University of Glasgow

Academic Standards Committee – Friday 22 March 2019

Report from the ASC Programme Approval Group, held on 28 February 2019

Ms H Clegg, Senate Office

Present:

Professor Niall MacFarlane (Convener), Dr Maria Dick, Dr Anna Morgan-Thomas

In attendance:

Ms H Clegg, Dr Matthew Barr, Dr Quintin Cutts, Mr Brian Hermiston (Skills Development Scotland)

The ASC Programme Approval Group convened to consider one proposal from the College of Science & Engineering.

BSc Honours in Software Engineering (Graduate Apprenticeship)

Rationale: The School of Computing Science had received funding from Skills Development Scotland (SDS) to begin delivering the graduate apprenticeship programme. Extensive consultation with employers had taken place.

Regulations: New regulations had been devised in consultation with the Senate Office.

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

- Section 8 of the Programme Specification - the Group considered the Aims to be rather lengthy. It was recommended that these be shortened and combined, where possible. Dr Barr agreed to consider this but advised that they had been written mindful of the graduate attribute principles that SDS required to be met;

- Section 9 of the Programme Specification – the Group was concerned that some of the Intended Learning Outcomes were very detailed and specific, and may rapidly become redundant. Dr Barr advised that the ILOs were aligned with SDS requirements and also with professional body accreditation in mind. Mr Hermiston confirmed that SDS would wish to have this level of detail;

- Section 12 of the Programme Specification – the diagram detailing the programme structure appeared confusing and the Group recommended that this be made clearer. It was noted that, in the narrative, there was no mention of the second Work-Based Learning element in Year 1, or any Work-Based Learning in Year 2. This should be addressed;

- Section B of the Programme Proposal Support Document should be completed;

- New Regulations Data Input Form – fields 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 and 1.5 should be completed;

- It was noted that the programme regulations prevented students from being able to repeat a year. The proposers were asked to comment on how cases of Good Cause, ongoing illness or Fitness to Study issues would be handled, as well as cases where (for example) the employer was no longer able to offer employment.

Mr Hermiston confirmed that study could be suspended for up to a year in the event of illness or other circumstances that meant the student was not able to study. Additionally, if the student's employment was ended, there was the possibility of transferring to a different employer;

- The Group was interested in the experience of students in the workplace, and whether those placed with smaller employers would be exposed to a similar range of opportunities as those placed with large employers. Dr Barr responded that students would enjoy different challenges but would be able to learn from other students' experiences in the classroom setting. Students placed with smaller employers were also likely to be given more responsibility. He added that employers would be required to have a staff of at least ten developers, in order that students could obtain a good range of experiences and challenges. He said that employers would be required to offer interesting opportunities;

- The Group asked about the Workplace Assessment, which it was understood would take the place of the usual dissertation, and how students would select topics. Dr Barr indicated that the topic would typically be selected by the student and employer together based on interest and business need but that a variety of options would be available. His view was that the variety of topics being covered by students would enrich the classroom-based elements of the programme;

- The Group asked about the practicalities of the day-release system and how this might impact on the optional courses students could choose. Dr Barr noted that the student would choose options in negotiation with the employer but that, ultimately, the final say would rest with the employer;

- The Group sought clarification with regard to the responsibility for student conduct, and whether students would have access to the Academic Appeals process if, for example, they failed to meet the list of competencies.

The Group agreed that the programme being proposed was excellent and was an exciting development.

SDS had some additional queries, which did not form part of the University's approval process, and these are detailed in the Appendix for information.

Conclusion: *The Group approves the proposal, subject to the amendments indicated above being made and points being clarified.*

Appendix

The points I would like clarified before I can endorse the programme as approved by SDS are:

- Provide a detailed mapping of the UoG programme learning outcomes against the SDS GA Framework.
- Provide evidence of employer engagement, and any changes made to programme design as a result of that consultation.
- Provide evidence of progress in discussions with professional bodies for future professional accreditation.
- Provide details of staff involved in the programme, capacity to deliver and ongoing CPD arrangements.

The title of the award is BSc Honours in Software Engineering (Graduate Apprenticeship). Can you advise why UoG propose to deviate from the approved qualification title in this instance?

Best Regards,

Brian Hermiston
Quality Manager, Higher and Graduate Apprenticeships
Service Design and Innovation