   |   |   | 7. To clarify the position of the Masters Degree in Health Studies as a non-standard exit award.
|   |   |   |   | 8. To make explicit i) The RPL requirements and how these will be assessed. Any response to this should specify that the RPL requirement is to facilitate the ‘accelerated’ nature of the programme and is an NMC requirement.
|   |   |   |   | ii) The entry requirements for this programme, their relationship to the RPL requirements. Any response to this condition should include specific information on how students might meet each requirement and offer transparent standards against which they will be assessed. |