

LTC11D063

Title: Faculty Responses to the PGT New Academic Model proposals
Author: Academic Director of Taught Programmes, Faculty Associate Deans for Learning, Teaching and Quality
Circulation: Learning and Teaching Committee – 28 March 2012
Agenda: LTC11A004
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

The report contains responses from the four Faculties to proposals from the Academic Director of Taught Programme relating to the New Academic Model for Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

Recommendation

Recipients are invited to read this document in conjunction with agenda item A2: report from the Academic Director of Taught Programmes on Proposals relating to the New Academic Model for Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

Resource Implications

Some of the proposals contained in the report will have resource implications for the University.

Risk Implications

Some of the proposals considered in the report will have a risk element for the University in the sense that decisions about policy issues have an impact on processes and outcomes for students and the student experience.

Equality and Diversity

It is not envisaged that any of the recommendations contained in the report will impact on groups with protected characteristics.

Timing of decisions

The Committee will be asked to decide on general principles today (under Agenda item A2) but full revised regulations for Postgraduate Taught Programmes will come to a future meeting of LTC for consideration.

Further Information

Julia Jones x3528 julia.jones@uea.ac.uk

Background

The Academic Director for Taught Programmes is bringing to the meeting a series of proposals relating to the New Academic Model for Postgraduate Taught Programmes (Agenda item A2).

Since October 2011, the ADTP and the NAM Project Officer has worked closely with members of the PGT NAM Working Group (including colleagues from all four Faculties and the support services of the University) to identify the key issues and challenges in relation to postgraduate provision. The Working Group met on four occasions and was very effective as a consulting body. As a result of this consultation process, the ADTP produced draft recommendations.

As part of the wider consultation process, each of the Faculty LTQCs was invited to provide feedback on these draft recommendations, with Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning being asked to summarise the view of their LTQCs. This feedback has informed the ADTP's final recommendations.

Discussion

The proposals from the Academic Director for Taught Programmes and the responses from the Faculty Associate Deans should be used by members to inform their consideration of the implementation of the New Academic Model for Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

Towards a New Academic Model for Post-Graduate Programmes:

Feedback from Faculty LTQCs on the Recommendations of the Academic Director for Taught Programmes

The Academic Director for Taught Programmes has circulated to Faculty LTQCs a series of recommendations relating to the development of the New Academic Model for PGT programmes. Since October 2011, the ADTP and the NAM Project Officer have worked closely with members of the PGT NAM Working Group (which includes colleagues from across all four Faculties and the support services of the University) to identify the key issues and challenges in relation to postgraduate provision. The Working Group met on four occasions and it has been very effective as a consulting body. The ADTP aims to bring a series of recommendations to LTC for its meeting on 28 March 2012. Prior to that, and as part of the wider consultation process, each of the Faculty LTQCs is invited to provide feedback on the ADTP's draft recommendations. Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning are asked to summarise the view of their LTQC using the table below. With regard to the specific recommendations it would be helpful if ADs could indicate whether their Faculty LTQC is: a) firmly in favour b) in favour but with reservations/concerns about aspects of implementation c) opposed, with clear reasons as to why. It would be helpful to keep feedback as succinct as possible. **ADs are asked to send their feedback to Julia Jones no later than Monday 12 March.**

Recommendations	HUM Feedback (Schools that provided feedback: AMS, LDC, FTV, PSI, ART, HIS, PHI)
1. Timing of the introduction of the PGT NAM	
<p>OPTION A: Implement PGT NAM in 2013/14, simultaneously with UG NAM.</p> <p>OPTION B: Postpone PGT NAM to 2014/15.</p>	<p>All Schools favour Option B. Key reasons identified by Schools are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have a year to get a sense of how the principles of UG NAM are working out in practice. We need to observe carefully implications for student recruitment, quality of student work and NSS results. - We will have a better idea of the conditions research funding bodies, like the AHRC, will attach to PGR (1+3) funding. - The new HUB-based administration has more time to bed down before further changes are introduced to courses.
2. Pass all modules	
<p>OPTION A: Students must pass all modules. The format of the PGT academic year should be re-ordered, accordingly, to facilitate this.</p> <p>OPTION B: Allow condoning failure to continue as at present (no change)</p> <p>OPTION C: Allow condoning failure to continue, but within specific constraints</p>	<p>The majority of Schools favour Option C (Note: this is listed as Option B on p.12 of the proposal), which is to allow condoning failure to continue, but within specific constraints. However, some Schools feel that where this particular issue is concerned, PGT courses should be brought in line with UG courses. Our arguments in favour of Option C are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It allows for flexibility while still enabling some understanding of the challenges facing international students. - It helps us maintain a safety net for students to cover the unforeseeable; a humane system, rather than a mechanistic one. Having a safety net is not the same thing as accepting low standards; it is about treating students empathetically, as individuals – something of which our external examiners strongly approve.

3. 20 credit minimum module size

OPTION A: 20 credit minimum module size. MBA to be an exception within the Regs.

OPTION B: Place no minimum limits on module size

Hum would prefer Option B.

While this is not an issue of concern for Schools that do not have any modules below 20 credits, some Schools that do have 10 credit modules urge in the strongest terms that 10-credits modules should *not* be disallowed. 10 credit modules are used to deliver research training, highly specialised research skills and in some Schools are used for synoptic assessments (contact time/teaching is part of the module). 20 credit modules would not provide the same intensive and highly targeted teaching/learning experience. This is particularly a concern for our creative writing courses, which are internationally recognised leaders in their field.

4. Earning the right to reassessment

OPTION A: Students will be offered a reassessment opportunity where they have met the following requirements:

1. must have no more than 20% unauthorised absence
2. must have achieved an overall module mark for the failed module of at least 20%.

OPTION B: No change. Students get automatic right to reassessment regardless of their 1st sit module mark.

All Schools are in favour of Option A. HUM expects a serious commitment from its PGT students, and we feel that such aspects as reassessment need to reflect this expectation. Some Schools have asked that this new regulation, if it was to be introduced, should also apply to modules where only one piece of assessment is involved (e.g. the dissertation or work placement modules).

5. Defined choice

OPTION A: The ADTP is of the view that imposing Defined Choice on Schools and artificially limiting the number of options than can be offered would be both potentially dangerous – in the sense that the ‘market position’ and recruitment of programmes might be undermined .
No change in the use of programme level choice is therefore proposed.

All Schools welcome this proposal.

A degree of flexibility and module choice are important for our MA programmes. We believe it is what gives us a competitive edge and allows us to make students part of the interdisciplinary culture of our School and the Faculty.

6. Joint degrees will have a Course Director from the School in which students are registered and Assistant Course Directors from other Schools contributing to the course

OPTION A: This precept should be adopted in the PGT NAM . No option B!

All Schools agree and are happy to provide deputy-course directors where they do not already exist.

7. Item and module assessment marks to be recorded as integers, and year and degree aggregates to be recorded to one decimal point

OPTION A: This precept should be adopted in the PGT NAM . No option B!

All Schools are happy with this proposal.

8. All courses to have Programme-level outcomes and the ways these are to be assessed to be clear for all courses

OPTION A: All courses to have Programme-level outcomes and the ways these are to be assessed to be clear for all courses. This was not a controversial issue in the PGT Working Group. It is accepted that programme level planning is important and that a clearer link can be created between outcomes and assessments. No option B!

All Schools are happy with this proposal.

9. SITS will be configured to accept marks on a pass/fail basis or 0-100 numerical scheme

OPTION A: The UG NAM precept should be adopted. The emphasis will be on the wider (but not exclusive) use of % marking, and with Pass/fail allowed on 'professional' courses.

All Schools are happy with this proposal.

10. M level award outcomes and thresholds: Pass/Merit/Distinction

OPTION A: There should be three separate outcomes available on PGT courses: Pass/Merit/Distinction. It was also the majority view that the % thresholds for each should be 50%, 60% and 70% respectively.

OPTION B: No change to current award outcomes. Pass where this is the only outcome, or Pass/Distinction.

All Schools are happy with this proposal.

However, some Schools argue that, as we accept people who at UG must have secured a 2.1 (minimum of 60%) the merit range, to reflect its quality, should be at the upper level of the 60 range (i.e 65-69).

11. Synoptic assessment

OPTION A: No further 'requirement' for synoptic assessment is necessary. No option B!

All School very much welcome that the initial proposal for synoptic assessment has been abandoned.

12. APEL/APCL arrangements

OPTION A: To accept a maximum of 50% of credits of Prior Certificated Learning from another HEI, and also to accept a maximum of 50% of credits for Prior Experiential Learning (or any combination of the two up to 50% in total).

All Schools are happy with this proposal.

Towards a New Academic Model for Post-Graduate Programmes:

Feedback from Faculty LTQCs on the Recommendations of the Academic Director for Taught Programmes

The Academic Director for Taught Programmes has circulated to Faculty LTQCs a series of recommendations relating to the development of the New Academic Model for PGT programmes. Since October 2011, the ADTP and the NAM Project Officer have worked closely with members of the PGT NAM Working Group (which includes colleagues from across all four Faculties and the support services of the University) to identify the key issues and challenges in relation to postgraduate provision. The Working Group met on four occasions and it has been very effective as a consulting body. The ADTP aims to bring a series of recommendations to LTC for its meeting on 28 March 2012. Prior to that, and as part of the wider consultation process, each of the Faculty LTQCs is invited to provide feedback on the ADTP's draft recommendations. Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning are asked to summarise the view of their LTQC using the table below. With regard to the specific recommendations it would be helpful if ADs could indicate whether their Faculty LTQC is: a) firmly in favour b) in favour but with reservations/concerns about aspects of implementation c) opposed, with clear reasons as to why. It would be helpful to keep feedback as succinct as possible. **ADs are asked to send their feedback to Julia Jones no later than Monday 12 March.**

Recommendations	FMH Feedback: Separated into pre and post registration
1. Timing of the introduction of the PGT NAM	
<p>OPTION A: Implement PGT NAM in 2013/14, simultaneously with UG NAM.</p> <p>OPTION B: Postpone PGT NAM to 2014/15.</p>	<p>There was a difference of opinion: Option A for PGT NSC and MED Option B in AHP:</p> <p>For pre-registration PGTP programmes this allows the present format of the course to run through once and allows for consolidation of the NAM in the UG programmes For other PGTP it allows time for the Professor of Workforce Futures to assess the impact on the market of the changes in NHS funding of CPD and the implications of the changes proposed in the NAM</p>
2. Pass all modules	
<p>OPTION A: Students must pass all modules. The format of the PGT academic year should be re-ordered, accordingly, to facilitate this.</p> <p>OPTION B: Allow condoning failure to continue as at present (no change)</p> <p>OPTION C: Allow condoning failure to continue, but within specific constraints</p>	<p>OPTION A already happens in FMH for pre-registration PGTP. But timing of exam boards and submission of dissertation must be timed exactly to fit placement pattern. This cannot be changed because of the way that it ties in with the UG placement pattern. i.e. Need interim and final exam boards at the beginning of February and reassessment board in May/June Dissertation submission cannot be September, but could be October.</p> <p>Option A already happens in FMH for other PGTP – post-reg and should continue.</p>

3. 20 credit minimum module size	
<p>OPTION A: 20 credit minimum module size. MBA to be an exception within the Regs.</p> <p>OPTION B: Place no minimum limits on module size</p>	<p>OPTION A is possible for pre-registration PGTP (currently with 4 10 credit modules) but this would be a major change requiring PSRB approval and a 2014/15 start would help to facilitate this.</p> <p>Option A already happens in FMH for other PGTP.</p>
4. Earning the right to reassessment	
<p>OPTION A: Students will be offered a reassessment opportunity where they have met the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. must have no more than 20% unauthorised absence 2. must have achieved an overall module mark for the failed module of at least 20%. <p>OPTION B: No change. Students get automatic right to reassessment regardless of their 1st sit module mark.</p>	<p>AHP- OPTION A:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Already happens in FMH for pre-registration PGTP but all absences are taken into account. This is not a punishment, but a means of ensuring that students have attended enough of the course to be safe to practise. If you only considered unauthorised absence then it would be possible for a student to have been ill for the majority of the year and still be allowed to be reassessed and progress. This is not acceptable. Is this behaviour management or based on educational principle? <p>Don't agree with this proposal. For preregistration programmes that have reduced the amount of assessments across the programme it might be possible to have one assignment in a module, just misunderstand it and fail badly and not be referred for reassessment – which would increase attrition. Would prefer OPTION B - an automatic right to reassessment regardless of mark.</p> <p>NSC and MED - Option A- but clarity about how mitigating circumstances would play into this</p>
5. Defined choice	
<p>OPTION A: The ADTP is of the view that imposing Defined Choice on Schools and artificially limiting the number of options than can be offered would be both potentially dangerous – in the sense that the 'market position' and recruitment of programmes might be undermined .</p> <p>No change in the use of programme level choice is therefore proposed.</p>	<p>Agreed- our choices are mainly quite defined.</p>

6. Joint degrees will have a Course Director from the School in which students are registered and Assistant Course Directors from other Schools contributing to the course

OPTION A: This precept should be adopted in the PGT NAM . No option B!

Agreed
There needs to be awareness that the NHS won't fund students to register for whole programmes now, just modules. Therefore it can be messy managing students, modules and programmes across the Faculty. Students can register in MED for the CBT Diploma

7. Item and module assessment marks to be recorded as integers, and year and degree aggregates to be recorded to one decimal point

OPTION A: This precept should be adopted in the PGT NAM . No option B!

Agree if marks are rounded up.

8. All courses to have Programme-level outcomes and the ways these are to be assessed to be clear for all courses

OPTION A: All courses to have Programme-level outcomes and the ways these are to be assessed to be clear for all courses. This was not a controversial issue in the PGT Working Group. It is accepted that programme level planning is important and that a clearer link can be created between outcomes and assessments. No option B!

Yes
On professional courses this is done already, however, response to item 6 needs to be taken note of here. Students are not always registered for a programme.

9. SITS will be configured to accept marks on a pass/fail basis or 0-100 numerical scheme

OPTION A: The UG NAM precept should be adopted. The emphasis will be on the wider (but not exclusive) use of % marking, and with Pass/fail allowed on 'professional' courses.

Yes

10. M level award outcomes and thresholds: Pass/Merit/Distinction

OPTION A: There should be three separate outcomes available on PGT courses: Pass/Merit/Distinction. It was also the majority view that the % thresholds for each should be 50%, 60% and 70% respectively.

OPTION B: No change to current award outcomes. Pass where this is the only outcome, or Pass/Distinction.

OPTION A –Thresholds should be as stated, 50, 60 and 70

AHP - It is important that students are eligible for these awards even if the marks are obtained through reassessment.

11. Synoptic assessment

OPTION A: No further 'requirement' for synoptic assessment is necessary. No option B!

OK

12. APEL/APCL arrangements

OPTION A: To accept a maximum of 50% of credits of Prior Certificated Learning from another HEI, and also to accept a maximum of 50% of credits for Prior Experiential Learning (or any combination of the two up to 50% in total).

Yes please for post-reg

Although limited APEL is permitted for the pre-registration PGTP, in reality it is never awarded. It is not appropriate because of the totally integrated nature of the programme.

Towards a New Academic Model for Post-Graduate Programmes:

Feedback from Faculty LTQCs on the Recommendations of the Academic Director for Taught Programmes

The Academic Director for Taught Programmes has circulated to Faculty LTQCs a series of recommendations relating to the development of the New Academic Model for PGT programmes. Since October 2011, the ADTP and the NAM Project Officer have worked closely with members of the PGT NAM Working Group (which includes colleagues from across all four Faculties and the support services of the University) to identify the key issues and challenges in relation to postgraduate provision. The Working Group met on four occasions and it has been very effective as a consulting body. The ADTP aims to bring a series of recommendations to LTC for its meeting on 28 March 2012. Prior to that, and as part of the wider consultation process, each of the Faculty LTQCs is invited to provide feedback on the ADTP's draft recommendations. Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning are asked to summarise the view of their LTQC using the table below. With regard to the specific recommendations it would be helpful if ADs could indicate whether their Faculty LTQC is: a) firmly in favour b) in favour but with reservations/concerns about aspects of implementation c) opposed, with clear reasons as to why. It would be helpful to keep feedback as succinct as possible. **ADs are asked to send their feedback to Julia Jones no later than Monday 12 March.**

Recommendations	SCI Feedback
1. Timing of the introduction of the PGT NAM	
<p>OPTION A: Implement PGT NAM in 2013/14, simultaneously with UG NAM.</p> <p>OPTION B: Postpone PGT NAM to 2014/15.</p>	<p>SCI Feedback:</p> <p>Preference is Option B to postpone to 2014/15 for two reasons.</p> <p>First is the time it will take to prepare PGT course for NAM, given that UG courses are currently being developed for NAM. Second is that UG NAM is a huge change and it will be useful to get feedback from this change to help develop PGT NAM.</p>
2. Pass all modules	
<p>OPTION A: Students must pass all modules. The format of the PGT academic year should be re-ordered, accordingly, to facilitate this.</p> <p>OPTION B: Allow condoning failure to continue as at present (no change)</p> <p>OPTION C: Allow condoning failure to continue, but within specific constraints</p>	<p>SCI Feedback:</p> <p>General preference is Option A that students must pass all modules. This is consistent with UG NAM. SCI has a lot of Integrated Masters courses and making PGT NAM the same as UG NAM is helpful.</p> <p>Some schools prefer to do this, whilst others are less keen but recognise the need to be consistent with UG NAM.</p> <p>ENV has concerns with regard to field courses which take place at Easter and how these will fit into proposed progression boards. Some practical workaround will be necessary. The timing of these boards will need careful thought as many students start dissertations early – before the summer.</p> <p>PHA comment that the mid-June progression board does not sit at an appropriate time as their students are not following normal academic years. Some allowances would be needed.</p>

3. 20 credit minimum module size

OPTION A: 20 credit minimum module size. MBA to be an exception within the Regs.

OPTION B: Place no minimum limits on module size

SCI Feedback:

General preference is Option A 20 credit minimum module size.

BIO are least keen in SCI and comment - Would absolutely prefer **B**. We have quite a number of modules worth 10 credits and it would be very difficult to go to 20 credits. We believe there are good reasons for 10 credit modules at PGT - e.g. our 10 credit molecular biology module for students with no or little background in the area, it is a good way to be introduced to the subject. Small modules are good for students taking PGT courses because they are 'moving sideways'. If option A was chosen we would need a delay to the introduction until at least 2014.

4. Earning the right to reassessment

OPTION A: Students will be offered a reassessment opportunity where they have met the following requirements:

1. must have no more than 20% unauthorised absence
2. must have achieved an overall module mark for the failed module of at least 20%.

OPTION B: No change. Students get automatic right to reassessment regardless of their 1st sit module mark.

SCI Feedback:

General feeling was Option A to be consistent with UG NAM and as it sets minimum standards and engagement expectations. Making PGT NAM regulations the same as UG NAM is helpful for IM.

5. Defined choice

OPTION A: The ADTP is of the view that imposing Defined Choice on Schools and artificially limiting the number of options than can be offered would be both potentially dangerous – in the sense that the 'market position' and recruitment of programmes might be undermined . **No change in the use of programme level choice is therefore proposed.**

SCI Feedback:

Accepted. Most PGT courses in SCI are quite focussed in any case and don't tend to offer much in the way of free choice options.

6. Joint degrees will have a Course Director from the School in which students are registered and Assistant Course Directors from other Schools contributing to the course

OPTION A: This precept should be adopted in the PGT NAM . No option B!

SCI Feedback:

Accepted – and welcomed.

7. Item and module assessment marks to be recorded as integers, and year and degree aggregates to be recorded to one decimal point

OPTION A: This precept should be adopted in the PGT NAM .
No option B!

SCI Feedback:

Accepted. Although why not record degree aggregates as an integer too?

8. All courses to have Programme-level outcomes and the ways these are to be assessed to be clear for all courses

OPTION A: All courses to have Programme-level outcomes and the ways these are to be assessed to be clear for all courses. This was not a controversial issue in the PGT Working Group. It is accepted that programme level planning is important and that a clearer link can be created between outcomes and assessments.
No option B!

SCI Feedback:

Accepted.

MTH does comment - This is slightly more controversial for Mathematics where the assessments tend to be about demonstrating specific knowledge and understanding, as delineated by a syllabus.

9. SITS will be configured to accept marks on a pass/fail basis or 0-100 numerical scheme

OPTION A: The UG NAM precept should be adopted. The emphasis will be on the wider (but not exclusive) use of % marking, and with Pass/fail allowed on 'professional' courses.

SCI Feedback:

Accepted – feeling is that it is good to follow UG NAM where possible/sensible.

10. M level award outcomes and thresholds: Pass/Merit/Distinction

OPTION A: There should be three separate outcomes available on PGT courses: Pass/Merit/Distinction. It was also the majority view that the % thresholds for each should be 50%, 60% and 70% respectively.

OPTION B: No change to current award outcomes. Pass where this is the only outcome, or Pass/Distinction.

SCI Feedback:

Accepted and the grade boundaries look appropriate and broadly consistent with other institutions.

PHA suggest this for all levels, certificate, diploma and masters.

11. Synoptic assessment

OPTION A: No further 'requirement' for synoptic assessment is necessary. No option B!

SCI Feedback:

Accepted.

12. APCL/APCL arrangements

OPTION A: To accept a maximum of 50% of credits of Prior Certificated Learning from another HEI, and also to accept a maximum of 50% of credits for Prior Experiential Learning (or any combination of the two up to 50% in total).

SCI Feedback:

Accepted, although wonder what the rationale is for setting the level at 50%. Shouldn't be any higher than this.

PHA do prefer a higher limit - This a problem for our current Postgraduate masters, which require 67% APCL for it to be marketable. Other Schools of Pharmacy allow students with a PG Diploma to APCL this against their postgraduate masters. We cannot currently attract these mature, professionally able and generally excellent research students to UEA due to this arbitrary barrier.

Towards a New Academic Model for Post-Graduate Programmes: Feedback from Faculty LTQCs on the Recommendations of the Academic Director for Taught Programmes

Context for PGT in SSF

Postgraduate taught programmes are vitally important to the Faculty of Social Science. The latest figures for AY11/12 show that we have 1777 PGT students active in the Faculty (making up 35% of SSF's overall student number). This compares to 719 active students in the other Faculties *collectively*. In other words, **SSF has nearly three quarters of the entire PGT number for the University.** Under New Academic Model, we anticipate we will be offering in the region of 70 PGT courses in the Faculty as a whole.

Within this number there are some very large and significant groups of students on specific and distinctive types of PGT courses that may not be familiar to other Faculties. Examples of these are: first, the EDU PGCE courses (400+ students); second the large cohort "conversion" Masters programmes including those of NBS at UEAL and in Norwich (350+ students) and of ECO at Norwich; and third other types of professionally or externally accredited PGT programmes such as those in Social Work, Law and the NBS MBAs. These are in addition to the 'standard' Masters PGT courses that exist in all SSF Schools. All SSF schools therefore have significant PGT cohorts of well over 100 students. It is clear that SFF has a significant number of students. What we also have are some significant PGT programmes which are different and distinct from standard Masters level courses.

Some of the ADTP's proposals do not fit well with our PGT provision, and their implementation could significant damage recruitment by making us less attractive to students than our competitors and leaving us in conflict with professional accrediting bodies. Details of this are outlined below. We recommend that LTC should allow different sets of regulations for **THREE** sets of regulations – one for professional courses , one for conversion degrees (in business, Law and economics) and a set for standard masters degrees. This would allow the regulations to meet the needs of very different versions of PGT provision.

Recommendations	SSF Feedback
1. Timing of the introduction of the PGT NAM	
<p>OPTION A: Implement PGT NAM in 2013/14, simultaneously with UG NAM.</p> <p>OPTION B: Postpone PGT NAM to 2014/15.</p>	<p>SSF Feedback: SSF recommends LTC adopt option B SSF PGT is complex. We estimate that in the region of 70 courses will need approval through the QA process (more than twice as many as the number of SSF UG courses to be approved). If we are to learn from the QA process we are currently undertaking with UG we will need more time than is afforded by the 13/14 deadline. We don't anticipate any significant problems resulting from the delay in terms of responding to the new HE environment, as our recruitment is currently as expected on key courses for AY12/13 when the new fee regime begins. There is a significant risk to SSF in trying to meet the AY13/14 deadline in terms of quality of UG and PGT because of the sheer volume of courses which will be affected.</p>

2. Pass all modules

OPTION A: Students must pass all modules. The format of the PGT academic year should be re-ordered, accordingly, to facilitate this.

OPTION B: Allow condoning failure to continue as at present (no change)

OPTION C: Allow condoning failure to continue, but within specific constraints

SSF Feedback:

There is general agreement in SSF that it would be desirable for students to pass all modules. However we do not believe that this measure is the right one to achieve that aim. We are happy to work towards reducing the levels of condoned failure through redesigning courses and assessment, by supporting students more effectively by using formative feedback and by improvements in student attendance and engagement. However we *strongly oppose* a change to the regulations for the reasons outlined below. We also believe that might be an unintended consequence of increasing the number of requests for remarks and appeals.

SSF recommends LTC adopt option B – no change

Condoned failure is applied in varying ways across the Faculty. The variation is accounted for by the type of PGT provision,. It is higher on conversion masters, but hardly used on professional PGT courses. This is because of the different purposes and external drivers of these programmes. **Because of these differences we believe that trying to impose a 'one size fits all' solution of any kind would be completely unworkable for SSF.**

SSF would consider Option C Note options B and C wrongly labelled in the position paper

Our second choice would be to allow condoned failure of modules within the kind of restrictions outlined in the position paper. However, this is acceptable *ONLY IF* the conditions allowing condoned failure be set at school level. This is because at school level there are vastly differing reasons for the use condoned failure, and therefore different levels between schools. (For example, its use is very low in EDU and SWP but much higher in NBS and ECO). This is because of the very diverse nature of PGT provision in SSF. For example, in professional PGT provision (PGCE, MA Social Work) it is inappropriate to fail modules which are relevant to a public sector professional competence. However, in ECO and NBS and LAW conversion PGT courses condoned failure is used much more widely. Conversion PGT courses take non-specialists in the discipline for masters level study in Business and Economics subjects – not as the position paper states on its first page – as a preliminary stage of PGR study. These courses, and the MBA, cater for a specific market where our competitor institutions allow condoned failure.

Option A is completely unacceptable for our Faculty and would, we would strongly assert, do considerable damage to the University's business. If LTC elects to impose option C here (allow condoned failure within constraints) we would require time to model the impact of the constraints on all courses to decide which constraints could be applied without damaging recruitment.

3. 20 credit minimum module size

OPTION A: 20 credit minimum module size. MBA to be an exception within the Regs.

OPTION B: Place no minimum limits on module size

SSF Feedback:

SSF recommends LTC adopt option A – but with two exceptions.

Firstly, as set out in the position paper, the MBA standard is for 10 credit modules and there is good pedagogical and recruitment reasons for maintaining this.

Secondly, the PGCE courses allocate 1 credit to placements and subject knowledge audits. These aspects of the PGCE curriculum are governed by external TDA criteria and it is not appropriate to judge them by M-level criteria. However, to carry them on SITS, one credit is allotted.

LTC should allow these exceptions to be made when approving option A

4. Earning the right to reassessment

OPTION A: Students will be offered a reassessment opportunity where they have met the following requirements:

1. must have no more than 20% unauthorised absence
2. must have achieved an overall module mark for the failed module of at least 20%.

OPTION B: No change. Students get automatic right to reassessment regardless of their 1st sit module mark.

SSF Feedback:

SSF recommends LTC adopt option B (no change)

Option A has been adopted for UG provision. However, the nature of PGT provision is different for the following reasons:

1. PGT often has fewer taught sessions (sometimes fewer than 10 for dissertation modules) which mean a student might meet the 20% threshold after missing just two sessions. This is unfair, so modules with low numbers of contacts would need to be outside this rule.
2. The right to reassessment on professional placements in EDU and SWP is governed by Professional Bodies – there would need to be an exception made.
3. Some PGT courses might choose to maintain pass/fail marking because % marking does not add pedagogical value (so the 20% threshold would be useless)

Given the exceptions necessary resulting from reasons 1,2 and 3 above, it would be more sensible to maintain the right to reassessment and allow exam boards to exercise judgement.

5. Defined choice

OPTION A: The ADTP is of the view that imposing Defined Choice on Schools and artificially limiting the number of options than can be offered would be both potentially dangerous – in the sense that the ‘market position’ and recruitment of programmes might be undermined . **No change in the use of programme level choice is therefore proposed.**

SSF Feedback:

Levels of choice vary widely in SSF PGT provision and for this reason we endorse the view of the ADTP that there should be no regulation around defined choice.

6. Joint degrees will have a Course Director from the School in which students are registered and Assistant Course Directors from other Schools contributing to the course

OPTION A: This precept should be adopted in the PGT NAM . No option B!

SSF Feedback:

This is a sensible proposal.

7. Item and module assessment marks to be recorded as integers, and year and degree aggregates to be recorded to one decimal point

OPTION A: This precept should be adopted in the PGT NAM .
No option B!

SSF Feedback:

This is a sensible proposal.

8. All courses to have Programme-level outcomes and the ways these are to be assessed to be clear for all courses

OPTION A: All courses to have Programme-level outcomes and the ways these are to be assessed to be clear for all courses. This was not a controversial issue in the PGT Working Group. It is accepted that programme level planning is important and that a clearer link can be created between outcomes and assessments.
No option B!

SSF Feedback:
Sensible to have this in line with UG. However, the workload in compiling Programme level outcomes for all 70 of our PGT courses is substantial. **We can only deliver quality in this regard if the NAM for PGT is implemented in AY14/15 (see item 1)**

9. SITS will be configured to accept marks on a pass/fail basis or 0-100 numerical scheme

OPTION A: The UG NAM precept should be adopted. The emphasis will be on the wider (but not exclusive) use of % marking, and with Pass/fail allowed on 'professional' courses.

SSF Feedback:
SSF recommends that both of these marking options are available, at the discretion of course directors.

10. M level award outcomes and thresholds: Pass/Merit/Distinction

OPTION A: There should be three separate outcomes available on PGT courses: Pass/Merit/Distinction. It was also the majority view that the % thresholds for each should be 50%, 60% and 70% respectively.

OPTION B: No change to current award outcomes. Pass where this is the only outcome, or Pass/Distinction.

SSF Feedback:
SSF recommends LTC adopt option A, but with room for exceptions where professional courses can award pass/fail certificates or diplomas with M-level credit to carry forward to a full award.

11. Synoptic assessment

OPTION A: No further 'requirement' for synoptic assessment is necessary.
No option B!

SSF Feedback:
This is a sensible proposal.

12. APEL/APCL arrangements

OPTION A: To accept a maximum of 50% of credits of Prior Certificated Learning from another HEI, and also to accept a maximum of 50% of credits for Prior Experiential Learning (or any combination of the two up to 50% in total).

SSF Feedback:
SSF would like to explore why the 50% threshold has been arrived at. Some students register on dissertation module of the MA AEP in EDU with 120 M-level credits from two other institutions. There may be other examples on professional courses.
We recommend that LTC exempt professional PGT provision from this rule.