

University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 15 November 2013

**Report from the Programme Approval Group for the College of
Social Sciences, held on 4 November 2013**

Ms H Clegg, Senate Office

Present:

Professor C Edwards (Convener), Dr P Morris, Dr M Veza.

In attendance:

Ms H Clegg, Dr B Dickson, Dr M Fischbacher-Smith.

1. UNDERGRADUATE PROPOSAL

1.1 Masters in Education (with Teaching Qualification) (New Programme)

Rationale: The programme has been developed in order to provide an evidence-based professional programme for entry to primary teaching, taking into account the School's responsibility to train teachers for Catholic schools.

Regulations: New regulations would be developed for the programme. These were currently in development.

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 statement was required to make it clear that the programme's focus was on primary teaching;
- In Section 10, some revision was required. Some of the ILOs were rather vague and required to be reworded to show what students would actually be required to do to meet the ILOs. Additionally, some were not pitched at the correct level for the masters level award. The 6th ILO in Knowledge and Understanding was particularly unclear. More active verbs should be used rather than 'display values' and links to the professional competencies required could be provided. The 'transferable/key skills' should be revised to indicate that students will have these skills at graduation rather than just an ability to develop them later and should be more specific;
- In Section 11, the information about the project work/60 credit inquiry was rather vague and should be clarified. Information on formative assessment outside of the school setting should also be included;
- In Section 14, the text in the first two paragraphs appeared to contradict the position agreed by ASC – that is, that students who accepted the MA Hons degree would not be permitted to use the credits towards a Masters degree. The level of each of the courses should be indicated, so that the Masters level courses could be easily identified. An indicative list of the available Honours options should be provided. The first column should show 'levels' instead of 'years' as this was misleading given that the final 'year' could be taken over a number of sessions. Some of the course titles should be amended to make it clear that the focus of the programme was on primary teaching and what was involved in each course.

The Group noted that it was not clear where in this integrated Masters programme the Masters level courses sat. Dr Dickson advised that they were mainly in Year 4. Students graduating with the MEduc award would have 600 credits, 180 of which were at Masters level. Those exiting at level 4 would leave with a Masters Diploma. This followed a similar structure to the existing PGDE, which contained 90 Masters level credits.

It was noted that a change of programme title, to MEduc with Primary Teaching Qualification, was being proposed. Dr Dickson agreed to change some course titles to reflect this, but noted that the course proposals had not yet been finalised.

It was also noted that the new regulations had not yet been finalised.

Conclusion: At present, the Group cannot recommend approval to ASC. Approval will be recommended when the amendments outlined above have been made, the regulations have been finalised and the course documentation has been completed and approved by College.

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 that the above proposal had been selected for spot-checking. As noted above, none of the course documentation was available for the programme; therefore, it was not clear on what basis the College Board of Studies had approved the programme. The Group could not recommend the programme for approval until the course documentation was completed.