

**University of Glasgow****Academic Standards Committee – Friday 25 May 2012****Report from Meeting of Academic Regulations Sub-Committee held  
on Friday 11 May 2012****Professor Tom Guthrie, Convener****1. PGT/MRes regulations***1.1 Background*

At the start of session 2010-11, ARSC was asked to review the generic MRes regulations, which are outdated and currently lacking in detail.

The typical structure of generic MRes programmes differs from the generic PGT structure as follows:

PGT: 120 taught credits + 60 credits dissertation/other independent work.

MRes: 60 taught credits + 120 credits independent work (often comprised of 2 x 60 credit research projects).

(There are a number of MRes programmes consisting of 120 taught credits and 60 credits of independent work, and these are governed by the existing generic PGT regulations.)

At the end of session 2010-11, ARSC proposed the introduction of a set of regulations that would accommodate all PGT generic programmes and those programmes that currently fall under the generic MRes regulations. MRes programmes from across the University had been consulted. EdPSC approved the proposed regulations. However, it was agreed that the regulations should be finally approved by DoGS before being recommended to Senate.

Subsequent feedback from DoGS indicated disquiet in relation to the proposed requirements for award. Current generic PGT regulations require a grade point average of 12 (equivalent to C3) over 120 taught credits and a minimum grade D3 on the 60 credit dissertation. The proposal was that for programmes (typically MRes) composed of 60 taught credits and two 60 credit projects, the standard required for award would be a grade point average of 12 (equivalent to C3) over the 60 taught credits and 60 of the credits derived from independent work together with a minimum of D3 on the remaining 60 credits of independent work. Comment from DoGS indicated a preference for requiring C3 in both projects. ARSC responded to this noting that D3 represented satisfactory achievement against Masters ILOs.

Further discussion has taken place regarding the issue of the standard to be applied to progression and award for Masters programmes.

*1.2 Consideration at meeting on 11 May 2012*

At its meeting in May, ARSC considered the most recent comments received from Graduate Schools and the views expressed by DoGS. A wide range of views had been expressed. ARSC was concerned that some staff considered D grades in Masters assessment to represent a 'fail'. This was a misrepresentation of the Code of

Assessment, as Schedule A described work that merited a D grade to be 'satisfactory'. ARSC had suggested that generic Masters regulations could adopt a D grade as being required for progress/award throughout and that the ILOs, and the marking of those ILOs, could be geared appropriately, but the comments submitted by Graduate Schools reflected a reluctance to accept this position.

ARSC identified a number of options that could be proposed to ASC:

1. Combined MRes/PGT regulations in the form approved by EdPSC in June 2011. These adhered to the same basic structure of the existing generic PGT regulations: a grade point average of 12 (equivalent to C3) across 120 credits, including taught credits, and a D3 for the remaining 60 credits (dissertation or other independent project).

The most recent response from DoGS had indicated a willingness to accept these regulations, but this was qualified with the desire to re-visit in the new academic session the question of the standards required for progression and award.

2. Regulations with the same basic structure as option 1. but with a requirement for the D3 in the final 60 credits (dissertation/independent project) to be achieved normally at the first attempt.

In relation to options 1. and 2., the proposed regulations permit a specific grade to be required on particular courses, as was currently the position in the PGT generic regulations. There was a view that the existence of this provision was not well known, and could be promoted as a further threshold for preventing progression of weaker students who would struggle in the independent work. (For example, programmes could specify in course documentation that a C3 was required, normally at the first attempt, in Research Methods in order to progress/for award.)

3. Combined MRes/PGT regulations which required a grade point average of 9 (equivalent to D3) across 120 credits (including taught credits) and a D3 for the remaining 60 credits. (The required standard could be required at the first attempt, and the regulations would include the provision allowing a specific grade to be achieved in particular courses, as with 1. and 2.)

This suggestion had not been well received by the DoGS group, and views on such a change had not been sought from programmes which were governed by the existing PGT regulations.

4. Continuing with generic PGT regulations and adopting separate regulations for MRes programmes which required more credits to be at C3. (MRes programmes currently governed by the PGT regulations would continue to be so governed.)

**ARSC agreed to propose to ASC option 2.** This would represent a desirable harmonisation across Masters programmes. The DoGS group had expressed the wish to return to a discussion regarding the standards adopted in the regulations but, given the lengthy period of consultation that had already been undertaken, **ARSC's view was that the regulations should be implemented in 2012-13 with a review in three years.**

## **2. Review of the Operation of the Code of Assessment in relation to the assessment of professional degrees: Schedule B**

ARSC noted that ASC had agreed that ARSC should be invited to undertake further work to explore the possibility of adopting a universal schedule of assessment. The Convener had discussed some of the issues with Professor Cotton from MVLS and it was clear that there were a number of issues to be taken into account. The Convener suggested that he would meet with representatives from the professional programmes with a view to understanding their own particular concerns and the requirements of the relevant professional bodies. The two possible outcomes were the adoption of one combined schedule of assessment or the refinement of existing Schedule B. It was hoped that a conclusion could be reached by the end of 2012-13.