

**LTC11D083**

**Title:** New Academic Model  
**Author:** Dr Adam Longcroft (Academic Director of Taught Programmes) & Head of LTS (West)  
**Date:** For LTC meeting of 16 May 2012  
**Circulation:** Learning and Teaching Committee – 16 May 2012  
**Agenda:** LTC11A005  
**Version:** Final  
**Status:** Open

---

**Guidance circulated by ADTP 7 May 20102**

**Dear LTC and TPPG colleagues**

In advance of the next two meetings of LTC (first is on 16 May, second is on 27 June) it is important that the new Programme Specs associated with the New Academic Model are subjected proper scrutiny. In each Faculty the Associate Deans have been working with colleagues in their respective Faculty LTQCs to develop these Specs. Each has developed a robust iterative process whereby drafts have been developed, scrutinised and then approved at Faculty level. Each Assoc Dean will have an opportunity at LTC to briefly explain/describe this process for the benefit of colleagues present.

As Academic Director for Taught Programmes I have agreed with the PVC (Academic) a simple process that I believe will ensure that LTC/TPPG colleagues also have an opportunity to view the NAM Programme Specs, as well as an opportunity to comment on them. Members of staff on LTC and TPPG have been 'pooled' into a single scrutiny group. All will be given access to the TPPG Blackboard site where Julia Jones has uploaded the Specs ready for scrutiny.

Each colleague will look at the Programme Specs from a single school (not their own). In the case of a School with large numbers of Prog Specs (e.g. LCS) this load will be shared between two colleagues.

Since ADs will have explained the iterative process, and since the scrutiny process will have been a robust one at Faculty level (thus ensuring that Specs are compliant with NAM requirements), colleagues should be able to focus their energies on the following:

- a) Clever use of the NAM Prog Spec template, with particularly clear, accessible ways of explaining, showing, describing, illustrating etc.
- b) Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g. use of larger modules, radical changes to assessment strategy, reduction in number of exams, etc).
- c) Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.

Note: If a colleague believes that a Programme is not compliant with the NAM they should bring this to the attention of the Academic Director for Taught Programmes a s a p.

Colleagues are encouraged to keep their written comments/feedback as brief as possible and to focus on the 3 areas (a, b, c) above. Their written comments should be sent to John Tully for record purposes a s a p.

In some cases, School NAM Specs have been delayed and will be placed on TPPG Blackboard site a s a p. If there are no Specs available re the School you have been allocated, contact **Julia Jones** to find out when we are expecting them to become available.

Best wishes

**Adam Longcroft**  
**Academic Director for Taught Programmes**

**Learning and Teaching Committee / Taught Programmes Policy Group Feedback on  
UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012**

School/s owning the Course			
Route code/s			
Course title/s			
Course Director /s			
<i>Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee scrutiny has ensured that the proposals meet with the requirements of the New Academic Model. Therefore LTC and TPPG reviewers are invited to consider and comment on the following:</i>			
a	Clever use of the NAM Programme Proposal template, with particularly clear, accessible ways of explaining, showing, describing, illustrating etc.		
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (eg, use of larger modules, radical changes to assessment strategy, reduction in number of exams, etc).		
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
d	Any further comments.		
<i>Note: If a colleague believes that a Programme is <u>not</u> compliant with the NAM they should bring this to the attention of the Academic Director for Taught Programmes immediately.</i>			
Name of reviewer		Date	

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk))**

## New Academic Model Project

### Progress update for LTC 16 May

Undergraduate NAM programme proposals – to be submitted to LTC 16 May meeting  
(for scrutiny by members to report to LTC 27 June)

Colleague	Allocated School(s)	Availability of documents on TPPG BlackBoard site
Erica Towner	AMS	Available
Helen Murdoch	AHP	Available (SLP available; OT and PT to submit in the summer)
Lynne Ward	ART	Available
Sanna Inthorn	BIO	By 11 May?
Alison Rhodes	CHE	Thursday 10 May (F008 Science with a Foundation Year to follow)
Ros Boar	CMP	By 11 May?
Ben Milner	DEV	Available
Jo Spiro	ECO	Available
Clive Matthews	EDU	Available (BAPS to follow)
Helena Gillespie & Rosie Doy	ENV	Thursday 10 May
Jon Sharp	FTV	Available
Tom Ward	HIS	Available (one proposal to follow)
Vicki Scaife	LAW	Available
John Tully & Caroline Sauverin	LCS	Available
Richard Gray	LDC	Available
Paul Levy	MED	Unconfirmed
Annie Grant	MTH	Thursday 10 May
Caroline Sauverin	NATSCI	Thursday 10 May
Jon Sharp	NBS	By 11 May?
Andrea Blanchflower	NSC	Unconfirmed
Jonathan Colam-French	PHA	Thursday 10 May
Adam Longcroft	PHI	Available
Adam Longcroft	PSI	Available
Julia Jones	SWP	Available

## **Draft Undergraduate Regulations**

- Need further work in order to submit to LTC 27 June 2012
- Capping issue and plagiarism penalties has to be resolved
- Modelling underway re algorithms for classification, ie downloading 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year marks from SITS for last year's finalists from various Schools to compile data and evidence for TPPG re various scenarios
- Some content of the regulations will depend on the Code of Practice on Assessment (which in turn depends on the Review of Internal Moderation)
- Regulations will also depend on outcome of review of Academic Appeals and Complaints

## **Module Coding**

- New Coding structure has been agreed

## **Code of Practice on Assessment**

- CS/JJ to write 2<sup>nd</sup> draft for submission to TPPG 6 June
- JJ to research relevant QAA policies, eg External Examiners, to make sure we're in line

## **Internal Moderation and Double Marking Review Group**

- Sara Connolly, John Tully, Helena Gillespie, Sanna Inthorn, Sandra Gibson, Helen James, JJ supporting
- Section set up on TPPG website and various documents uploaded (background info, current practice at UEA and elsewhere, QAA guidelines etc)
- Meeting 1 took place 24 April 2012

## **PGT and the NAM**

- ADTP's proposals went to LTC 28 March 2012
- General implementation delayed until 2014/15
- No date currently set for the abolition of Condoned Failure
- Constraints on CF from 2014/15 to be decided?
- All students to receive a reassessment opportunity, rather than condoning failure at first sit, from 2014/15?
- 20 credit minimum module size – MBA has concession for 10 credit modules
- SSF likely to seek concession for 10-credit PGCE placement module
- PGT NAM course approval form to be redesigned / simplified
- SSF would like the redesigned form available from September 2012 in order to start the PGT proposal / approval process

## **Course approval**

- JJ to review process and forms, guidance etc in order to bring them more in line with the requirements of the NAM (in conjunction with Laurence Wild, SSF LTQC secretary, who has amalgamated the Course Approval form and the NAM form)
- Need to add section to the form for the HEAR course summary
- New course webpages will need a revamp and out of date documents removing etc
- JJ and LW consulting with other FLTQC secretaries (Michele Pavey and Rob Gray) re the process

## Module Coding Convention for the New Academic Model

After extensive deliberation and discussion, the agreed structure for the new module codes with the introduction of the New Academic Model is a 9-character fixed-length code which takes the following convention:

Character	1 -3	4	5	6-8	9
Use	School	*Hyphen or sector	FHEQ level	Sequence Number	Admin Use – eg period of delivery, type of module ** (see below)
Example	BIO	-	5	004	A

New Code:                                      BIO-5004A (example – this would be the 4<sup>th</sup> allocated code for an autumn-semester module at level 2/5 in BIO)

Current code equivalent:                  BIO-2B01

**\*Character 4** would normally be a hyphen, but where Schools are sectorised, this can continue to be used as a sector identifier. In addition, where a module has been identified as a defined choice Language (G) or Employment or Enrichment (R) module, these will be identified by G and R as the 4<sup>th</sup> character.

**\*\*Character 9** would be solely for admin use as detailed to identify, for example, when the module was delivered, or to identify International Summer School Modules, as follows:

A	Autumn Semester
B	Spring Semester
Y	Year Long
X	Spanning two academic years
D	Term 1
E	Term 2
F	Term 3 (and Summer Semester)
G	Term 1 and 2 together
H	Term 2 and 3 together
S	International Summer School

C	Coursework variant (we are working on accommodating CW and Fieldwork variants within normal module codes, so this may not be required)
K	Fieldwork variant (we are working on accommodating CW and Fieldwork variants within normal module codes, so this may not be required)

## Background and Details

### 1. Current System

The current module coding convention was transferred over to SITS from the previous course management system. This coding structure is based on a 9-character string, with the following notation:

Characters 1 – 3:	School acronym
Character 4	Hyphen, or school sector
Character 5	Module level
Character 6	Free for school's use (used in some schools to denote size of module/whether module is compulsory/area of discipline module covers)
Character 7	non-specific character, usually used sequentially as new modules are created
Character 8	odd/even number or letter Y or X, to denote period the module is delivered in (Autumn Semester, Spring Semester, Year long, or spanning two academic years)
Character 9	qualifiers to denote specific variants of modules, namely C for coursework variants, K for fieldwork variants and, potentially, 'S' for Summer School modules.

### 2. Discussion of the limitations of the current system

#### 1. Period of Delivery

The 8<sup>th</sup> character of the current code denotes the period of delivery of the module. This is not required, as there is a separate field in SITS to denote period. In addition, it means that when modules swap periods, a new module code, and associated records, needs to be set up. However, in discussing this issue with the Associate Deans, there was a clear steer that it is useful and familiar to have a way of identifying the period of delivery from the module code. Therefore, the recommendation takes this into account, albeit in a new form. The (small) number of Schools which do not currently follow the convention are identified in Appendix One. We will ensure that all new codes follow the convention correctly.

## 2. Implied meaning in characters 6 to 8

Some Schools use characters 6 and 7 to convey meaning, in terms of subject studied, or number of credits. However, there have been problems in continuing this convention as more and more module codes get 'used up', and compromises over these conventions mean that they often lose their meaning. The recommendation removes all meaning from these characters, to be replaced by a sequence number. There is space for 999 modules in one period at one level. However, the recommendation is that the sequence numbers are unique at the level, rather than the period ie if a School uses BIO-5004A, it would not use BIO-5004B for a different module delivered in the Spring Semester.

## 3. FHEQ level

With the introduction of the New Academic Model, we are taking the opportunity to incorporate the QAA Framework for HE level qualifications into the module codes. The new levels will be mapped as follows:

<b>Current Level</b>	<b>New Level</b>
0	0 (until 2016/7, or when current level 3 is no longer available)
1	4
2	5
3	6
M	7
R	R (no change)

For clarity, we will retain stages (ie year of study for full time students) as follows:

<b>Current Stage - No Change proposed</b>
0
1
2
3
M
R

4. The use of character 4 (hyphen or School sector) will continue except letters G and R will be ring fenced to identify Language and Employment and Enrichment Defined Choice modules, and will not be available to Schools for sector use (neither letter is currently in use).



APPENDIX ONE

Table to illustrate where module codes do not follow the 8<sup>th</sup>-character 'period' convention

8th character	Number of modules							Grand Total	Modules not following convention:
	SEM1	SEM2	SEM3	T1	T2	T3	YEAR		
0		116	4					120	NSC, SWP
1	263	2					2	267	SWP, NBS, CCE (and APL)
2	5	263	3				1	272	NBS, CCE (and APL)
3	165	1					1	167	SWP (and APL)
4	1	190	1				2	194	SWP, NBS (and APL)
5	158	4	1				1	164	SWP, CCE, HUM (Research), (and APL)
6	1	148					1	150	SWP (and APL)
7	135							135	SWP, NBS, CCE
8	2	127	1					130	SWP, NBS, CCE
9	86	1						87	SWP
D	24	1		10				35	AHP, MED, NBS, NSC
E	1	37			10			48	AHP, MED, NBS, NSC
F		2	27	8		10		47	NSC, NBS, MED, AHP
I			6					6	summer school modules - to be changed
M							1	1	(APL)
R							1	1	CCE (research)
X	92	68	5	15	6	1	18	205	
Y	2	4		5			1062	1073	NSC, MED, EDU
Z				28	36	25	1	90	NSC
S			1					1	CCE (research)
L					2			2	NSC
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>935</b>	<b>964</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1091</b>	<b>3195</b>	

