University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Wednesday 18 April 2012

Report from the Programme Approval Group for the College of Social Sciences

Ms H Clegg, Senate Office

Present:

Professor N Evans (Convener), Professor C Hough, Dr B Stewart, Mr D Walker

In attendance:

Ms H Clegg

1. *POSTGRADUATE PROPOSALS*

1.1 MSc Governance & Accountability (New Programme)

Rationale: The programme had been designed in order to widen and diversify the range of postgraduate provision within the Business School.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45(PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-49(PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification for this degree, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 9, the Programme Aims should be bullet pointed;
- In Section 10, the words 'for example' should be deleted from all three bullet point under the heading 'Skills and Other Attributes';
- In Section 11, a number of points should be deleted – the third, fourth and fifth bullet points under 'Coursework', and the second under 'Degree Examinations'. Examples of the types of coursework to be completed should be given in the final bullet point under 'Coursework';
- In Section 12, the first paragraph should be revised as it appeared to refer to three, not two, delivery formats. The word 'Moodle' should be in title case rather than capitals;
- In Section 14, the course codes should be removed as these have changed in MyCampus. Reference to 'existing' and 'new' should also be removed. References to 'departments' should be removed, or updated to reflect the current University structure. The link to the University Calendar should refer to the 2012-13 version (or be replaced with www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/calendar which would default to the most up to date version).

There were a number of typographical errors, superfluous words and missing words throughout the document. It should be proof-read for publication.

Conclusion: The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made.

1.2 MSc TESOL (New Programme)

Rationale: The programme had been designed to meet the needs of those interested in the field, but who had not yet achieved the level of experience required for an MEd. It would provide the opportunity to research theoretical underpinnings along with practical applications.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45(PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-49(PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification for this degree, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 1, 'TESOL' should be written in full, as this is the title which will appear on the degree parchment and transcript;
- In Section 10, a superfluous 'a' should be deleted from the third bullet point under 'Knowledge and Understanding'. The heading 'Subject Specific Skills' should appear below the text 'By the end of this programme students will be able to'. In the final bullet point, the words 'become familiar with the use of' should be changed to 'demonstrate familiarity with';
- In Section 12, the word 'reflection' should be in lower case in point 4;
- In Section 14, the link to the University Calendar should refer to the 2012-13 version (or be replaced with www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/calendar which would default to the most up to date version). The description of the dissertation should be moved to Section 11.

Conclusion: The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made.

1.3 MSc Working with World Englishes (New Programme)

Rationale: The programme had been designed in response to a need for an English Language studies programme by those wishing to deepen their knowledge and understanding of English language.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45(PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-49(PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification for this degree, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 1, space between the M and S of 'MSc' should be removed. The Certificate and Diploma titles should be deleted unless these can be applied to as programmes in their own right. The MSc title did not match the title shown in the Proposal Support Document – this required clarification;
- In Section 9, it did not seem clear that the programme was aimed at students for whom English was not their first language. This should be clarified in order that it is obvious this is not a programme of English language and linguistics;
- In Section 10, the use of capitals at the beginning of each bullet point should be consistent. There was a typographical error in the final heading, 'Transferable' and the word 'skills' should be added to this heading. The second, fourth and fifth bullet points should be reworded as they would be difficult to assess in their current form;

- In Section 11, '12-15,000; should be changed to '12,000 – 15,000'. The final paragraph, beginning 'Transferable skills are not directly assessed' should be deleted;
- In Section 12, the paragraph beginning 'As seen above' should be deleted. The detail describing the number of hours might be made less specific in order to make teaching more flexible without requiring changes to the specification;
- In Section 14, the structure should be presented in a simpler, tabular format, showing the courses to be taken in each Semester. The link to the University Calendar should refer to the 2012-13 version (or be replaced with www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/calendar which would default to the most up to date version).

Conclusion: The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made.

1.4   MSc Advanced Community Development (New Programme)

Rationale: The programme had been developed to respond to the increasing use of a Community Development approach to dealing with a wide range of issues, and to meet the demand for high-level education for practitioners in the field.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45(PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-49(PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification for this degree, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 1, the Certificate and Diploma titles should be deleted unless these can be applied to as programmes in their own right. The word 'Modular' should be removed from the title as this would otherwise appear on the degree parchment and transcript. The title also did not match that reported in the Proposal Support Document or Board of Studies minute. This required clarification;
- In Section 9, an introductory paragraph should be included. The aims should be reviewed with a view to making them more specific as they were rather vague at present;
- In Section 10, the ILOs should be revised in order to meet the standard format and give clearer, more specific information;
- In Section 11, information on how the assessment of the Work Based Project was required;
- In Section 12, the Learning and Teaching Approaches to the Work Based Project were required. A typographical error in the penultimate sentence ('allows') should be corrected;
- In Section 13, the information should be replaced with a statement that no relevant benchmarking statement exists;
- In Section 14, the word 'taught' should be removed from the first paragraph and a full stop should be added at the end of the paragraph. The second sentence of the second paragraph should be deleted. In the third paragraph, the word 'four' should be changed to 'five' and 'each equivalent to 20 credits' should be deleted. The five courses (including Work Based Project) should then be listed with their credit value in brackets. The sentence beginning 'In addition' should therefore be deleted. The link to the University Calendar should refer to the 2012-13 version (or be replaced with www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/calendar which would default to the most up to date version).

Conclusion: The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made.

1.5   PgCert Primary Science (New Programme)

Rationale: The programme

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45(PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-49(PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specification for this degree, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 9, an introductory paragraph should be included. The final point should be amended to read 'Equip participants to evaluate their...';
- In Section 10, the fifth bullet point under Knowledge and Understanding should be changed to 'Identify barriers to learning in science and consider how these might be overcome'. The third last point under Transferable/Key Skills should be amended to read 'An appreciation of the impact...' as it was not currently assessable;
- In Section 11, title case should be used for each course title;
- In Section 12, GLOW should be written in full or explained;
- In Section 13, the information should be replaced with a statement that no relevant benchmarking statement exists;
- In Section 14, the first paragraph should end after 'taken in any order'. The course titles should be written in title case. The link to the University Calendar should refer to the 2012-13 version (or be replaced with www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/calendar which would default to the most up to date version).

There was no evidence that consultation with the student body had taken place, either within the Proposal Support Document, the Board of Studies minute or the spot-checked documentation. This was a mandatory part of the approval process.

Conclusion: The Programme Approval Group agreed that, until evidence of student consultation could be provided, the proposal could not yet be recommended to ASC for approval.

2.   SPOT-CHECKING OF PROPOSALS

Under the current process, Programme Approval Groups examine only the programme specification and support document for programme proposals. However, PAGs reserve the right to ask for full documentation if desired. It was recommended in the Deloitte Internal Audit report that occasional 'spot checks' be undertaken on proposal documentation.

In line with this recommendation, the Clerk reported a sample of proposals had been selected for spot-checking, and that the full documentation for the proposals shown below had been examined:

- MSc Working with World Englishes

    All documentation was found to be in order.

- PgCert Primary Science

No evidence could be found of consultation with the student body. As this was a mandatory part of the approval process, approval could not be given until consultation had been evidenced.