

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Thursday 9 April 2009

Report from the Programme Approval Group for the Faculties
of Engineering and Science

Mr J Craig, Senate Office

Present:

Professor Neil Evans (Convener), Dr Philip Cotton, Dr Alice Jenkins

In attendance:

Mr Jim Craig (Clerk)

By invitation:

Mrs Eleanor Waugh (for Faculties of Science proposals)

1. FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

1.1 POSTGRADUATE PROPOSALS

1.1.1 MSc Aeronautical Engineering (New programme)

Rationale: This proposal has been developed in response to a perceived need for a short postgraduate programme including the opportunity for specialisation in rotorcraft engineering. A similar programme at the University of Bristol has recently been discontinued though it had been consistently attracting around a dozen students each year. Discussions with a key industrial partner are underway in order to secure and maintain full industrial relevance and support through industrial placements.

Regulations: This programme would be governed by the generic PGT regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and requested some alterations as follows:

- Section 7 (Programme accredited by) – Since accreditation had not yet been attained, the Group requested that reference to the intention to apply should be removed to section 16 of the Programme Specification.
- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group requested that this section be revisited and redrafted in accordance with the guidance published on the Senate Office web pages. It wished to draw to the Faculty's attention the need for outcomes to be objective, specific and testable, and that, in a public document, they had to be assembled carefully with due respect for syntax.
- Section 12 (Assessment methods) – The Group requested that the final sentence be removed, this being universal for all of the University's taught programmes.
- Section 14 (Relevant QAA subject benchmark statements ...) – The Group requested that, in the absence of appropriate statements, the text supplied should be replaced with 'None'.

- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) – The Group noted that this included occurrences of the expression ‘Semester 3’ and requested that these be deleted and, as appropriate, replaced by a reference to the months, season, or part of the session. In the table of courses it was noted that a mixture of notations was employed and that if ‘M’ was to be used to indicate masters level, ‘H’ rather than ‘10’ should be used for the *Aerospace Design Project 4* course.

Conclusion:

Subject to the requested adjustments to the Programme Specification, the Group recommends the proposed new programme to ASC.

1.1.2 MSc Computer Systems Engineering (New programme)

Rationale: Following review of existing MSc provision in Electronics and Electrical Engineering and Computing Science in the context of perceived demand, a gap was discovered which might be filled largely by combining courses which were already running. The proposed programme will permit Electronic Engineering graduates to advance their software skills while affording Computing Science graduates an opportunity to extend their knowledge and understanding of hardware issues.

Regulations: This programme would be governed by the generic PGT regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and requested some alterations as follows:

- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group requested that, under the sub-heading *Knowledge and Understanding*, the word ‘typical’ should be removed from the expression ‘typical student’. It requested also that, under the sub-heading *Transferable skills* and within the statement of intent, the future conditional (should) be replaced by the future indicative (will).
- Section 12 (Assessment methods) – The Group requested that the first sentence be removed, this being universal for all of the University’s taught programmes.
- Section 14 (Relevant QAA subject benchmark statements ...) – The Group requested that, in the absence of appropriate statements, the text supplied should be replaced with ‘None’.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) – The Group found this section difficult to follow and requested the following amendments:
 - The presentation of courses should be revised so that they appear under the sub-headings ‘Compulsory’ and ‘Optional’ and are arranged then according to the semester in which they are taught.
 - The requirements for the MSc may be shown with early exit points for certificate (60 credits) and diploma (120 credits) indicated.
 - The Group envisaged that in this restructuring the second and third paragraphs, “The minimum requirement ... 180 credits” would be removed.

Points for discussion:

The Group raised the following issues with regard to the proposed new programme:

- The Group noted in section 4.6 of the Support Document (Consultation with potential employers) the inscription, “Not relevant – market is almost entirely international.” The Group found it difficult to reconcile this with the rationale for the programme, and suggested that, if it were difficult to identify a potential employer locally, the programme proposers ought to consider consulting further afield.
- The Group similarly questioned the statement “Not relevant – no additional lecture provision” which appeared in section 4.8 of the same document. The Group considered it unreasonable to assume that the Learning and Teaching Centre would have no advice to offer when existing courses were repackaged to produce a new programme.

Conclusion:

The Group recommends to ASC approval of the proposed new programme subject (a) to a satisfactory outcome of consultations with potential employers and the Learning and Teaching Centre or the Group’s being persuaded by the Faculty that such consultations were impracticable or unnecessary, and (b) to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specification.

1.1.3 MSc Global Water Sustainability (New programme)

Rationale: Following agreement with Heriot-Watt University to discontinue the joint MSc in Water Resources Engineering Management and, in the context of the Glasgow Research Partnership in Engineering, this proposal has been developed with the University of Strathclyde. The proposal fits comfortably within the Department of Civil Engineering’s strategy to create an internationally leading postgraduate school under the umbrella of the Glasgow Sustainability Network and the David Livingstone Centre for Sustainability.

Regulations: This programme would be governed by the generic PGT regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and requested some alterations as follows:

- Section 2 (Final award ...) – The value of the programme, presented as 600 credits requires correction.
- Section 10 (Programme aims) – Mindful of the function of the Programme Specification, the Group took the view that this section, as presented, was too long and required considerable pruning.
- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group requested that this section be revisited and redrafted in accordance with the guidance published on the Senate Office web pages. It wished to draw to the Faculty’s attention the need for outcomes to be objective, specific and testable. The Group advised that phrases such as “a deeper understanding” were not appropriate in this context, and took the view that the bullet points under the sub-heading *More Specific Intended Learning Outcomes* were expressed as programme aims rather than ILOs.
- Section 12 (Assessment methods) – The Group requested that the content of this section be reduced to a statement of assessment methods. Details, particularly in respect of the timing of events, are liable to change, and it is not in the interest of the programme proposers to commit unnecessarily. In passing, the Group noted that the expression ‘course’ should be used instead of ‘module’.

- Section 13 (Learning and teaching approaches) – The Group took the view that this section also was too discursive and required considerable pruning. Again ‘module’ is wrongly used for ‘course’.
- Section 14 (Relevant QAA subject benchmark statements ...) – The Group took the view that the considerable amount of information presented in this section could and should be removed.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) – The Group noted that the course CL931 appeared in the table of optional courses but was categorised as compulsory, and so requested that this be reviewed. It requested also the following amendments:
 - In the leading instruction, replace ‘totally’ with ‘totalling’.
 - Use ‘course’ rather than ‘module’ throughout.
 - Delete the ‘Comp/optional’ column which is redundant in the given presentation.
 - Show the credit requirements for the award of the certificate and diploma.
- Section 15 (Additional relevant information) – The Group requested that the names of course leaders be removed from the information provided.

Points for discussion:

The Group raised the following issues with regard to the proposed new programme:

- The Group noted in the Minutes of the Faculty Teaching Committee held on 28 January the reference to a “detailed response to comments from industry and external sources” which the Committee had not received. The Group noted also that the extract from the minutes of the Faculty meeting held on 4 February did not mention whether this response had been recovered and checked.
- The Group noted also that Faculty approval of the proposal had been made conditional upon confirmation of the proposed terms, and in particular the financial arrangements, being agreed with the University of Strathclyde.

Conclusion:

The Group recommends to ASC approval of the proposed new programme subject (a) to confirmation that consultation dialogues have been concluded satisfactorily, (b) to formal agreement being concluded to the satisfaction of the Faculty with the University of Strathclyde, and (c) to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specification.

1.2 UNDERGRADUATE PROPOSALS

1.2.1 BEng (Honours) Aerospace Systems (New programme)

Rationale: It is intended that the proposed programme should replace the BEng in Avionics. The new degree is intended to provide a unique fusion of aeronautical, electrical and systems engineering concepts. Such a blend of disciplines will provide the basis for development of professional engineering graduates with a knowledge range appropriate to graduate employment in aerospace and related industries.

Regulations: The proposed programme would be governed by the existing BEng regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and found it generally well constructed. It suggested minor alteration as follows:

- Section 7 (Programme accredited by) – Since accreditation had not yet been attained, the Group requested that reference to the intention to apply should be removed to section 16 of the Programme Specification.
- Section 8 (UCAS code) - The Group was uncertain whether this field had been overlooked and requested that the code be added if or when available.
- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group requested that “Write and” be deleted from the fourth bullet point.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) - The Group requested that the final sentence be removed, this being universal for all of the University’s taught programmes.

Conclusion:

Subject to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specification, the Group recommends the proposed new programme to ASC.

1.2.2 MEng (Honours) Aerospace Systems (New programme)

Rationale: It is intended that the proposed programme should replace the MEng in Avionics. The new degree is intended to provide a unique fusion of aeronautical, electrical and systems engineering concepts. Such a blend of disciplines will provide the basis for development of professional engineering graduates with a knowledge range appropriate to graduate employment in aerospace and related industries.

Regulations: The proposed programme would be governed by the existing MEng regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and found it generally well constructed. It suggested minor alteration as follows:

- Section 7 (Programme accredited by) – Since accreditation had not yet been attained, the Group requested that reference to the intention to apply should be removed to section 16 of the Programme Specification.
- Section 8 (UCAS code) - The Group was uncertain whether this field had been overlooked and requested that the code be added if or when available.
- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group requested that “Write and” be deleted from the fourth bullet point.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) - The Group requested that the final sentence be removed, this being universal for all of the University’s taught programmes.

Conclusion:

Subject to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specification, the Group recommends the proposed new programme to ASC.

2. FACULTIES OF SCIENCE

2.1 POSTGRADUATE PROPOSALS

2.1.1 MSc Biotechnology (New Programme)

Rationale: This proposal was inspired by feedback from the International and Postgraduate Service indicating a high level of interest among overseas students for a taught biotechnology MSc. It was recognised that such a programme would also appeal to UK and EU students interested in entering the rapidly expanding biotechnology sector because it would combine the science with a business perspective. The proposal draws significantly on expanded and repackaged teaching material from other programmes and on research expertise already located in the Faculty.

Regulations: If approved, the programme will be governed by the Generic Regulations for Taught Masters Degrees.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and found it well constructed. It suggested only minor alteration as follows:

- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) – The Group suggested that the timing of the dissertation, presented as “July-August” should be amended to reflect the fact that work will normally be begun rather earlier than this suggests.

Points for discussion:

The Group raised the following issues with regard the proposed new programme:

- The Group noted that the Programme Specification indicated that the relative weights assigned to component courses in the assessment of the programme as a whole were at variance with the distribution of course credits across the programme. The Group recognised that variance appeared to be permitted by the Generic PGT Regulations (the footnote assigned to §7.1 refers) but questioned whether the Committee should review the principle. In the proposal presented to the Group for consideration the variance between assessment weighting and course credits was not great except in a single course, Biotechnology Business Skills, which carried 11.1% of the programme’s 180 credits but a proposed 20% of the programme assessment.
- The Group noted that the Proposal Support Document made no reference to consulting potential employers. The Group took the view that it would have been appropriate, especially in the context of the rationale offered, for such consultations to have been made, and the Group would have found a positive response helpful.

Conclusion:

The Group recommends to ASC approval of the proposed new programme subject, (a) to the view taken by the Committee as a whole to the proposed assessment weightings, (b) to the Faculty’s response to the Group’s view that potential employers might have been consulted, and (c) to the requested minor amendment being made to the Programme Specification.

2.1.2 MSc Brain Imaging Methods (New Programme)

Rationale: The central role played by brain imaging methods in modern psychology has resulted in a growing demand from students wishing to learn the new techniques as part of their research training. There is a demand also from other professionals who wish to learn the techniques of research in a brain imaging environment and in processing the data streams generated. The proposed programme is aimed at both markets.

Regulations: If approved, the programme will be governed by the Generic Regulations for Taught Masters Degrees.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and requested some alterations as follows:

- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group considered that the first of the ILOs presented under the sub-heading *Transferable / key skills* was too wide-ranging and imprecise, and the last incapable of being demonstrated in assessment, and requested that these be redrafted or removed.
- Section 12 (Assessment methods) – The Group requested that the final sentence referring to the Code of Assessment be deleted.
- Section 13 (Learning and teaching approaches) – The Group requested that what was probably a pasting error producing “Quantitative methods is taught” be corrected.
- Section 14 (Relevant QAA subject benchmark statements ...) – The Group took the view that the information provided in this section was excessive and misplaced. It requested that, in the absence of appropriate benchmark statements, it would be appropriate to substitute ‘None’. A synopsis of the information supplied might be relocated in section 10 (Programme aims). A link to the ESRC website might be provided there or in section 16 (Additional relevant information).
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) – The Group requested that the requirements for the early exit award of a PG Certificate be provided. The Group understood from the final sentence in this section that students exiting the programme with a PG Diploma would be required to complete a literature review on an appropriate topic. It concluded, therefore, that the statement earlier that the review was optional for Diploma students was incorrect, and that it should be deleted.

Points for discussion:

The Group raised the following issues with regard the proposed new programme:

- The Group noted that the Proposal Support Document indicated “awaiting” against consultations with potential employers. Mrs Waugh suggested that the potential employer contacted would probably have been a local health board and agreed to check whether any response had been received.
- The Group discussed the expressed wish of prospective students for more ‘hands on’ experience but was satisfied with the conclusion that this would not be appropriate.

Conclusion:

Subject to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specification, and a satisfactory outcome to consultations with potential employers, the Group recommends the proposed new programme to ASC.

2.1.3 MRes Human Geography: Space, Policy and Power (Major Change)

Rationale: Following a review of the programme, the proposed change to its content is intended (a) to provide students with a deeper engagement with contemporary issues, (b) to appeal to a larger number of potential students, and (c) to reflect the current research interests of staff.

Regulations: If approved, the programme will be governed by the Generic Regulations for Taught Masters Degrees.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and found it generally well constructed but requested alterations as follows:

- Section 11 (Intended Learning Outcomes) - The Group took the view that some of the ILOs presented under the sub-heading *Transferable / key skills* were too specialised to be included in this group and requested that they be relocated as appropriate. It noted also that the usual sub-heading *Knowledge and understanding* had not been used and that, as expressed, some of the ILOs would be incapable of assessment. The Group requested, therefore, that this section be redrafted in accordance with the advice published on the Senate Office web pages.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) – The Group requested that the statement in bold type “In addition, students may take an alternative pathway:” be replaced by: “The following alternative pathway is available:”. The Group noted the absence of reference here and in section 2.2 to the availability of a Postgraduate Certificate as an exit award and requested that such references be provided.

Points for discussion:

The Group raised the following issue with regard the proposed new programme:

- The Group noted that the assessment methods section of the Programme Specification indicated a total reliance on coursework assessment. In the absence of any discussion of this point in the Faculty minutes the Group asked Mrs Waugh to confirm that the Faculty was content that sufficient checks were in place to ensure the integrity of the programme assessment as a whole.

Conclusion:

Subject to reassurance in respect to the integrity of the assessment and the requested amendments being made to the programme specification, the Group recommends approval of the proposed change by ASC.

2.2 UNDERGRADUATE PROPOSALS

2.2.1 BSc (Honours) Accounting and Mathematics (New programme)

BSc (Honours) Accounting and Applied Mathematics (New programme)

BSc (Honours) Accounting and Pure Mathematics (New programme)

Rationale: The proposal is to permit students to study for a joint Honours degree in Accounting with Mathematics, Pure Mathematics or Applied Mathematics. Both Departments believe this to represent a useful extension of study options.

Regulations: This proposed programme would be governed by existing regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the three Programme Specifications and found them generally well constructed but requested alteration to all of them as follows:

- Section 10 (Programme aims) – The Group noted that the redundant “problem” in the fourth bullet point should be deleted.
- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group expressed its unease with the phrases “gain and demonstrate” and “develop and demonstrate” in the ILOs – the ‘gain’ and the ‘development’ being difficult to assess – and requested that these be amended. It requested, further, that the fifth bullet point under the sub-heading *Knowledge and understanding* be relocated as a *Transferable skill*.
- Section 12 (Assessment methods) – The Group suggested that the information provided should be limited to methods and that references to timing and credits should be removed.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) - The Group requested that the final sentence of the introductory paragraph be amended to read: “In all cases, students must take a minimum of 280 credits in the first two years.” The Group found the presentation of the Years 3 and 4 syllabi unnecessarily complex with the mix of fonts and bleeding from one column to another. For example, “PDEs” which appears in the Year 3 column in the Accounting with Mathematics Programme Specification is an overflow from “(Numerical solutions of)” in the Year 4 column, and it is not clear whether the change of font for ‘Algebra 2’ and ‘Analysis 2’ is intended to be significant. More seriously the Group was unable to see from the data presented how a student who was not doing the Accountancy dissertation might muster 240 credits across Years 3 and 4, and requested clarification.

Points for discussion:

The Group raised the following issue with regard the proposed new programme:

- The Group noted the absence of consultations with potential employers in respect of the new joint programmes and Mrs Waugh explained that the new combinations followed the pattern of Accounting with Statistics which had been scrutinised in session 2007-8. Students had been consulted but no formal response had been received. Mrs Waugh suggested that it was perhaps not surprising that current students should show comparatively little interest, and reminded the Group that no new

investment in teaching was envisaged, simply the opportunity to combine study in accounting and mathematics.

- The Group noted that the higher than usual workload to be carried by students in the first and second years had been discussed in the Faculty and approved.

Conclusion:

Subject to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specifications, including clarification or correction in respect of the credits available in Years 3 and 4, the Group recommends the proposed new programmes to ASC.

2.2.2 BSc (Honours) Finance and Mathematics (New programme)

BSc (Honours) Finance and Applied Mathematics (New programme)

BSc (Honours) Finance and Pure Mathematics (New programme)

Rationale: The proposal is to permit students to study for a joint Honours degree in Finance with Mathematics, Pure Mathematics or Applied Mathematics. Both Departments believe this to represent a useful extension of study options.

Regulations: This proposed programme would be governed by existing regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the three Programme Specifications and found them generally well constructed. It requested minor alteration to all of them as follows:

- Section 10 (Programme aims) – The Group noted again that the redundant “problem” in the fourth bullet point should be deleted.
- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group identified the same issues as with the immediately previous proposals and again requested deletion of “gain” and “develop,” and the relocation of the fifth bullet point under the sub-heading *Knowledge and understanding as a Transferable skill*.
- Section 12 (Assessment methods) – Again, the information provided should be limited to methods and that references to timing and credits should be removed.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) - The Group requested that the final sentence of the introductory paragraph be amended to read: “In all cases, students must take a minimum of 275 credits in the first two years.” Again the Group was unable to see from the data presented how a student who was not doing the Finance dissertation might muster 240 credits across Years 3 and 4, and requested clarification.

Points for discussion:

The Group raised the following issue with regard the proposed new programme:

- The Group again noted that the higher than usual workload proposed for students in the first and second years had been discussed in the Faculty and approved.

Conclusion:

Subject to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specifications, including clarification or correction in respect of the credits available in Years 3 and 4, the Group recommends the proposed new programmes to ASC.

2.2.3 BSc (Honours) Pure Mathematics (New programme)

MSci Pure Mathematics (New programme)

Rationale: The object of the proposal is to offer students an Honours degree programme in Pure Mathematics, such provision being made by Mathematics Departments in other UK universities.

Regulations: The proposed programmes would be governed by existing regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and requested some alterations as follows:

- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group considered that the ILOs presented appeared rather thin, and asked that these be reconsidered with a view to adding more specific learning objectives and perhaps something to suggest attainment of creativity and imagination among the learning objectives. It was also surprised that there should be no difference between the ILOs for the BSc and MSci programmes, such anticipated differences providing the rationale for discrete Programme Specifications. It requested that the Department of Mathematics be asked to reconsider this. The Group also requested that the sentence beginning, “These skills are developed ...” should be deleted in each of its occurrences.
- Section 12 (Assessment methods) – Again, the information provided should be limited to methods, and that references to timing and credits should be removed.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) – From the syllabus presented in the Programme Specification for the Single Honours BSc, the Group calculated that the degree would require the completion of 485 credits, not the 480 indicated both in the first line of the second paragraph and in section 2.4. The Group understood that the details of the programme structure were correct and requested that the figure for the total credits be amended.

The Group also noted that for the ‘faster route’ of the programme including Statistics, the entry year consists of 130 credits; a fact not recognised in the rating of the programme. The Group requested that credit ratings be checked and the Programme Specification amended as appropriate. It noted also that no early exit point was indicated in the description of the BSc Honours programme and requested that further information in this respect should be provided.

- Section 16 (Additional relevant information) – The Group noted that in the Programme Specification for the Single Honours BSc, the number of powerful, modern PCs available to students in the computer laboratory was presented as 80 while in the other Programme Specifications the number given was 40. The Group requested that the actual figure be determined and the error corrected.

Points for discussion:

The Group raised the following issue with regard the proposed new programme:

- The Group again noted the absence of consultations with potential employers and agreed that some further advice should have been taken, perhaps through the Careers Service. Mrs Waugh agreed to seek confirmation that the proposed degrees would be useful to students seeking employment.

Conclusion:

Subject to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specifications, including clarification or correction in respect of the credits available in Years 3 and 4, and a satisfactory outcome to the consultation with the Careers Service, the Group recommends the proposed new programmes to ASC.

2.2.4 BSc (Honours) Mobile Software Engineering (New programme)

Rationale: The object of the proposal is to create an undergraduate programme for would-be software engineers who wish to specialise in development for platforms such as mobile phones, personal digital assistants and entertainment systems.

Regulations: The proposed programmes would be governed by existing regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and requested some alterations as follows:

- Section 7 (Programme accredited by) – Since accreditation had not yet been attained, the Group requested that reference to the intention to apply should be removed to section 16 of the Programme Specification.
- Section 11 (Intended learning outcomes) – The Group considered that the ILOs presented under the sub-heading *Knowledge and understanding* had not been written in the prescribed form, and requested that these be redrafted in accordance with the guidance published on the Senate Office web pages.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) – Under the sub-heading *Level 3* the Group noted the statement, “Entry will be guaranteed to students who have demonstrated exemplary programming skills during Levels 1 and 2 CS.” The Group considered this requirement to be too demanding and perhaps intimidating for the prospective student, and requested that it be replaced by a statement of the grade requirement. The Group noted that no early exit point was indicated and requested that further information in this respect should be provided.
- Section 16 (Additional relevant information) – The Group requested that the general information about student services which formed the first paragraph be removed. It also requested that the sixth bullet point referring to prosecution of plagiarism be deleted.

Conclusion:

Subject to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specification, the Group recommends the proposed new programmes to ASC.

2.2.5 BSc (Honours) Psychology (Major change)

Rationale: The object of the proposal is to increase significantly the choice of options available to Honours students.

Regulations: The proposal, if accepted, would require no change to existing regulations.

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification and found it generally well constructed. It requested minor alteration as follows:

- Section 10 (Programme aims) – The Group took the view that this was too long and that it might be reduced by avoidance of repetition.
- Section 13 (Learning and teaching approaches) – The Group noted references to ‘maxi’ and ‘maxi study’ and requested that these be amended to ‘maxi project’ for consistency with the description in section 15 of the Programme Specification.
- Section 15 (Programme structure and features) – Under the sub-heading *Year 2* the Group noted that the course ‘Statistics 1C’ was designated a Level 2 course and requested that this be corrected. The Group also requested that the (largely repeated) line “Nine options 10 credits each totalling 90” be deleted.

Conclusion:

Subject to the requested amendments being made to the Programme Specification, the Group recommends approval of the proposed change by ASC.