

LTC11D088

Title: Taught Programmes Policy Group
Author: Director of Taught Programmes (Professor Adam Longcroft)
Circulation: Learning and Teaching Committee – 27 June 2012
Agenda: LTC11A006
Status: Open
Version: Final

Report on TPPG to University LTC (27 June) from the Academic Director of Taught Programmes

1) Assessment Tariffs

A paper on Assessment Tariffs was considered by TPPG (**See Appendix 1**). The paper was based closely on guidelines produced by the University of Newcastle, and which had been in existence there since 2006. The ADTP reminded TPPG members that the Review of Assessment at UEA conducted several years ago had demonstrated very clearly that at UEA assessment loads and the numbers of assessments varied wildly between schools of study, with as few as 12 summative coursework submissions in some schools in the 1st Year compared to over 80 summative submissions in others. There was little consistency in terms of what was expected of a student studying on a 20 credit module. The emphasis on modules rather than carefully planned assessment across programmes at UEA meant that historically there had been little oversight of such inconsistencies, resulting in an inconsistent student experience of assessment. In the lead-up to the development of the New Academic Model and during Grahame Gibbs' visits to UEA it became apparent that UEA was massively over-assessing its students, at an enormous cost in staff time and to the detriment of student learning.

TPPG members felt that the NAM had provided an opportunity for Schools to address this issue and to plan and coordinate assessments in such a way that the dramatic variance seen in the past would be 'designed-out' of degree programmes. It was felt that we should wait to see how schools had embraced both the ethos and the requirements of the NAM before placing any further constraints on assessment at module level.

The ADTP accepted that this was a fair and prudent view. However, if it becomes apparent that the ethos of the NAM, and the drive to reduce the number of summative assessments and Exams has not been embraced by schools, then it will be necessary to revisit guidelines of this kind. Some TPPG colleagues feel that they are unhelpful and could constrain creativity and innovation in assessment design. This is, of course, a risk we need to be aware of. However, the ADTP feels that the advantages of such guidelines in a Code of Practice on Assessment would greatly outweigh any disadvantages – in particular by ensuring a more consistent workload for students across faculties (and thereby addressing issues of equity, fairness etc) and ensuring that staff have clearer guidance they can follow when designing assessments on their modules.

2) Revisions to the Policy of Plagiarism and Collusion

Amendments to the policy are set out in a separate agenda item for the 27 June LTC. Please refer to the relevant agenda item. The ADTP and Head of LTS (West) will be developing enhanced guidance for Plagiarism Officers, and aim to present the latter to LTC at its meeting on 25 July.

3) Review of Academic Appeals and Complaints

The Panel which undertook the review of academic appeals and complaints has now completed its work. The proposed Regulations relating to both Academic Appeals and Complaints, and Extenuating Circumstances, are set-out in a separate agenda item. Please refer to this for further details.

The review began in Oct 2011. The panel have met on 8 occasions since then. The Panel comprised the following members:

Hannah Coman (Partnerships, PPE)
Annie Grant (DoS)
Jo Spiro (SU Adviser)
Megan Evans (SU Academic Officer)
Prof John Street (HUM)
Adam Longcroft (ADTP, Chair)
Chris Bennett (LTS) Secretary
Helena Gillespie (Assoc Dean for SSF)
Nigel Claydon (CHE)
Nicola Spalding (Assoc Dean for FOH)
Prof Richard Holland (Course Director MBBS, MED)
John Tully (LTS, UG)
Lynne Ward (LTS, PGT)
Mel Steele (PGR)
Jon Sharp (LTS)
Caroline Sauverin (LTS)
Julia Jones (LTS)
Jacqueline Collier (HoS, AHP)

Early-on in the deliberations of the Panel it became evident that the issue of extenuating circumstances was a particularly complex one which required particularly detailed research and attention. A sub-group of the Panel was convened considered the regulations around Extenuating Circumstances. This met on 4 occasions. The sub-group members were: Richard Holland, Jon Sharp, Jo Spiro, Annie Grant, Lynne Ward, Caroline Sauverin, Adam Longcroft, and Rob Grant.

The ADTP would like to take this opportunity to extend his heartfelt thanks to each and every member of the panel for their important contributions to this process. Discussions with the Panel were often passionate, but always conducted in constructive manner.

A great deal of research into regulatory frameworks and practices in other HEIs had to be conducted during the review in order to ensure that we were aware of best practice (and poor practice) across the sector. Many colleagues in other Universities kindly shared with the Panel members their experience of practice in their own Universities – this was enormously helpful and shedding important light onto, for example, the impact of ‘Fit to sit’ policies, the use of appeals panels, and the role of students on panels and in the appeals process. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them all.

4) The UEA Learning & Teaching Day 2012 and looking forward to 2013.

The UEA Learning & Teaching Day 2012 was the best attended – ever. A summary of the feedback received from attendees via an online evaluation are attached as **Appendix 2**.

Over 130 colleagues attended either the whole or part of the day. Unlike last year's event, where male colleagues and male academic staff in particular were notable for their almost complete absence, there was a very good mix of attendees at this year's event. However, it would be fair to say that one would wish to see a larger number of academics attending the event in future. Those responsible for planning the event in future years will need to think carefully about the timing and focus (and relevance) of the event in order to maximise staff attendance. It will also be important for Heads of Schools to provide a strong lead in promoting the event to their staff, and leading by example by attending the event themselves. The expectation should be that all academic staff attend at least part of the event, unless there are good reasons not to.

Looking forward, the ADTP's initial thoughts on L & T Day 2013 are:

- 1) We should ensure that we build into the L & T Day opportunities for students to make an input – perhaps pilot a couple of projects where students act as 'agents of change' by exploring a problem (e.g. how to maximise value of online feedback) and report at L&T Day on their conclusions/recommendations etc?
- 2) I'd also like to see colleagues from UEA London, and from partner colleges (UCS, Easton, CCN etc) making an input – we have had good input from the latter in previous years but this wasn't the case this year.
- 3) Might be worth exploring a 2 day format – we would be able to drill-down in greater depth into key areas of practice. Or have short morning sessions (9:30-12:00am) spread during a one-week period.
- 4) Some external input – high profile keynote on key theme?
- 5) Explore opportunities for MA HEP participants – especially those who have done Mod 6 (use of ITC in teaching) to lead some mini workshops?

5) Update on UEA Teaching Excellence Website

As LTC colleagues will remember the ADTP set in motion in Sept 2011 the development of a new website which would provide a major online focal point for best practice in teaching and learning which would be of value to both staff, students and others outside the institution. This will eventually form part of the LTS website. A small steering group has been leading on the development of the website. It is hoped that a demonstration of the site will be given by Andy Mee at the next TPPG meeting on 10 July. It should be possible to demonstrate it, in a more developed form, to LTC members at LTC on 24 October 2012.

6) Progression Rules for Year Abroad, Year in Industry and Integrated Masters Programmes

This is an important policy area for taught programmes since progression rules dictate the basis on which students are permitted or earn the right to take advantage of a year abroad as part of their studies. The attached guidance on progression rules (the rationale for their existence) and a spreadsheet (**See Appendix 3**) show the progression rules or 'thresholds' (in SCI, SSF and HUM) that students need to achieve in order to take advantage of the opportunity to do a year abroad or a year in industry as part of their programme of study. The spreadsheet reveals some very interesting differences in the regulations (thresholds) which are in place in different Faculties and in different schools within Faculties. There are complex reasons for these differences. Julia Jones and myself have met with colleagues from SSF and HUM recently to explore some of the factors which have influenced practice in the past. A further meeting will take place soon with key colleagues in SCI. In the interim I thought LTC members would welcome an opportunity to discuss the variations in practice, the implications these might have in terms of parity of treatment for students, and in terms

of meeting the wider objectives of the University – especially the aim in the Corporate Plan to provide more opportunities for students at UEA to experience study abroad and to ‘internationalise’ the curriculum. In his presentation at the UEA Learning & Teaching Day on 15 May the Director of Internationalisation emphasised the importance of maximising the opportunities for students to experience a period of study abroad.

Are progression rules of the kind that currently exist likely to enable us to facilitate these opportunities? What are the risks associated with keeping them? What are the risks associated with reducing them or introducing a standardised set of thresholds across the institution? I don’t think LTC members have been provided with this information in the recent past and the ADTP would welcome views and observations on whether the differences are justifiable, sustainable or in keeping with the objectives of the Corporate Plan.

Julia Jones and the ADTP have had several meetings with colleagues from HUM, SCI and SSF in relation to progression rules. Additional meetings will take place shortly. It is hoped that some consensus can be achieved around simplification and standardisation of progression rules where this is appropriate, in keeping with programme objectives, and in keeping with the Corporate Plan.

7) Action Plan stemming from the Student Experience Survey

For the first time, in 2011/12 the University instigated a Student Experience Survey. This is reported in detail in a separate agenda item, with a report from BIU.

The reports on the SES produced by Sree and her colleagues in BIU provide the University with a unique body of data for Year 1 and Year 2 students. It should be noted, however, that the relatively low response rate (20%) means that the results should be treated with due caution. I am sure LTC colleagues will welcome the availability of this kind of data, even if, at present, it is imperfect. The opportunity to compare the experience of 1st and 2nd years is of value, as is the opportunity to compare the SES with our NSS data for finalists.

The PVC Academic has asked that TPPG consider the detail contained in the SES surveys and produce a report based on them for LTC to consider on 27 June. As ADTP I have reviewed the reports and have tried to identify areas where feedback suggests an area of weakness for the University, or a vulnerability, that the institution needs for address. The Action Plan (**See Appendix 4**) is in its early stages of development but it is worth, I believe, sharing it with LTC at this stage. The Action Plan highlights only issues and possible action points. At this stage areas of responsibility for enacting the action points and timeframes for completion of them has not been integrated. A more detailed Action Plan will be submitted to LTC for formal approval at its meeting on 25 July.

All the SES Reports are accessible via the TPPG website. If you would like to view them and do not currently have access rights to the TPPG site, then please contact Chris Bennett in the LTS Assessments Office.

8) Code of Practice on Assessment

A Code of Practice (CoP) on Assessment is being developed, to be a central reference point for a number of University strategies and policies in this area.

The CoP on Assessment will bring together all aspects of assessment previously dispersed within various University policies, procedures and guidelines. The QAA Quality Code on Assessment of

students and accreditation of prior learning (Chapter B6) is due to go out for consultation in Spring 2013, with a view to being finalised by the end of 2013. UEA's CoP will be finalised in line with this Quality Code, to ensure that the University meets the requirements.

The CoP will include, amongst other things, information on:

- Assessment strategies,
- Grading criteria and marking,
- Moderation,
- Examinations and course tests,
- Feedback on assessment to students,
- Extenuating circumstances
- Good academic practice and the designing out of plagiarism and collusion,
- Retention of assessed work,
- Link to External Examiners' CoP
- Link to CoP covering course review, module monitoring etc.

The University Regulations on awards, examinations and assessment, and the associated disciplinary regulations around these will be referred to, but not duplicated. The CoP will set out the University's policies on each of these areas, linking to UEA regulations, procedures and guidelines as appropriate, the regulations being a link to the Calendar, and the procedures and guidelines being a link to an online resource for academics and students, working title 'Central Student Handbook'. LTS are recruiting to two posts for web administrators to work on this over the coming academic year.

Dr Adam Longcroft
Academic Director of Taught Programmes

Appendix 1

Guidelines on the amount of summative assessment for modules on all taught programmes: Assessment Tariffs

We all recognise that assessment strategies on different courses and individual modules vary between disciplines and there are often very good subject-related reasons for this variance. Different programmes have different programme outcomes and these drive the assessments within modules and across programmes. This is how it should be, and no one at UEA would either wish to see, or expect to see, a 'one size fits all' approach. However, what became clear during the review of assessment conducted several years ago, and during the preparatory work leading up to the development of the New Academic Model, is that assessment practice has become wildly inconsistent across Faculties in terms of the 'effort hours' attached to assessment, and the resulting 'workload' implications for students. In his visits to UEA Professor Grahame Gibbs (one of the world's leading authorities on HE assessment and programme design) was struck by the 'fragmented' nature of our programmes resulting from the emphasis on 'modules' at the expense of programme-level coordination. This lack of programme-level coordination is often reflected in surprising inconsistencies in assessment between modules on the same programme, as well as huge differences between subjects.

Colleagues have already begun to address the problems associated with programme-level coordination of assessment through their NAM Programme Specifications. Early indications suggest that the result will be greatly enhanced consistency in assessment practice and the resulting workloads for students, resulting in a more consistent 'student experience' between Faculties.

The University is currently developing a Code of Practice on Assessment which is both in keeping with the QAA Quality Code and informed by practice within other HEIs. An interesting difference between UEA and some other very good universities is the move in the latter towards clearer assessment guidelines which place constraints on the variation which is allowed across modules. At Newcastle University, for example, clear guidance pertaining to Assessment Tariffs has been in place since 2006. Similar tariffs are in place at Durham.

As always with developments of this kind, there is a balance to be achieved between 'empowering' academics to devise assessments which they feel are best suited to their discipline, and ensuring a consistent student experience, with the workload for students in history, say, being comparable (though different in detail) to that of students in Chemistry. If we can agree that the number of effort hours (study hours) related to assessment should be roughly comparable between disciplines (i.e. a student in philosophy shouldn't have to devote three times as many hours to assessment-related activities as one in Nursing or visa versa), then this means we might also then be able to agree on some reasonable 'limits' to the workload attached to assessment between degree subjects.

What follows is a discussion document in which some basic guidelines are sketched-out for colleagues to consider. The guidance is adapted from published guidance employed at Newcastle. As ADTP I am acutely aware that these constitute a significant break with existing practice at UEA in the sense that no such guidelines have ever existed at UEA. I hope that colleagues will welcome, however, the opportunity to explore the benefits that could stem from them.

The benefits include:

- 1) Clearer guidance for staff, and especially staff new to HE teaching, who require guidance when devising their assessment strategies.

- 2) Clearer alignment between module size and the number, length and weighting of assessments, which would result in a better 'fit' between credit and 'effort' or study hours.
- 3) More clearly expressed expectations for students, so they have a better sense of how to prioritise their time and studies between modules.
- 4) Ensuring that students are not confused by overly-fragmented assessment strategies with too many different kinds of assessment on a single module. Research indicates that students often struggle when presented with too great a variation in assessment tasks.
- 5) Clearer alignment between module size (measured in credits) and the number, length and weighting of exams. Given the move, with the NAM, to a 4 week examination period, tariffs of the kind set out below would help us to collectively 'manage-down' the number and length of exams accordingly.

Within the proposed framework, the following guidelines apply:

1. The framework is based on a typical 20 credit module, and those modules with greater, or, by concession, smaller credit value should be adjusted accordingly.
2. In general, a 20 credit module should have up to three separate assessments, often two. In deciding the number and methods of assessment for each module, consideration should be given to the feedback that students will expect on their work in order to improve their performance - and the consequential impact of this on staff workload.
3. There should be course-level assessment strategy, covering a range of different assessment methods which are appropriate to the intended learning outcomes of the programme. Where modules contribute to more than one course, consideration should be given to all the programmes' strategies to ensure students are not overloaded.
4. The length of the assessment should be proportionate to the credit value of the module.
5. Notional study hours for a 20-credit module is 200 hours (10 hours per credit).
6. Of this total, a minimum of 80 hours should be devoted to activities related to summative assessment (i.e. this figure would not including lab hours, lectures, seminars, general background reading unrelated to assessment).

Assessment Tariffs

The following is an example of what might be an appropriate amount of assessment for a 20 credit module. This may vary depending on whether the assessment is an essay-style assessment or takes some other form (e.g. a lab-based report). The tariff should be used flexibly and could be scaled down or up for lower or higher credit-weighted modules; however, a 30 credit module may not need as much as 50% more assessment than a 20 credit module and a 10 credit module may need a little more than half that of a 20 credit module.

Formal Examination

Credit value	Proportion of assessment (for module)	Upper limit
20 Credit Module	100%	3 hours
20 Credit Module	70%	2 hours
20 Credit Module	50% and under	1 hour

Assessed Coursework

Credit value	Proportion of assessment (for module)	Upper limit
20 Credit Module	100%	4,000 words or equivalent
20 Credit Module	70%	2,500 words or equivalent
20 Credit Module	50% and under	2,000 words or equivalent

NB Coursework might be made up of, for example, 2 x 2000 word essays rather than 1 x 4000.

Effort Hours

Credit value	Proportion of assessment	Proportion of effort hours
20 credit module	100%	80 hrs minimum
20 credit module	70%	60 hrs minimum
20 credit module	50% and under	40 hours minimum

Dr Adam Longcroft, Academic Director of Taught Programmes, 25 May 2012

Appendix 2

Learning and Teaching Day: A Brief Summary of Feedback

2. How did you rate the day in terms of Usefulness? Create Chart Download			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		29.3%	17
Good		53.4%	31
Fair		15.5%	9
Poor		1.7%	1
		answered question	58
		skipped question	1

3. How did you rate the Theme of the day - Engaging and Assessing Students in a Diverse Higher Education Environment? Create Chart Download			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		40.4%	23
Good		49.1%	28
Fair		10.5%	6
Poor		0.0%	0
		answered question	57
		skipped question	2

4. How did you rate the general structure of the day? Create Chart Download			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		29.8%	17
Good		50.9%	29
Fair		17.5%	10
Poor		1.8%	1
		answered question	57
		skipped question	2

5. How many sessions did you attend in total excluding the keynote presentations and the plenary? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

		Response Percent	Response Count
One		13.5%	7
Two		30.8%	16
Three		55.8%	29
		answered question	52
		skipped question	7

6. On a scale of 1 - 4, where 1 is poor and 4 is excellent, please rate each session that you attended by ticking the relevant box: [Download](#)

Content	1	2	3	4	Response Count
Engaging students through inclusive attitudes and approaches to English	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	44.4% (4)	55.6% (5)	9
Using Videos and Podcasts in Blackboard	30.8% (4)	30.8% (4)	38.5% (5)	0.0% (0)	13
Putting the "I" in Experience: experiential learning pedagogy	0.0% (0)	18.2% (2)	36.4% (4)	45.5% (5)	11
Student attendance and engagement in a School with a diverse student body	27.3% (3)	27.3% (3)	36.4% (4)	9.1% (1)	11
Using Clickers to engage students in lectures and assess their understanding	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	18.2% (2)	72.7% (8)	11
Pilot study for the use of screencasting and mindmaps in undergraduate laboratory preparation	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (2)	75.0% (6)	8
Handouts or no handouts, that is the question	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	41.7% (5)	50.0% (6)	12
In Vitro - using film to explore ethical questions in science	0.0% (0)	25.0% (2)	25.0% (2)	50.0% (4)	8
Greening tomorrow's leaders: Designing sustainability teaching in all disciplines at UEA	0.0% (0)	66.7% (4)	33.3% (2)	0.0% (0)	6
The flipping lecture	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	42.9% (6)	57.1% (8)	14
Exploring IELTS: implications for academic study on UEA Masters Courses	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	50.0% (3)	6

Peer-assisted Learning: A new way of engaging and supporting a diverse range of learning needs.	0.0% (0)	6.7% (1)	46.7% (7)	46.7% (7)	15
Opportunity to participate/interact					
	1	2	3	4	Response Count
Engaging students through inclusive attitudes and approaches to English	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	22.2% (2)	77.8% (7)	9
Using Videos and Podcasts in Blackboard	46.2% (6)	23.1% (3)	15.4% (2)	15.4% (2)	13
Putting the "I" in Experience: experiential learning pedagogy	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	90.9% (10)	11
Student attendance and engagement in a School with a diverse student body	18.2% (2)	36.4% (4)	45.5% (5)	0.0% (0)	11
Using Clickers to engage students in lectures and assess their understanding	0.0% (0)	18.2% (2)	27.3% (3)	54.5% (6)	11
Pilot study for the use of screencasting and mindmaps in undergraduate laboratory preparation	12.5% (1)	37.5% (3)	25.0% (2)	25.0% (2)	8
Handouts or no handouts, that is the question	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)	33.3% (4)	50.0% (6)	12
In Vitro - using film to explore ethical questions in science	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	42.9% (3)	28.6% (2)	7
Greening tomorrow's leaders: Designing sustainability teaching in all disciplines at UEA	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	66.7% (4)	6
The flipping lecture	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (14)	14
Exploring IELTS: implications for academic study on UEA Masters Courses	0.0% (0)	50.0% (3)	33.3% (2)	16.7% (1)	6

Peer-assisted Learning: A new way of engaging and supporting a diverse range of learning needs.	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	46.7% (7)	26.7% (4)	15
Usefulness to own role					
	1	2	3	4	Response Count
Engaging students through inclusive attitudes and approaches to English	0.0% (0)	11.1% (1)	22.2% (2)	66.7% (6)	9
Using Videos and Podcasts in Blackboard	23.1% (3)	30.8% (4)	15.4% (2)	30.8% (4)	13
Putting the "I" in Experience: experiential learning pedagogy	0.0% (0)	20.0% (2)	20.0% (2)	60.0% (6)	10
Student attendance and engagement in a School with a diverse student body	18.2% (2)	27.3% (3)	45.5% (5)	9.1% (1)	11
Using Clickers to engage students in lectures and assess their understanding	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	45.5% (5)	54.5% (6)	11
Pilot study for the use of screencasting and mindmaps in undergraduate laboratory preparation	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	25.0% (2)	62.5% (5)	8
Handouts or no handouts, that is the question	0.0% (0)	25.0% (3)	33.3% (4)	41.7% (5)	12
In Vitro - using film to explore ethical questions in science	12.5% (1)	25.0% (2)	25.0% (2)	37.5% (3)	8
Greening tomorrow's leaders: Designing sustainability teaching in all disciplines at UEA	33.3% (2)	16.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	16.7% (1)	6
The flipping lecture	0.0% (0)	28.6% (4)	35.7% (5)	35.7% (5)	14
Exploring IELTS: implications for academic study on UEA Masters Courses	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	50.0% (3)	6
Peer-assisted Learning: A new way of engaging and supporting a diverse range of learning needs.	0.0% (0)	20.0% (3)	33.3% (5)	46.7% (7)	15
Comments (optional) Show Responses					22
answered question					52
skipped question					7

9. Do you have any suggestions for a Theme for Learning and Teaching Day 2013?		Download
	Response	
	Count	
	Show Responses	22
	answered question	22
	skipped question	37

Suggestions for 'themes' in 2013:

- Research, Scholarship and Teaching * Academic Literacy * Curriculum Design in the 21st Century
- How good administration to support courses creates the spaces for good teaching and targeted learning.
- Not specifically, but a focus on pedagogical challenges in a 'performativity culture' might be a start. I think the experiences of lecturers/students needs to be linked more coherently to the type of practices within UEA. At times, it felt that practice was something that we do not necessarily who we are.
- The postgraduate experience
- I would like a session on the use of blogs through Blackboard.
- Peer teaching seems like a good idea - please can students be involved?
- I don't know about a theme, but I would like to know more about engaging and assessing students in large-class situations. I am involved in teaching classes of 80-200 and many of the ideas about engagement are more relevant to seminar groups and small classes where you can more easily build a relationship with students.
- I would like to see some participation from students in how they find a teaching UEA and how we could improve on it
- Employability issues
- Peer Learning & Developing opportunities for students to be 'agents of change'.
Internationalising the curriculum Embedding enterprise and entrepreneurship into the curriculum
- "What is feedback? Feedback to students and feedback from students: satisfied learners or satisfied consumers?"
- Peer Learning was suggested on the day. I'm not as interested in this topic as I would be in, say, thinking more broadly about new forms of teaching and learning, but it would be ok.
- Suggestion 1: Placement learning (from year in industry, to project placements, projects involving data acquisition, field sites with industry/gov/charities etc., to just day visits to employers run within modules i.e. all levels represented. Suggestion 2: enrichment modules
Suggestion 3: Internationalization
- PAL, peer marking and group work (all inter-related and linked)
- Linking science and art
- Multi media in the classroom.
- Will reflect on this!
- Research projects; creative pedagogical approaches
- Issues around Employability.
- A theme related to employability / embedding transferable skills into the curriculum

Appendix 3

Integrated Masters and 'Year Out' progression rules - rationale

There are a large number of 'Year Out' programmes (Year Abroad and Year in Industry) across the University, as well as Integrated Masters programmes in the Faculty of Science. These programmes have a wide variety of progression thresholds. There is variation between Schools, and sometimes also within Schools. In the majority of cases the thresholds require performance beyond and above the requirements of the Common Course Structure regulations.

Integrated Masters programmes

- Usually have additional progression requirements at Stage 1, 2 and 3
- Usually but not always require students to pass all modules
- Weighted average requirement varies from 40% to 60%, but is most commonly set at 60% or 55%

IM programmes are academically demanding with high entry requirements, and tend to attract the more able students, many of whom who are likely to go to PhD study. Therefore Schools feel it appropriate to set high standards. IM programmes include a Masters level year (year 4). The usual requirement for acceptance on a standalone Masters course is a 2:1 at undergraduate level, hence the requirement for a higher standard of performance within IM courses is deemed appropriate.

A number of IM programmes include a Year Abroad or a Year in Industry, where the comments below re 'Year Out' schemes also apply. Furthermore, in the case of IM programmes, the Year Abroad marks are converted and count towards final classification. As the students concerned will be studying abroad under a completely different system without their usual UEA support, they need to be strong academically to benefit fully.

Year Out programmes

- Usually have additional progression requirements at Stage 1, 2 and 3
- Usually but not always require students to pass all modules
- Weighted average requirement varies from 40% to 60%, but is most commonly set at 60% or 55%

To some extent the requirements that Schools set correlate to the entry tariffs of their students in general and their 'Year Out' students in particular. For example, if a student is recruited with A*AA he or she would be expected to be able to achieve 60% or more without difficulty. Schools also set a threshold for students wishing to transfer from a standard 3-year course to the 'Year Out' variant after Year 1. This is usually the same threshold as that set for students already on the course, and is deemed an appropriate hurdle for any students who didn't meet the original A-level requirements.

Schools generally report that they wish only to send their most academically able students abroad, in order to enhance the reputation of UEA in general and the School in particular. They don't want to risk sending an unengaged student - someone who won't work hard and give a good impression, and they feel that academic excellence is the most reliable method of quality control. As one 'Year Out' director puts it, 'Marks reflect more than memory'. Schools view their 'Year Out' students as ambassadors for the School and for the University, and only want those they regard as their best students to represent them. The 'Year Out' is also viewed as a reward for these hard-working and committed students.

Some Schools have a different attitude; for example, one School is unusual in that Stage 1 'Year Out' students are only required to fulfil CCS progression regulations, although they are required to

achieve 55% in Stage 2. The School in question reports that their 'Year Out' students tend to improve academically and to blossom as the course continues, and that the 'Year Out' is often the making of them. A requirement beyond CCS regulations in Stage 1 would deprive a number of students in the School of this opportunity. Some Schools would consider using alternative or additional indicators to decide whether a student would benefit from and succeed on a 'Year Out', e.g, attendance and engagement records.

Note -The International Office is doubtful whether our exchange partner Universities would be willing to accept students with a weighted average as low as 50%. IO staff reported that a grade stipulation may be incorporated within some of the agreements set up with exchange partners, but they would need to check

The Year in Industry is viewed slightly differently to the Year Abroad in some Schools, with the academic requirements being set slightly lower. Although Schools only want to send engaged and hard working students on placements, and again view them as ambassadors, they are more ready to take into account factors additional to academic performance.

Progression rules for Integrated Masters courses and courses with a Year Out

Course Title	Route Code	Course length/structure	IM or YO	Further details	School	Faculty	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage Y (if applicable)	Stage 3 (if applicable)	Stage 4 (if applicable)
MICROBIOLOGY (MSCi)	U1C501401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	BIO	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
PLANT SCIENCES (MSCi)	U1C201401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	BIO	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
BIOLOGICAL AND MEDICINAL CHEMISTRY (MCHEM)	U1F152401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	CHE	SCI	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
CHEMISTRY (MCHEM)	U1F101401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	CHE	SCI	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
FORENSIC AND INVESTIGATIVE CHEMISTRY (MCHEM)	U1FF41401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	CHE	SCI	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
BIOLOGICAL AND MEDICINAL CHEMISTRY WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA	U1F153401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM YA North America	CHE	SCI	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
BIOLOGICAL AND MEDICINAL CHEMISTRY WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1F154401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM Industry	CHE	SCI	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
CHEMICAL PHYSICS WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY (MCHEM)	U1F191401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM Industry	CHE	SCI	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
CHEMISTRY WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY (MCHEM)	U1F104401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM Industry	CHE	SCI	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
BIOLOGICAL AND MEDICINAL CHEMISTRY WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA	U1F153401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM YA North America	CHE	SCI	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
CHEMICAL PHYSICS WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA (MCHEM)	U1F190401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM YA North America	CHE	SCI	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
CHEMISTRY WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA (MCHEM)	U1F103401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM YA North America	CHE	SCI	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	55% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	50% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
MASTER OF COMPUTING IN COMPUTER GRAPHICS	U1G413402	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	CMP	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	40% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	40% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
MASTER OF COMPUTING IN COMPUTING SCIENCE	U1G407401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	CMP	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	40% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	40% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
MASTER OF COMPUTING IN COMPUTING SCIENCE WITH A YEAR OUT	U1G408401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM YA	CMP	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	40% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	40% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
CLIMATE SCIENCE (MSCi)	U1F760401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	ENV	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
ENVIRONMENTAL EARTH SCIENCE (MSCi)	U1F647401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	ENV	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
ENVIRONMENTAL GEOPHYSICS (MSCi)	U1F661401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	ENV	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES (MSCi)	U1F750401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	ENV	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY (MSCi)	U1F790401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	ENV	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
ENVIRONMENTAL GEOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE CHANGE (MSCi) (check)	U1F812401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	ENV	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
MASTER OF MATHEMATICS	U1G103401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	MTH	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
MATHEMATICS WITH A YEAR IN AUSTRALIA (MMTH)	U1G106401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM YA Australia	MTH	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
MATHEMATICS WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA (MMTH)	U1G102401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM YA North America	MTH	SCI	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs

Progression rules for Integrated Masters courses and courses with a Year Out

Course Title	Route Code	Course length/structure	IM or YO	Further details	School	Faculty	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage Y (if applicable)	Stage 3 (if applicable)	Stage 4 (if applicable)
NATURAL SCIENCES (MNATSCI)	U1CGF0401	1, 2, 3, 4	IM	IM	SCI	SCI	40% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	N/A	60% aggregate + pass 80 credits + pass all core	IM regs
AMERICAN AND ENGLISH LITERATURE	U1TQ73401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America / S1 NA S2 Aus	AMS	HUM	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
AMERICAN HISTORY WITH MODERN HISTORY	U1V238401B	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America / S1 NA S2 Aus	AMS	HUM	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
AMERICAN HISTORY WITH POLITICS	U1V2L2401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America / S1 NA S2 Aus	AMS	HUM	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
AMERICAN LITERATURE WITH CREATIVE WRITING	U1T7W8401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America / S1 NA S2 Aus	AMS	HUM	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
AMERICAN STUDIES	U1T700401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America / S1 NA S2 Aus	AMS	HUM	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ARCHAEOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY AND ART HISTORY (YR IN	U1V0LX401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia/NA	ART	HUM	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
HISTORY OF ART (WITH A YEAR IN AUSTRALASIA OR NORTH AMERICA)	U1V354401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia/NA	ART	HUM	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
HISTORY OF ART (ERASMUS YEAR ABROAD)	U1V350301EY	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Erasmus year	ART	HUM				CCS regs	N/A
FILM AND AMERICAN STUDIES	U1TW76401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America / S1 NA S2 Aus	FTV	HUM	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
BIOCHEMISTRY WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1C720401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	BIO	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1C104401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	BIO	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR ABROAD	U1C10C401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA All	BIO	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ECOLOGY WITH A YEAR ABROAD	U1C?01	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia	BIO	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ACTUARIAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1N323402	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	CMP	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%			N/A
COMPUTER SYSTEMS ENGINEERING YEAR IN INDUSTRY (BENG)	U1HG6M401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	CMP	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%			N/A
COMPUTING FOR BUSINESS WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1G511401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	CMP	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%			N/A
COMPUTING SCIENCE WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1G401401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	CMP	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%		CCS regs	N/A
COMPUTING SCIENCE WITH A YEAR ABROAD	U1G404301	1,2,3	YO	YA All (out in Yr 2)	CMP	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	CCS regs	CCS regs	CCS regs	N/A
CLIMATE SCIENCE WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1F764401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%		CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL EARTH SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1F645401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%		CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL GEOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE CHANGE WITH A YEAR IN	U1F814401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%		CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL GEOPHYSICS WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1F660402	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%		CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1F850401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%		CCS regs	N/A

Progression rules for Integrated Masters courses and courses with a Year Out

Course Title	Route Code	Course length/structure	IM or YO	Further details	School	Faculty	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage Y (if applicable)	Stage 3 (if applicable)	Stage 4 (if applicable)
GEOPHYSICAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1F660401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%		CCS regs	N/A
METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY WITH A YEAR IN CLIMATE SCIENCE WITH A YEAR IN AUSTRALASIA	U1FF87401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%		CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL EARTH SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN AUSTRALASIA	U1F763401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL GEOPHYSICS WITH A YEAR IN AUSTRALASIA	U1F646401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN AUSTRALASIA	U1F662402	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
GEOPHYSICAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN AUSTRALASIA	U1F854401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY WITH A YEAR IN EUROPE	U1F662401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL EARTH SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN EUROPE	U1FF8R401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL GEOPHYSICS WITH A YEAR IN EUROPE	U1F643401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Erasmus year	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN EUROPE	U1F664401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Erasmus year	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
GEOPHYSICAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN EUROPE	U1F902401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Erasmus year	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA	U1F642401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Erasmus year	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL EARTH SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA	U1FFX7401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Erasmus year	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL GEOPHYSICS WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA	U1F765401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA	U1F644401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
GEOPHYSICAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA	U1F665401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY WITH A YEAR IN INDUSTRY	U1F901401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
NATURAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN AUSTRALASIA	U1F641401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
NATURAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN EUROPE	U1FFY7401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America	ENV	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 60%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
NATURAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA	U1GCF0401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	Industry	SCI	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
NATURAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN EUROPE	U1FCG0401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Australasia	SCI	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
NATURAL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR IN NORTH AMERICA	U1FGC0401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Erasmus year	SCI	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
LAW WITH AMERICAN LAW	U1GFC0401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America	SCI	SCI	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
	U1M123402	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA N America	LAW	SSF	CCS regs	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A

Progression rules for Integrated Masters courses and courses with a Year Out

Course Title	Route Code	Course length/ structure	IM or YO	Further details	School	Faculty	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage Y (if applicable)	Stage 3 (if applicable)	Stage 4 (if applicable)
LAW WITH EUROPEAN LEGAL SYSTEMS	U1M120401	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Erasmus year	LAW	SSF	CCS regs	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
LAW WITH FRENCH LAW AND LANGUAGE	U1M121402	1, 2, Y, 3	YO	YA Erasmus year	LAW	SSF	CCS regs	Pass all modules + weighted average of 55%	Aggregate mark of 40% or equivalent, or a pass	CCS regs	N/A
TO BE CHECKED											
NOTE - STUDENTS ON A SEMESTER (AS OPPOSED TO A YEAR) ABROAD SOMETIMES HAVE TO FULFIL CRITERIA BEYOND CCS REGS - THESE CRITERIA ARE SET BY THE SCHOOLS											

Appendix 4

SES Survey of Year 1 & Year 2 Students: Report and Action Plan from the Academic Director of Taught Programmes

The reports on the SES produced by Sree and her colleagues in BIU provide the University with a unique body of data for Year 1 and Year 2 students. **It should be noted, however, that the relatively low response rate (20%) means that the results should be treated with due caution.** I am sure TPPG colleagues will welcome the availability of this kind of data, even if, at present, it is imperfect. The opportunity to compare the experience of 1st and 2nd years is of value, as is the opportunity to compare the SES with our NSS data for finalists.

The PVC Academic has asked that TPPG consider the detail contained in the SES surveys and produce a report based on them for LTC to consider on 27 June. As ADTP I have reviewed the reports and have tried to identify areas where feedback suggests an area of weakness for the University, or a vulnerability, that the institution needs for address. I welcome the opportunity to share the survey reports and this action plan with TPPG colleagues and invite colleagues to consider:

- a) Whether the proposed action points needs to be refined
- b) Whether additional action points are needed to address the issues concerned.

The feedback from TPPG will inform a revised copy of the Action Plan for LTC.

Dr Adam Longcroft

Academic Director for Taught Programmes, 18 June 2012

Issue	Concerns	Actions for 2012/13
RESPONSE RATES		
Overall response rate of 20%. (Year 1: 22%, Year 2: 18%)	The response rate was relatively low. This undermines the reliability of the results. Important to increase participation in future years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulate info re the SES earlier, repeatedly, in different venues, formats.
Variation in response rates between schools. NBS Year 1: 13%; CHE Year 2: 8%	Some schools have high participation, others have very low participation. Important to understand factors underlying this variance. Response rates across Years 1 & 2 of 20% (the average) or less a particular concern: e.g. EDU, CMP, ECO, NBS, CHE, LAW, MTH, NSC, PHI, PSI. Explore how lessons from these schools might nurture a higher response rate in other schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine why some schools achieved a high response rate across Years 1 & 2. (AHP: 32%, SCI: 51%, ENV: 29%, DEV: 28%). • Share factors/strategies between schools.

TEACHING		
Feedback on quality of teaching is generally very positive across the University, though ratings are lower for SES than for NSS.	This should be celebrated since it has a huge impact on the student experience. There is a sound bedrock for the University to build on here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of teaching highly praised. LTC should acknowledge the positive feedback on the work of academic colleagues in their teaching and explore ways of maintaining and building-on this success.
Over-use of PowerPoint	PPT is a hugely valuable tool, but its use needs to be aligned carefully with learner needs and objectives of taught sessions. If PPT slides can be used more as 'back-up' in terms of content delivery (e.g. via Blackboard) more time could be devoted to active learning, groupwork, discussion and dialogue in class/seminars.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course/Module teams to consider whether the standard 'lecture' using PPT slides is the most effective method of supporting student learning. • Course/Module teams to consider creative uses of 'contact time' within the constraints of room availability/timetabling. • ADTP and CSED to develop/deliver workshops focusing on active learning, groupwork and creative uses of 'lecture' time and 'lecture' spaces.
Variable standard of teaching by PGR/PHD students	Use of PGR students in Schools needs to be accompanied by a more robust system of 'mentoring' so as to enhance experience of UG students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTC to consider development of a more robust mentoring system for PGRs in schools. • Review CSED-run PGR training programme with a view to drawing-on best practice in sector and practical seminar preparation and management skills.
Enhance use of Blackboard to support student learning	The use of Blackboard is extremely variable within the University. In some modules its use is dynamic, but in some it is not used at all or at a very basic level. Differences in student experience emerge and some are disadvantaged by not having materials available to them online.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course/module teams need to examine how use of Blackboard can be enhanced and made more consistent. • ISD to work with Schools to identify Blackboard 'cold spots' in Schools and focus staff development workshops on key staff groups. • ISD Education Board is investigating how use of /content on Blackboard can be maximised – the impact of these developments need to be welcomed and supported (and monitored) by LTC.

ASSESSMENT

<p>Fairness of assessment. 7.5% of Year 1 and 10.8% of Year 2 students felt that assessment was not fair</p>	<p>That more than 1 in 10 Yr 2s do not think assessment is 'fair' is a source of considerable concern. Why do students feel this way? What might change their perceptions of fairness?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where might causes for concern about 'fairness' be located within the process? Discuss in Schools with student reps and SSLCs. • Course teams to reflect on how they can make the marking process more transparent. • Schools/Faculties to place more emphasis on marking/feedback workshops focused on sharing best practice and achieving consistency across subjects/disciplines. • Involve students in reviewing/unpacking the criteria used to assess them – e.g. Senate Scale, assessment criteria for individual assignments etc. • Involve students in 'mock' marking exercises so they develop a better understanding of marking process.
<p>Procedure for submission of coursework is clear. Disagree: 9.3% of Year 1s and 17.2% of Year 2s</p>	<p>Feedback from Year 2 students re the HUBs differs from Year 1s. How can their experience of the submission process be enhanced next year?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance quality of written guidance and verbal guidance provided in Handbooks/Class. • Clearer guidance on LTS website about submission process. • Ensure clear guidance for online submission.
<p>I understand how and when to expect marks. Disagree: 24.4% of Year 1s and 28.6% of Year 2s</p>	<p>Feedback from Year 2 students re the HUBs differs from Year 1s. Return processes problematic. How can their experience be enhanced next year?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance quality of written guidance and verbal guidance provided in Handbooks/in Class. • Clearer guidance on LTS website about release of marks and return process for coursework.
<p>Satisfaction with assessment in general. Year 1s experience more positive than Year 2s.</p>	<p>Why do Year 2s feel less satisfied with assessment? Is it just the HUBs or are they affected by increasing difficulty/challenge and a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools/Faculties to place more emphasis on marking/feedback workshops focused on sharing best practice.

	<p>subsequent drop in marks? How can their level of satisfaction be enhanced next year?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure clear guidance for online marking and feedback is available to students.
<p>FEEDBACK</p>		
<p>Feedback was prompt. Disagree: Year 1s 30%, Year 2s 40%.</p> <p>In relation to HUBs, student's views on prompt return of coursework are again a concern. 35.4% of Year 1s disagree 44.7% of Year 2s disagree</p>	<p>30-40% of students feel feedback was not provided promptly. Huge 20% negative difference between SES(45%) and NSS (65%). Similar big difference (11%) between ratings for assessment overall (58% vs 69%).</p> <p>Research indicates that the value of feedback is inversely proportional to the time taken to receive it. Therefore prompt return of feedback is key to effective learning and a positive student experience. UEA (like other HEIs) knows that prompt turnaround is critical – we need to explore all possible means of addressing this issue at institutional level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate academic resource needs to be applied to marking and internal moderation process - and achieving 20 day return period. • Re-emphasise importance of meeting 20 day return period. • Close monitoring of return dates and receipt of scripts in HUBs by HUB managers, TDs and Faculty ADs. • Improve liaison between markers, moderators and HUBs.
<p>Satisfied with <u>quantity</u> of written feedback. Disagree: Year 1s 25.0%; Year 2s 31.1%</p>	<p>Between a quarter and a third of students want <i>more</i> written feedback. Students will probably always want more feedback regardless of how much is provided. However, first we need to be clear when we will be giving feedback (the cycle of feedback needs to be explicitly articulated) and we need to remind students when we do give it to them. The latter is crucial in terms of influencing students' perceptions of the quantity of feedback received.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll-out online marking and new ITC-led methods of providing written feedback on scripts. This will also address the 'illegible handwriting' issue. • Schools/Faculties to place more emphasis on marking/feedback workshops focused on sharing best practice. • Develop/articulate clear 'cycle of feedback' at course and module level. • Remind students when they are receiving feedback.

<p>Satisfied with <u>quality</u> of written feedback. Disagree: Year 1s 21.4%, Year 2s 24.7%. Feedback often difficult to read.</p>	<p>Between a fifth and a quarter of students want better <i>quality</i> feedback. Hand-written feedback often difficult to read.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll-out online marking and new ITC-led methods of providing more helpful computer-generated (legible) feedback on scripts. • Schools/Faculties to place more emphasis on marking/feedback workshops focused on sharing best practice. • CSED to run workshops on role of written feedback as an aid to learning.
<p>Satisfied with <u>quantity</u> of oral feedback. Disagree: Year 1s 33.5%; Year 2s 43.2%</p>	<p>Between one third and 43% of students want <i>more</i> oral feedback.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools to build-in more opportunities for oral feedback in modules/courses, e.g. by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ using more formative assessment where feedback is oral; ○ building-in more tutorial time; ○ building-in more opportunities for generic 'group' oral feedback. ○ Reminding students when they <u>will</u> receive and <u>do</u> receive oral feedback. • Separate return process for coursework, and provision of feedback on coursework.
<p>Satisfied with <u>quality</u> of oral feedback. Disagree: Year 1s 28.8%, Year 2s 35.1%</p>	<p>Roughly 29-35% of students want <i>better</i> oral feedback.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools to run collaborative workshops on providing oral feedback. Share practice. Involve students? • CSED to run workshops on role of oral feedback as an aid to learning. • Separate return process for coursework, and provision of feedback on coursework.
<p>EMPLOYABILITY</p>		
<p>The course is preparing me for employment. Disagree: Year 1s 7.4%, Year 2s 11.1%</p>	<p>More than 10% of 2nd years feel their course is not equipping them for employment. This is despite more Year 2s being involved in internships/placements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools to articulate for students how transferable/translatable skills are being developed via assessment in each module/across courses.

ACADEMIC SUPPORT		
Role of DOS	The feedback on services and support provided by DOS should be celebrated. The rating and qualitative feedback is remarkably positive – it has a huge impact on the student experience and on the progression/performance of individual students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SES survey illustrates DOS's huge contribution to ensuring a positive student experience at UEA – LTC and the wider University community need to find ways of maximising this as a 'USP' of the University.
I have adequate opportunities for discussions with staff. Disagree: Year 1s 6.9%, Year 2s 9.0%	Nearly 1 in 10 2 nd years feel they do not have sufficient opportunity to speak to staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module convenors, seminar leaders and advisers to use clear 'office hours' when they are available to talk to students. • Develop school culture with greater emphasis on oral, 'individualised' contact with students – more human, face-to-face interaction and less online (i.e. by e mail, or Blackboard). • Re-emphasise importance of the role of the adviser and use of adviser as a 'sounding board', source of guidance etc.
ORGANISATION & MANAGEMENT		
Changes are communicated effectively. Disagree: Year 1s 13.0%, Year 2s 12.2%	More than 1 in 10 students feel that changes to courses were not communicated effectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HUBs and Module Convenors to identify most effective and speedy means of conveying info re changes. Inform students repeatedly how this info will be conveyed – e.g. emails, e-vision, texts etc. • Share anonymised examples in Schools of how poor communication disadvantages students and sometimes results in concession requests (e.g. DFS)
Changes to rooms/timetables are communicated effectively. Disagree: Year 1s 15.5%, Year 2s 16.3%	Around 15% of students feel that changes to timetable/rooms etc were not communicated effectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HUBs and Module Convenors to identify most effective and speedy means of conveying info re changes. Inform students repeatedly how this info will be

		<p>conveyed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share anonymised examples in Schools of how poor communication disadvantages students and sometimes results in concession requests (e.g. DFS)
EXPERIENCE OF THE HUBS		
<p>Negative comments on HUBs.</p>	<p>There were three times as many negative comments as there were positive ones. However, negative comment largely relate to delays in release of marks and return of coursework. HUBs cannot do either until <u>all scripts</u> are marked and moderated internally. It would be unwise, therefore, to interpret negative comments on HUBs solely as an LTS problem since the marking process is in the hands of academics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training to be prioritised for frontline HUB staff re customer service. • Training for HUB staff on dealing with extension requests. • Enhance 'link-up' between HUB staff and school-based academics re approval of extensions. • Investigate introduction of a system of receipts for submitted coursework. • Roll-out online submission more widely and online marking/feedback to improve quality/quantity of feedback. • Modules where coursework is returned well after the 20-day return period need to be clearly identified. Module Convenors need to consider whether they need to redesign assessments in such a way that they are not 'setting themselves up to fail' in terms of meeting the 20-day rubric.
<p>Staff were knowledgeable and helpful. Disagree: Year 1s 8.8% Disagree: Year 2s 17.3%</p>	<p>Experiences of 2nd years much less positive than that of 1st years. 2nd years have obviously been most affected by the new HUBs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise staff training of frontline HUB staff.
<p>My problems were dealt with in a timely manner. Disagree: Year 1s 10.2% Disagree: Year 2s 16.4%</p>	<p>Experiences of 2nd years much less positive than that of 1st years. 2nd years have obviously been most affected by the new HUBs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise staff training of frontline HUB staff. • Improve communication between HUBs and academics

	1 st years seem very happy with the HUBs.	
LEARNING RESOURCES		
There are adequate group study spaces. Disagree: Year 2s 18.3%	Nearly 1 in 5 students feels there are inadequate small group spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify new spaces for group learning in Schools, in other study areas, and in Library. • Explore how provision of University iPads or similar tablets might free-up space currently dedicated to desk-top IT facilities. The latter could be dedicated to group learning space instead.
I have been able to access IT resources when I need them. Disagree: Year 2s 17.2%%	Nearly 1 in 5 students feels there are inadequate desk-top IT resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore how provision of University iPads or similar tablets might free-up space currently dedicated to desk-top IT facilities. Provision of tablets would ensure 24-7 access to online resources and key (e.g. MS Office) packages.
There are adequate quiet study spaces. Disagree: Year 2s 16.5%	Many students feels there are inadequate quiet spaces for study.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore how provision of University iPads or similar tablets might free-up space currently dedicated to desk-top IT facilities. The latter could be dedicated to quiet learning space instead.
SKILLS DEVELOPMENT		
The lowest scores are for oral skills and team-working skills.	<p>Scores for analytical and problem-solving and research skills are very good indeed.</p> <p>Lower scores for Oral communication skills and team-working skills are a cause for concern - they are key to employability (e.g. interviews and job selection processes) and to wider professional development/competencies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll-out PAL across UEA over a three year period – mentors will develop both oral and team-working skills to a high level. • Build into modules more opportunities for individual and group oral presentations. • Build into modules more opportunities for collaborative learning and team-working.