

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Tuesday 16 April 2013

Report from the Programme Approval Group for the College of
Social Sciences, held on 19 March 2013

Ms H Clegg, Senate Office

Present:

Professor P Cotton (Convener), Professor C Edwards, Dr R Brown

In attendance:

Ms H Clegg, Mrs F Green

Apologies

Ms J Kempe

1. *POSTGRADUATE PROPOSALS*1.1 **MSc Asset Pricing & Investment (New Programme)**

Rationale: The new programme is being proposed in order to fill a gap in existing Finance offerings, and to provide theoretical and practical knowledge demanded by employers in the field.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45-50 (PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-50 (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 American spelling ('program') should be avoided. The text should take the form of an introductory paragraph and several bullet points which should reflect the aims for Masters-level students. Reference to the programme being 'unique in the UK' should be removed as this may date quickly;
- In Section 10, the Intended Learning Outcomes should be revised to reflect that this is a Masters-level programme. Intellectual skills, including a critique of literature, should feature, rather than simply tasks to be completed. In the first ILO, students should be formulating 'solutions' rather than 'problems'. Use of 'understand', 'explain' and 'demonstrate' should be avoided. The 23rd ILO should be rewritten as a Masters-level outcome. The final paragraph should be deleted;
- In Section 11, the word 'also' should be deleted from the second paragraph. The table should be removed as this information will appear in the individual course specifications;
- In Section 14, the second paragraph should be reworded to read "an early exit point for MSc students who do not progress to the dissertation". Part (d) of the regulations should be removed. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition.

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

1.2 MSc Finance & Management (New Programme)

Rationale: The new programme is being proposed as part of the overall enhancement of the Adam Smith Business School's suite of provision.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45-50 (PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-50 (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 10, use of 'demonstrate' and 'summarise' should be avoided;
- In Section 11, the table should be removed as this information will appear in the individual course specifications;
- In Section 12, it was not clear how the compulsory classes in study skills would be made compulsory as they were not credit-rated;
- In Section 14, the second paragraph should be reworded to read "an early exit point for MSc students who do not progress to the dissertation". Part (d) of the regulations should be removed. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition;
- In Section 15, the School should consider adding additional information about the School and the programme.

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

1.3 MSc Investment Fund Management (New Programme)

Rationale: The new programme is being proposed in order to fill a gap in existing Finance offerings, and to provide theoretical and practical knowledge demanded by employers in the field.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 35-50 (PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-50 (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, it was not clear whether this programme was aimed primarily at Scottish students. Although there was mention of employers outside of Scotland, the programme appeared to have a Scottish context;
- In Section 10, the ILOs were not appropriate for a Masters-level programme and needed to be rewritten;
- In Section 11, a typographical error in the second line should be corrected ('consist of in-course examination). The table should be removed as this information will appear in the individual course specifications;
- In Section 14, the first paragraph should be reworded to read "an early exit point for MSc students who do not progress to the dissertation". The dissertation should appear in the table of courses, and removed from the text below the table. Part (d) of the regulations should be removed. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition.

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

1.4 MSc Global Cities (New Programme)

Rationale: The new programme is being proposed as part of a review of the Urban Studies offering, in order to increase its appeal to global markets.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45-50 (PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-50 (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 6, the School should be shown as ‘Social and Political Sciences’
- In Section 8, it was not clear whether practical experience was considered to discount the requirement for a first degree;
- In Section 9, the first paragraph should be deleted up to “The Global Cities MSc is aimed at students who...”. The aims should be rewritten in a student-friendly manner;
- In Section 10, the Intended Learning are much too lengthy and some appear to be course outcomes rather than programme outcomes. The use of ‘explain’, ‘recognise’, ‘summarise’, and ‘demonstrate’ should be avoided;
- In Section 11, the second, third, fourth and fifth paragraphs should be deleted. A list of all the assessment methods used should be provided;
- In Section 12, it is not necessary to cross-refer learning and teaching approaches to intended learning outcomes. The section should be more concise and specific to the programme;
- The information in Section 13 should be deleted unless the links refer to formal benchmarks;
- In Section 14, information on the part-time structure should be provided. The two paragraphs starting “The School welcomes” and “Employer feedback” should be removed. Part (d) of the regulations should be removed. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition;
- In Section 15, the first and fifth paragraphs should be deleted;
- Throughout the document, there are a number of font changes and typographical errors that should be corrected.

Conclusion: At present, the Group cannot recommend approval to ASC. The proposal will be reconsidered when the programme specification has been amended as required above.

1.5 MSc International Planning Studies (New Programme)

MSc International Real Estate (New Programme)

Rationale: The new programmes are being proposed as part of a review of the Urban Studies offering, in order to increase its appeal to global markets.

Regulations: The programmes will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45-50 (PG). They will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-50 (PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specifications for these degrees, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 6, the School should be shown as ‘Social and Political Sciences’
- In Section 8, it was not clear whether practical experience was considered to discount the requirement for a first degree;
- In Sections 9, 10 and 15 there is reference to ‘the Real Estate, Planning and Regeneration programme’. This creates confusion with the programme titles and should either be removed or changed to ‘suite’ or similar;
- In Section 10, the Intended Learning Outcomes are much too lengthy and some appear to be course outcomes rather than programme outcomes. Many are not Masters level. The preamble should be ‘students will be able to’ rather than ‘should’. The use of ‘explain’, ‘recognise’, ‘summarise’, ‘understand’ and ‘demonstrate’ should be avoided. There is some repetition which should be consolidated;
- In Section 11, the second, third and fourth paragraphs should be deleted. A list of all the assessment methods used should be provided;
- In Section 12, it was not necessary to cross-refer learning and teaching approaches to intended learning outcomes. The section should be more concise and specific to the programme;
- The information in Section 13 should be deleted unless the links refer to formal benchmarks;
- In Section 14, information on the part-time structure should be provided. The two paragraphs starting “The School welcomes” and “Employer feedback” should be removed. Part (d) of the regulations should be removed. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition;
- In Section 15, all but the first and sixth paragraphs, and the default text, should be deleted;
- Throughout the documents, there are a number of font changes and typographical errors that should be corrected.

Conclusion: At present, the Group cannot recommend approval to ASC. The proposals will be reconsidered when the programme specifications have been amended as required above.

1.6 MSc Public & Urban Policy (New Programme)

Rationale: The new programme is being proposed as part of a review of the Urban Studies offering, in order to increase its appeal to global markets.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45-50 (PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-50 (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 6, the School should be shown as ‘Social and Political Sciences’
- In Section 10, the Intended Learning are not at Masters level and need to be rewritten. The use of ‘explain’, ‘recognise’, ‘summarise’, and ‘demonstrate’ should be avoided. There is duplication, which should be consolidated;
- In Section 11, the third and fifth paragraphs should be deleted. A list of all the assessment methods used should be provided;
- In Section 12, it is not necessary to cross-refer learning and teaching approaches to intended learning outcomes. The section should be more concise and specific to the programme;

- The information in Section 13 should be deleted unless the links refer to formal benchmarks;
- In Section 14, information on the part-time structure should be provided. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition;
- In Section 15, the School should consider adding additional information about the School and the programme;
- Throughout the document, there are a number of font changes and typographical errors that should be corrected.

Conclusion: At present, the Group cannot recommend approval to ASC. The proposal will be reconsidered when the programme specification has been amended as required above.

1.7 MSc Sustainability, Professional Practice & Leadership (New Programme)

Rationale: The new programme is being proposed in order to address the need for interdisciplinary training in sustainability.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45-50 (PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 47-50 (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, titles are given for PgD and PgC awards, but it is not clear whether applicants can apply for these as programmes in their own right, or whether they are exit awards only;
- If the PgC cannot be applied to directly, the final sentence in Section 9 should be deleted;
- In Section 10, some of the Intended Learning Outcomes were not Masters level. The use of 'demonstrate', 'contribute', 'gather' and 'show' should be avoided. If the PgC cannot be applied to directly, the final sentence should be deleted;
- In Section 12, the final sentence should be deleted;
- In Section 14, the first and second paragraphs should be altered to contain only the requirement (e.g. "...consists of 180 credits based upon four core courses, three optional courses and a research dissertation"). The third paragraph should be reworded to read "an early exit point for MSc students who do not progress to the dissertation". The dissertation should appear in the table of courses. Part (d) of the regulations should be removed. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition.

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

1.8 PgCert Estonian Language (New Programme)

PgCert Hungarian Language (New Programme)

PgCert Latvian Language (New Programme)

Rationale: The new programmes are being proposed as part of the subject;s commitment to the development of Language Based Area Studies supported by the AHRC and ESRC.

Regulations: The programmes will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 38-40 (PG). They will also be added to the list on SocSci 40 (PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specifications for these degrees, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 6, the School should be shown as 'Social & political Sciences';
- In Section 9, the programme aims are not appropriate to postgraduate study;
- In Section 10, the Intended Learning Outcomes are not appropriate to postgraduate study;
- In Section 14, a list of the courses taken, with information on credits and the semester in which the courses are taken, should be provided. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition.

It was noted that no consultation had taken place with the External Academic for the Latvian programme, and that only one response had been forthcoming from the student consultation.

The Group took the view that the programmes could not be approved as Postgraduate Certificates as the content was not at postgraduate level. It was noted that they were based on an existing PgC in Russian Language which had been approved in 2011, but the Group did not feel able to approve the new programmes despite this. The Convener would contact the College Dean of Graduate Studies for further discussion.

Conclusion: At present, approval could not be recommended to ASC.

1.9 PgCert Leading Professional Learning (New Programme)

Rationale: The new programme is being proposed due to changes in policy in Scotland in relation to continuing professional development for teachers, in order to raise the quality of school education.

Regulations: The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 41-42 (PG). It will also be added to the list on SocSci 41 (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, a paragraph of introductory text would be useful;
- In Section 10, the use of 'describe' should be avoided. Some of the intended learning outcomes were not at Masters level, and more reference to literature and evidence was required;
- In Section 11, summative assessment should appear before formative assessment;
- In Section 14, the reference to the participant's choice of programme should be deleted as the specification relates only to the Postgraduate Certificate and not the Masters degree. Part (d) of the regulation should be deleted. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition.

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

1.10 MEd Professional Learning & Enquiry (Major Change)

Rationale: The change to the programme is being proposed in order to ensure focus is on practice-based learning, and alters the title and content of the existing MEd Professional Learning & Reflection to this end.

Regulations: The programme continue to be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45-50 (PG). The title will be altered in the list on SocSci 47-50 (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 7, the information should be deleted as this pathway was no longer covered by this specification;
- In Section 10, the intended learning outcomes were not presented in the standard format with active verbs and the usual preamble. Many were not written at Masters level. This section should be rewritten;
- In Section 11, the information was rather vague and should be expanded;
- In Section 14, the sentence beginning “This provision is already available...” in the second paragraph should be deleted. The information in the table should be presented in chronological order. Part (d) of the regulation should be deleted. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition.

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

1.11 MRes Public Policy Research (Major Change)

MRes Urban Research (Major Change)

Rationale: The changes to the programmes are being proposed as part of the outcome of a review of PGT teaching in Urban Studies.

Regulations: The programmes will continue to be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45-50 (PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specifications for these degrees, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 6, the School should be shown as ‘Social and Political Sciences’
- In Section 9, the final bullet point should be deleted;
- In Section 10, the intended learning outcomes were not appropriate to Masters level study. The paragraph under ‘skills’ should be deleted. The use of ‘recognise’, ‘explain’ and ‘demonstrate’ should be avoided;
- In Section 11, the second, third and fourth paragraphs should be deleted. A list of the assessment methods used should be provided;
- In Section 12, the second paragraph should be deleted or moved to Section 11;
- In Section 14, the ‘core non-assessed components’ should be moved to Section 11. It was noted that there was a substantial amount of teaching given that these are MRes degrees. It was not clear to the Group why these degrees were MRes rather than MSc. Part (d) of the regulation should be deleted. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition.

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

1.12 MSc Housing Studies (Major Change)

PgDip Housing Studies (Major Change)

Rationale: The changes to the programmes are being proposed as part of the outcome of a review of PGT teaching in Urban Studies.

Regulations: The programmes will continue to be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 38-40 (PG) and 45-50 (PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specifications for these degrees, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 6, the School should be shown as 'Social and Political Sciences'
- In Section 9, the programme aims were identical for the MSc and the postgraduate diploma. The aims needed to distinguish between the two;
- In Section 10, the intended learning outcomes were identical for the MSc and the postgraduate diploma. The ILOs needed to distinguish between the two. The use of 'recognise', 'summarise' and 'demonstrate' should be avoided;
- In Section 11, the third and fifth paragraphs should be deleted. A list of the assessment methods used should be provided;
- In Section 12, it was not necessary to cross-refer learning and teaching approaches to intended learning outcomes. The section should be more concise and specific to the programme;
- In Section 13, the information should be deleted;
- In Section 14, the course information should be presented in tabular form, showing the course title, credit, whether compulsory or optional, and the semester in which the course is studied. The Group noted that the credits for the MSc appear to add up to 200 rather than 180, and 140 instead of 120 for the PgD. This needs to be clarified. Information on the part-time structure is required.
- Both documents use different fonts throughout and this should be tidied.

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

1.10 MSc City Planning & Real Estate Development (Major Change)

MSc City Planning & Regeneration (Major Change)

MSc City & Regional Planning (Major Change)

MSc Real Estate & Regeneration (Major Change)

MSc Real Estate (Major Change)

Rationale: The changed programmes are being proposed as part of a review of the Urban Studies offering, in order to increase its appeal to global markets.

Regulations: The programmes will continue to be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 45-50 (PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specifications for these degrees, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 6, the School should be shown as 'Social and Political Sciences'
- In Section 8, it was not clear whether practical experience was considered to discount the requirement for a first degree;

- In Sections 9, 10 and 15 there is reference to 'the Real Estate, Planning and Regeneration programme'. This creates confusion with the programme titles and should either be removed or changed to 'suite' or similar. The aims appear identical for all programmes. They should be revised to distinguish between the programmes;
- In Section 10, the Intended Learning Outcomes are much too lengthy and some appear to be course outcomes rather than programme outcomes. Many are not Masters level. The preamble should be 'students will be able to' rather than 'should'. The use of 'appreciate', 'recognise', 'acknowledge' and 'demonstrate' should be avoided. There is some repetition which should be consolidated. The ILOs appear identical for all programmes. They should be revised to distinguish between the programmes;
- In Section 11, the second and fourth paragraphs should be deleted. A list of all the assessment methods used should be provided;
- In Section 12, it was not necessary to cross-refer learning and teaching approaches to intended learning outcomes. The section should be more concise and specific to the programme;
- The information in Section 13 should be deleted unless the links refer to formal benchmarks;
- In Section 14, information on the part-time structure should be provided. The two paragraphs starting "The School welcomes" and "Employer feedback" should be removed. Part (d) of the regulations should be removed. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition;
- In Section 15, all but the first and sixth paragraphs, and the default text, should be deleted;
- Throughout the documents, there are a number of font changes and typographical errors that should be corrected.

Conclusion: At present, the Group cannot recommend approval to ASC. The proposals will be reconsidered when the programme specifications have been amended as required above.

1.10 PgCert Real Estate (Major Change)

PgCert Spatial Planning (Major Change)

Rationale: The changed programmes are being proposed as part of a review of the Urban Studies offering, in order to increase its appeal to global markets.

Regulations: The programmes will continue to be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 38-40 (PG).

Programme Specification: The Group considered the Programme Specifications for these degrees, and raised the following points requiring to be addressed:

Points for discussion:

- In Section 6, the School should be shown as 'Social and Political Sciences'
- In Sections 9, 10 and 14 there is reference to 'the Real Estate, Planning and Regeneration programme'. This creates confusion with the programme titles and should either be removed or changed to 'suite' or similar;
- In Section 10, some of the Intended Learning Outcomes are not at postgraduate level;
- In Section 11, the second and third paragraphs should be deleted. A list of all the assessment methods used should be provided;

- In Section 12, it was not necessary to cross-refer learning and teaching approaches to intended learning outcomes. The section should be more concise and specific to the programme;
- The information in Section 13 should be deleted unless the links refer to formal benchmarks;
- In Section 14, information on the part-time structure should be provided. The Calendar link should be changed to the generic link rather than a link to the 2011-12 edition. In the PgC Spatial Planning document, the first paragraph should be deleted as this is a PgC specification;
- In Section 15, all but the first and fourth paragraphs, and the default text, should be deleted.

Conclusion: At present, the Group cannot recommend approval to ASC. The proposals will be reconsidered when the programme specifications have been amended as required above.

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 City Planning & Real Estate Development
Documentation was found to be largely in order although it was noted that not all consultations had received responses. As noted above, the programme change could not be approved at the present time due to significant changes being required to the programme specification.
- MSc Sustainability, Professional Practice & Leadership
All documentation was found to be in order.
- PgCert Estonian Language
Only one course specification, for one 60 credit course, was submitted to PIP. It was expected that the certificate would contain two or three distinct courses. Only one response had been forthcoming from the student consultation. As noted above, the new programme change could not be approved at the present time.