

## University of Glasgow

## Academic Standards Committee – Tuesday 15 April 2014

Report from the Programme Approval Group for the College of  
Social Sciences, held on 27 March 2014

Ms H Clegg, Senate Office

**Present:**

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

**In attendance:**

Ms H Clegg, Professor R Paton

**Apologies:**

Ms A Vincett

1. *UNDERGRADUATE PROPOSAL*1.1 **Certificate of Higher Education in Counselling Skills (New Programme)**

**Rationale:** The new programme has been developed in order to complement the existing COSCA Certificate in Counselling Skills by adding courses which allow students to achieve a Certificate of Higher Education. At present there is no progression opportunity from the COSCA Certificate.

**Regulations:** The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 27-30 (UG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 1, the title should read 'Certificate of Higher Education in Counselling Skills';
- In Section 9, the aims should follow the standard format, i.e., a short introductory paragraph followed by several bullet pointed aims;
- In Section 10, the ILOs do not appear to reflect the fact that students are expected to leave with practical skills. Information on the skills to be attained needs to be clear. The second bullet point under 'knowledge and understanding' is a transferable skill and should be moved to that section;
- In Section 11, the specific assessment methods should be listed, as the reader does not necessarily have access to the course specifications. The reference to course specifications should be removed. Detail is required as to how practical skills are assessed;
- In Section 12, the 'range of teaching approaches' should be listed and reference to course specifications should be removed as the reader may not have access to these;
- In Section 14, information on the length of the programme is required. The course codes should be confirmed and the information on 'semester taught' should be clarified, bearing in mind that this specification relates only to session 2014-15. The courses in the table add up to 60 credits, so information on the

possible courses from which the remaining 60 credits must be taken is required. This may be in the form of a web link to a page on the School's website. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme;

- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. Whilst this is not essential for a Certificate of Higher Education, it would be useful information for the School and is recommended.

**Conclusion:**

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

## 1.2 Certificate of Higher Education in Psychology (New Programme)

**Rationale:** The new programme has been developed in order to allow students completing the current Certificate of Higher Education to specialise in psychology by studying an increased range of psychology courses. At present students can only achieve a general Cert HE.

**Regulations:** The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 27-30 (UG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 9, the aims should follow the standard format, i.e., a short introductory paragraph followed by several bullet pointed aims;
- In Section 10, the ILOs are rather vague. More active verbs should be used, and the emphasis should be on the skills and knowledge the student will have achieved by the end of the programme, not what they will be doing throughout the programme. The section should be proof read as there are typographical errors;
- In Section 11, the specific assessment methods should be listed, as the reader does not necessarily have access to the course specifications. The reference to course specifications should be removed;
- In Section 12, the 'range of teaching approaches' should be listed and reference to course specifications should be removed as the reader may not have access to these;
- In Section 14, it is not clear what is meant by 'core' courses as the preamble to the table states those in the table are core, but in the table they are shown as optional. This information needs to be presented much more clearly. The Group was surprised that the 'Fundamentals of Psychology' course was not mandatory for all students. If additional optional courses are available, these should be presented, perhaps in the form of a web link to a page on the School's website. The 'features' section should be deleted as it offers no new information. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme;
- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. Whilst this is not essential for a Certificate of Higher Education, it would be useful information for the School and is recommended.

**Conclusion:**

**The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made. However, approval cannot be granted**

retrospectively for session 2013-14, as seems to be suggested in the Board of Studies minute.

### 1.3 Diploma of Higher Education in Egyptology (New Programme)

**Rationale:** The new programme has been developed in response to demand from students who have already achieved a Certificate in Egyptology and wish to progress further.

**Regulations:** The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 27-30 (UG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 7, the field should be left blank, as anything included in this field is published in the HEAR;
- In Section 14, under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme. The asterisks and asterisk reference should be removed. All core courses must be approved by the summer prior to being taught;
- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. Whilst this is not essential for a Certificate of Higher Education, it would be useful information for the School and is recommended.

**Conclusion:**

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

## 2. POSTGRADUATE PROPOSALS

### 2.1 MSc Tourism, Heritage and Development (New Programme)

**Rationale:** The new programme constitutes a substantial revision of the existing MLitt Tourism, Heritage and Development, which it replaces.

**Regulations:** The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 46-51 (PG). It will be added to the list of awards at SocSci 48-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 7, the information should be removed and the field left blank, as this field refers only to professional accrediting bodies;
- In Section 10, more active verbs should replace 'describe', 'be aware of' and 'use'. The Group suggests an ILO related to information management would also be relevant;
- In Section 11, no mention of the dissertation is evident;
- In Section 12, the information is too detailed; this should be shortened;
- In Section 13, the information should be deleted;
- In Section 14, the term 'electives' should be changed to 'options'. The sentence 'Students may choose...' should be deleted as this is standard information. It is not clear how the dissertation and project report differ, and the Group suggests

these are not separate items. Information about the part-time structure is required. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme;

- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. This is required before approval can be granted;
- The Group is unclear as to the difference between this programme and the proposed MSc Tourism, Heritage and Sustainability. They appear to be identical with only the topic selected for the dissertation/project potentially having a different focus. The Group does not believe this is sufficient to justify distinct degree titles, particularly as students leaving with an exit award would complete the same courses but receive different award titles.

### **Conclusion:**

**At present, the Group cannot recommend approval to ASC. The Group will reconsider the proposal when the RIO consultation has been completed and considered, justification for the distinct programme titles has been presented, and the amendments identified above have been made.**

## **2.2 MSc Tourism, Heritage and Sustainability (New Programme)**

**Rationale:** The new programme has been developed in order to meet demand for degrees focusing directly on sustainability in relation to tourism and heritage.

**Regulations:** The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 46-51 (PG). It will be added to the list of awards at SocSci 48-51 (PG).

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

### ***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 7, the information should be removed and the field left blank, as this field refers only to professional accrediting bodies;
- In Section 10, more active verbs should replace 'describe', 'be aware of' and 'use'. The Group suggests an ILO related to information management would also be relevant;
- In Section 11, no mention of the dissertation is evident;
- In Section 12, the information is too detailed; this should be shortened;
- In Section 13, the information should be deleted;
- In Section 14, the term 'electives' should be changed to 'options'. The sentence 'Students may choose...' should be deleted as this is standard information. It is not clear how the dissertation and project report differ, and the Group suggests these are not separate items. Information about the part-time structure is required. The standard information about regulations has disappeared and should be reinstated;
- The Group is unclear as to the difference between this programme and the proposed MSc Tourism, Heritage and Development. They appear to be identical with only the topic selected for the dissertation/project potentially having a different focus. The Group does not believe this is sufficient to justify distinct degree titles, particularly as students leaving with an exit award would complete the same courses but receive different award titles.

### **Conclusion:**

**At present, the Group cannot recommend approval to ASC. The Group will reconsider the proposal when the RIO consultation has been completed and**

**considered, justification for the distinct programme titles has been presented, and the amendments identified above have been made.**

### **2.3 MSc Urban Transport (New Programme)**

**Rationale:** The new programme has been developed in order to offer provision in the area of transport, which is seen as being of key importance.

**Regulations:** The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 46-51 (PG). It will be added to the list of awards at SocSci 48-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 7, the field should be left blank, as anything included in this field is published in the HEAR;
- In Section 10, more active verbs should replace 'recognise', 'summarise', 'show' and 'use'. The last bullet point under 'knowledge and understanding' is a transferable skill and should be moved to that section;
- In Section 13, it is not clear whether the information provided is relevant to a Masters level degree. If not, it should be removed;
- In Section 14, there is concern that there is a heavy load of 70 credits in the first semester. The proposer is asked to explain how there are sufficient notional learning (700 notional learning hours) hours available to allow 70 credits to be completed. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme. The Calendar link should be to the main calendar page, rather than a session-specific edition.

**Conclusion:**

**The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made and satisfactory explanation of the heavier credit load in the first semester.**

### **2.4 Pg Certificate in Academic Practice (New Programme)**

**Rationale:** The programme has been developed to replace the existing PGCAP programme in order to meet changes required by the Early Career Development Planning Group. It will run concurrently with the existing programme for two years to allow those already registered on the current programme to complete it.

**Regulations:** The programme will be governed by the regulations set out in the University Calendar at SocSci 41-42 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 9, references to 'you' and 'your' should be avoided;
- In Section 10, references to 'you' and 'your' should be avoided. The final ILO should be reworded to read 'Plan continuing professional development...';
- In Section 11, under 'formative assessment', it is not clear what is meant by 'supervision practice' – for example, does this refer to research supervision or class supervision?

- In Section 14, the final two rows of the table should be removed and the information added as text beneath the table. The words 'subject to reaccreditation in 2014' should be removed. All of the text after '...research teaching links and internationalisation' should be removed.

**Conclusion:**

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

## **2.5 Pg Certificate in Legal Education (New Programme)**

**Rationale:** The new programme has been developed with the aim of giving legal practitioners the skills to teach on legal courses. At present there is no such award elsewhere in the UK.

**Regulations:** The proposer is asked to confirm the regulations governing this programme.

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 7, the field should be left blank, as anything included in this field is published in the HEAR;
- In Section 8, a link to the prospectus should be included;
- In Section 9, the first sentence should read 'The aims of this programme are to enhance...'
- In Section 10, the first ILO should be separated into several ILOs;
- In Section 11, a word appears to be missing in the third line after 'work-based';
- In Section 14, a link to the CPE webpage should be provided. The final sentence of the first paragraph should be deleted. The final paragraph under 'features' should be moved to Section 15. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme;
- Throughout the document, there should be consistent use of the word 'student(s)' to refer to those taking the programme, even though they are also tutors. This will alleviate the confusion of variably using 'students', 'tutors' and 'tutors as students'.

**Conclusion:**

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

## **2.6 MSc Finance and Management (Major Change)**

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to strengthen the School's specialist management provision, enhancing market appeal by addressing issues raised by students and staff.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 7, the name of the accrediting body should appear in full;

- In Section 9, the penultimate bullet point should be changed to read ‘Provide a good grounding in econometrics...’;
- In Section 10, verbs such as ‘recognise’ and ‘identify’ should be avoided, and more Masters-level wording should be used. Under ‘transferable/key skills’, the last two ILOs should be revised, bearing in mind that the ILOs are intended to reflect what the graduate will be able to do, rather than what they do throughout the programme;
- In Section 11, only a list of the assessment methods are required;
- In Section 12, only a list of the teaching and learning methods are required;
- In Section 14, ‘the following’ should be deleted in the first paragraph in case this leads to dubiety about when the dissertation is to be completed. The second paragraph should be deleted except for ‘Occasionally, not all optional courses may be available’. The information about the workshop programme should be moved to Section 15 as it is non-assessed. Under ‘regulations’, section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme.

**Conclusion:**

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

**2.7 MSc International Business and Entrepreneurship (Major Change)**

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to strengthen the School’s specialist management provision, addressing issues raised by students and staff, and more ably meeting their needs.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 10, verbs such as ‘recognise’ and ‘identify’ should be avoided, and more Masters-level wording should be used. Under ‘transferable/key skills’, the last two ILOs should be revised, bearing in mind that the ILOs are intended to reflect what the graduate will be able to do, rather than what they do throughout the programme;
- In Section 11, only a list of the assessment methods are required;
- In Section 12, only a list of the teaching and learning methods are required;
- In Section 14, ‘the following’ should be deleted in the first paragraph in case this leads to dubiety about when the dissertation is to be completed. The second paragraph should be deleted except for ‘Occasionally, not all optional courses may be available’. The information about the workshop programme should be moved to Section 15 as it is non-assessed. The standard section on regulations has disappeared and should be reinstated;
- In Section 15, some of the regulations information has appeared and should be deleted.

**Conclusion:**

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

## 2.8 MSc International Management and Leadership (Major Change)

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to strengthen the School's specialist management provision, addressing issues raised by students and staff, particularly concerning the common-core, large class format of the current programmes.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 7, 'to' should be changed to 'of';
- In Section 9, in the first bullet point, 'impress upon students that' should be changed to 'increase students' awareness that';
- In Section 10, verbs such as 'develop' and 'cultivate' should be avoided, and more Masters-level wording should be used;
- In Section 11, only a list of the assessment methods are required;
- In Section 12, only a list of the teaching and learning methods are required;
- In Section 14, 'the following' should be deleted in the first paragraph in case this leads to dubiety about when the dissertation is to be completed. The second paragraph should be deleted except for 'Occasionally, not all optional courses may be available'. The standard section on regulations has disappeared and should be reinstated;
- In Section 15, some of the regulations information has appeared and should be deleted.

**Conclusion:**

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

## 2.9 MSc International Strategic Marketing (Major Change)

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to strengthen the School's specialist management provision, addressing issues raised by students and staff, particularly concerning the common-core, large class format of the current programmes.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 10, verbs such as 'describe', 'outline', 'explain' and 'display' should be avoided, and more Masters-level wording should be used. Some of the ILOs under 'knowledge and understanding' would be more appropriate under the 'skills' headings;
- In Section 11, only a list of the assessment methods are required;
- In Section 12, only a list of the teaching and learning methods are required;
- In Section 14, 'the following' should be deleted in the first paragraph in case this leads to dubiety about when the dissertation is to be completed. The second paragraph should be deleted except for 'Occasionally, not all optional courses may be available'. The information about the workshop programme should be



moved to Section 15 as it is non-assessed. The standard section on regulations has disappeared and should be reinstated;

- In Section 15, some of the regulations information has appeared and should be deleted.

**Conclusion:**

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

## **2.10 MSc International Strategic Marketing (EIA) (Major Change)**

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to strengthen the School's specialist management provision, addressing issues raised by students and staff, particularly concerning the common-core, large class format of the current programmes.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 7, the name of the accrediting body should appear in full;
- In Section 10, verbs such as 'describe', 'outline', 'explain' and 'display' should be avoided, and more Masters-level wording should be used. Some of the ILOs under 'knowledge and understanding' would be more appropriate under the 'skills' headings;
- In Section 11, only a list of the assessment methods are required;
- In Section 12, only a list of the teaching and learning methods are required;
- In Section 14, the courses taken at EIA should be listed and an indication of the period of time spent at EIA should be provided. The standard section on regulations has disappeared and should be reinstated;
- In Section 15, the duplicate information should be deleted.

**Conclusion:**

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

## **2.11 MSc International Management and Design Innovation (Major Change)**

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to strengthen the School's specialist management provision, addressing issues raised by students and staff, particularly concerning the common-core, large class format of the current programmes.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 10, the wording of the fourth bullet point should be changed as, at present, it is difficult to know how this could be assessed;
- In Section 11, the first and second paragraphs should be deleted;
- In Section 12, much less detail is required, and there should be input from GSA to this section. Some of the detail relates to assessment and should be moved to that section;

- In Section 14, the second paragraph should be deleted as this is standard information'. The standard section on regulations has disappeared and should be reinstated;
- In Section 15, the duplicate information should be deleted;
- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. This is required before approval can be granted.

**Conclusion:**

**The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made and the RIO consultation being completed and considered.**

## **2.12 MSc International Real Estate and Management (Major Change)**

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to facilitate the transfer of the programme to Urban Studies from Management on its Professional Pathway.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 10, the ILOs are rather lengthy and should be shortened, particularly in the 'knowledge and understanding' section;
- In Section 13, the second and third paragraphs should be deleted;
- In Section 14, the second paragraph under 'features' should be deleted as this is standard information. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme.
- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. This is required before approval can be granted.

**Conclusion:**

**The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made and the RIO consultation being completed and considered.**

## **2.13 MSc Management (Major Change)**

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to address issues raised by staff including the duplication of material in core courses, the need for study skills tuition, and the need for decision making tools to be included in the curriculum.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 10, the words 'recognize, compare and' should be deleted from the third bullet point. Under 'intellectual skills' the first bullet point should be amended to read 'Critically evaluate key conceptual and empirical contributions in scholarly publications. The use of 'comprehend' should be avoided, with more active, Masters level verbs being used;
- In Section 11, the first paragraph should be deleted;

- In Section 14, there is concern that the workload is very heavy in the second semester and there appears to be no Easter break for students. The proposer is asked to explain how this is feasible, particularly in terms of learning hours. The information on the non-assessed workshop should be moved to Section 15. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme;
- In Section 15, the duplicated information should be deleted;
- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. This is required before approval can be granted.

**Conclusion:**

**The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made and the RIO consultation being completed and considered.**

**2.14 MSc Management with Enterprise and Business Growth (Major Change)**

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to address issues raised by staff including the duplication of material in core courses, the need for study skills tuition, and the need for decision making tools to be included in the curriculum.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 9, the first paragraph should be revised as it cannot be assumed the reader will have access to the MSc Management specification;
- In Section 10, the first paragraph should be revised as it cannot be assumed the reader will have access to the MSc Management specification. The specification for this degree must be a standalone document providing all the information for the specific programme. The words 'recognize, compare and' should be deleted from the third bullet point. Under 'intellectual skills' the first bullet point should be amended to read 'Critically evaluate key conceptual and empirical contributions in scholarly publications. The use of 'comprehend' should be avoided, with more active, Masters level verbs being used;
- In Section 11, the first paragraph should be deleted;
- In Section 14, there is concern that the workload is very heavy in the second semester and there appears to be no Easter break for students. The proposer is asked to confirm that this is feasible, particularly in terms of learning hours. The information on the non-assessed workshop should be moved to Section 15. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme;
- In Section 15, the duplicated information should be deleted;
- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. This is required before approval can be granted.

**Conclusion:**

**The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made and the RIO consultation being completed and considered.**

## 2.15 MSc Management with Human Resources (Major Change)

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to address issues raised by staff including the duplication of material in core courses, the need for study skills tuition, and the need for decision making tools to be included in the curriculum.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

### ***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 9, the first paragraph should be revised as it cannot be assumed the reader will have access to the MSc Management specification;
- In Section 10, the first paragraph should be revised as it cannot be assumed the reader will have access to the MSc Management specification. The specification for this degree must be a standalone document providing all the information for the specific programme. The words 'recognize, compare and' should be deleted from the third bullet point. Under 'intellectual skills' the first bullet point should be amended to read 'Critically evaluate key conceptual and empirical contributions in scholarly publications. The use of 'comprehend' should be avoided, with more active, Masters level verbs being used;
- In Section 11, the first paragraph should be deleted;
- In Section 14, there is concern that the workload is very heavy in the second semester and there appears to be no Easter break for students. The proposer is asked to explain how this is feasible, particularly in terms of learning hours. The information on the non-assessed workshop should be moved to Section 15. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme;
- In Section 15, the duplicated information should be deleted;
- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. This is required before approval can be granted.

### **Conclusion:**

**The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made and the RIO consultation being completed and considered.**

## 2.16 MSc Management with International Finance (Major Change)

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to address issues raised by staff including the duplication of material in core courses, the need for study skills tuition, and the need for decision making tools to be included in the curriculum.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

### ***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 9, the first paragraph should be revised as it cannot be assumed the reader will have access to the MSc Management specification;
- In Section 10, the first paragraph should be revised as it cannot be assumed the reader will have access to the MSc Management specification. The specification for this degree must be a standalone document providing all the information for

the specific programme. The words 'recognize, compare and' should be deleted from the third bullet point. Under 'intellectual skills' the first bullet point should be amended to read 'Critically evaluate key conceptual and empirical contributions in scholarly publications. The use of 'comprehend' should be avoided, with more active, Masters level verbs being used;

- In Section 11, the first paragraph should be deleted;
- In Section 14, there is concern that the workload is very heavy in the second semester and there appears to be no Easter break for students. The proposer is asked to explain how this is feasible, particularly in terms of learning hours. The information on the non-assessed workshop should be moved to Section 15. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme;
- In Section 15, the duplicated information should be deleted;
- It was noted that no market assessment had been carried out by RIO. This is required before approval can be granted.

**Conclusion:**

**The Group recommends the proposal to ASC, subject to the amendments identified above being made and the RIO consultation being completed and considered.**

**2.17 MSc Public Policy and Management (Major Change)**

**Rationale:** The change is being proposed in order to increase the appeal and intellectual interest of the programme, and to make it more straightforward to administer.

**Regulations:** The programme will continue to be governed by the regulations at SocSci 46-51 (PG).

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

***Points for discussion:***

- In Section 7, 'N/A' should be deleted as this field is published on the student HEAR;
- In Section 10, the standard preamble should be used for the 'knowledge and understanding' section, with each of the ILOs having an active, Masters level verb. An ILO appears to be missing at the end of the section;
- In Section 12, the second and third paragraphs should be deleted;
- In Section 13, the information should be deleted;
- In Section 14, there is concern that the workload in the first semester is too heavy at 80 credits. The proposer is asked to revise the structure to avoid this. A link should be provided to possible courses that may be taken as options. Under 'regulations', section (d) should be deleted as it is not relevant to this programme;
- In Section 15, the duplicated information should be deleted;
- Although the Proposal Support Document indicated that a market assessment had been completed and was attached, such a document could not be found in PIP. This is required before approval can be granted.

**Conclusion:**

**At present, the Group cannot recommend approval to ASC. The Group will reconsider the proposal when the programme structure has been altered to avoid having 80 credits in one semester, the RIO consultation has been completed and considered, and the amendments identified above have been made.**

**3. 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:

- Certificate of Higher Education in Counselling Skills  
All documentation was found to be in order.
- MSc Finance and Management  
All documentation was found to be in order.
- Pg Certificate in Legal Education  
All documentation was found to be in order.