

**LTC11D110**

**Title:** Reviews of New Academic Model Undergraduate course proposals  
**Author:** Julia Jones  
**Date:** 12 July 2012  
**Circulation:** Learning and Teaching Committee- 25 July 2012  
**Agenda:** LTC11A007  
**Version:** Final  
**Status:** Open

---

**Issue**

To receive reviews of New Academic Model Undergraduate course proposals (*NB: 3 of the attached reviews, ie AMS, HIS and MED, were submitted to the LTC meeting of 27 June, but have been included again for completeness and ease of reference*)

**Recommendation**

None

**Resource Implications**

Not applicable

**Risk Implications**

Not applicable

**Equality and Diversity**

Not applicable

**Timing of decisions**

Not applicable

**Further Information**

Contact details: Julia Jones, Learning and Teaching Coordinator, telephone 01603 593528, email: [julia.jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:julia.jones@uea.ac.uk) for enquiries about the content of the paper

**Background**

Not applicable

**Discussion**

Not applicable

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	AMS		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All (but note that U1T701301 on the Portal is a duplicate of U1T700301)		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All		
<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.		
Clear mapping of well described learning outcomes.			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
Standard module sizes across the Faculty, with clear progression between 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> stage modules including examples of year -long 60 credit modules in stage 3. A number of examples of using the Portal to provide regular formative feedback.			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
Thoughtful approach to the ‘first year experience’ with a year-long induction through a series of study skills workshops.			
d	Any further comments		
The programmes provide opportunities for students to elect modules of up to 40 credits which focus on employability/work placements as well as employability being embedded in some other modules.			
<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	Erica Towner	Date	14 June 2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>	
School of Study	ART
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All
<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	<p>Clever use of the NAM Programme Proposal template, with particularly clear, accessible ways of explaining, showing, describing, illustrating etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear mapping of modules to learning outcomes</li> </ul>
b	<p>Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment strategies include a varied and appropriate range of assessment methods.</li> <li>• Summative feedback opportunities outnumber formative opportunities at Stage 1 in some programmes, but this balance is redressed at Stage 2 and 3 in most cases.</li> <li>• There appears to be a lower ratio of exams to other assessment methods generally, although some proposals do not specify the number of examined hours. It is likely that this represents an overall reduction in examined assessment consistent with the requirements of the NAM.</li> <li>• All formative assessment will be mandatory and the final assessment is to be invalid if formative has not been submitted – commendable but how will this work if student does not submit formative assessment?</li> <li>• Formative assessment feedback will focus almost exclusively on essay preparation</li> <li>• Introduction of individual exams feedback delivered by Personal Tutors early in Years 2 and 3</li> </ul>
c	<p>Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 joint programmes</li> <li>• Good formative feedback on joint programmes, particularly LDC modules</li> <li>• Significant proportion of modules compulsory at Stage 1 on most programmes (80-100 credits)</li> <li>• All Stage 1 modules compulsory on FTV/ART joint program</li> </ul>

d	Any further comments		
<p><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></p>			
Name of reviewer	Lynne Ward	Date	17 July 2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	BIO		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	C100, C104 and C10C		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	Biological Sciences deferred specialism Biological Sciences part time Biological Sciences with Year Abroad		
<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.		
As several courses have been presented in one form the course profile was a bit difficult to read.			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
There are a couple of year long modules, but I think this is current practice in BIO (i.e. not new for NAM).			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
Selection of optional and compulsory modules, but also their arrangement into option ranges assures that students can be assessed on and demonstrate all learning outcomes.			
d	Any further comments		
I like that the programme offers the option to take a language, thus preparing students for their study abroad. The introduction of a ‘skills’ module is an interesting initiative. It would be useful for other Schools and faculties to hear how BIO went about designing and delivering such a module in practice.			
There are a couple of inserted comments in the form. I assume the School has by now addressed the questions that have been posed.			
<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	S Inthorn	Date	31.05.2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	BIO		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	C180 C18? (Year Abroad)		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	Ecology part-time Ecology with a year abroad		
<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.		
I had no problems reading this form.			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
There are a couple of year long modules, but I think this is current practice (i.e. not new for NAM) in BIO.			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
Selection of optional and compulsory modules, but also their arrangement into option ranges assures that students can be assessed on and demonstrate all learning outcomes.			
d	Any further comments		
Stage 2 profile: HISHH2A51 and HISHH2A51, which are listed in the section on feedback cycles, are not included.			
I would recommend that the School considers embedding a language option into year 1 (especially for the ‘year abroad’ version of this course. It would strengthen employability, but also help students prepare for their year abroad.			
<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	S Inthorn	Date	31.05.2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	BIO		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	C201		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	Plant Science		
<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.		
I had no problems understanding the proposal.			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
There are a couple of year long modules, but I think this is already current practice in BIO.			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
Selection of optional and compulsory modules, but also their arrangement into option ranges assures that students can be assessed on and demonstrate all learning outcomes.			
d	Any further comments		
I like that the programme offers the option to take a language. However, in the stage 2 profile it says that this option is not available for ‘Sci Comm’. The form does not make it clear to which students this refers and why. Maybe it’s just a typo?			
<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	S Inthorn	Date	31.05.2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	BIO		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	C501		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	Microbiology		
<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.		
I had no problems reading this form.			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
There are a couple of year long modules. The use of year long modules I think is existing practice in BIO (i.e. not new for the NAM), but the School has introduced new modules in preparation for the NAM.			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
Selection of optional and compulsory modules, but also their arrangement into option ranges assures that students can be assessed on and demonstrate all learning outcomes.			
d	Any further comments		
I like that students have the option to take a language. It strengthens employability skills.			
20 credits for a ‘research proposal’ module (stage 4) seems rather a lot, but I am not an expert in this area of research and teaching.			
<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	S Inthorn	Date	31.05.2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study		BIO	
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)		C700 and C720	
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)		Biochemistry and Biochemistry with a year in industry	
<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.		
I had no problems reading this form, but I think most Schools chose to use the form in the way colleagues in BIO have done.			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
There are several year long modules. The use of year long modules I think is existing practice in BIO (i.e. not new for the NAM), but the School has introduced new modules in preparation for the NAM.			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
Selection of optional and compulsory modules, but also their arrangement into option ranges assures that students can be assessed on and demonstrate all learning outcomes.			
d	Any further comments		
The School could consider making additional employability enhancing modules available through defined choice (languages maybe?).			
<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	S Inthorn	Date	31.05.2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	BIO		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	C930		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	Biomedicine		
<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.		
I had no problems reading this form, but I think most Schools chose to use the form in the way colleagues in BIO have done.			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
There are several year long modules. The use of year long modules I think is existing practice in BIO (i.e. not new for the NAM), but the School has introduced new modules in preparation for the NAM.  Stage 1 and 2 consist of compulsory modules only.			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
Selection of optional and compulsory modules, but also their arrangement into option ranges assures that students can be assessed on and demonstrate all learning outcomes.			
d	Any further comments		
The School could consider making additional employability enhancing modules available through defined choice (languages maybe?).  Stage 1 still needs one additional 20 credit module.			
<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	S Inthorn	Date	31.05.2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	BIO		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	CC74		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	Molecular Biology and Genetics		
<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.		
I had no problems reading this form.			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
There are a couple of year long modules. The use of year long modules I think is existing practice in BIO (i.e. not new for the NAM), but the School has introduced new modules in preparation for the NAM.			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
Selection of optional and compulsory modules, but also their arrangement into option ranges assures that students can be assessed on and demonstrate all learning outcomes.			
d	Any further comments		
I think the School could consider offering a language option as part of defined choice. Students on other programmes in the School do have this option and language modules are a good way to strengthen student employability.			
The introduction of a ‘skills’ module is an interesting initiative. It would be useful for other Schools and faculties to hear how BIO went about designing and delivering such a module in practice.			
<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	S Inthorn	Date	31.05.2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>	
School of Study	CHE
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	ALL
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	ALL
<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	<p>Clever use of the NAM Programme Proposal template, with particularly clear, accessible ways of explaining, showing, describing, illustrating etc.</p> <p>There is very detailed information about the programmes on offer. For ease of interpretation, I would prefer to have the course structure outlined first followed by the learning outcomes mapped against assessment types and then by the feedback schedule.</p> <p>The learning outcomes appear to have been taken directly from the relevant subject benchmark statements.</p>
b	<p>Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)</p> <p>It is pleasing that CHE has reduced the number of summative assessments, although there still appears to be a particularly large volume of (formative) assessments, especially course tests. However, laboratory work is a key learning/teaching approach.</p> <p>CHE has also overhauled some of its modules, combining some to create larger modules, devising new ones and changing others into year-long mode of presentation.</p> <p>The use of problem-based learning (2F9Y), guest lectures (module 3F1Y) peer(student)-marked assignments (2C32), the use of a mock court room (3F2Y) and presentation of evidence in court (MF4Y) (with regard to forensic chemistry), workshops after release of a coursework question (3F1Y) and student-led revision seminars (MF13) stood out as formative and summative learning/teaching methods and assessment approaches.</p> <p>Over all, the amount and type of feedback opportunities appears impressive.</p>
c	<p>Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.</p>
No specific comments.	

d Any further comments

**General points for CHE to consider:**

- i) One or two specifications indicated that external examiners had been invited to comment on the revised programmes but on the whole, it was not clear how much external consultation (with external examiners and other relevant Professional, Statutory and/or Regulatory Bodies) had taken place.
- ii) The section on equality and diversity was not addressed in any detail.
- iii) If the programme specifications are to be publicly available, CHE's comments about its approach to the development of a 'community of scholars' are possibly not meant for wider publication.
- iv) The University's new Corporate Plan places great emphasis on 'employability.' CHE may benefit from further consideration of this issue. Clarification of the intended use of the RSA's new on-line modules to develop business awareness would be welcome. It was not clear whether CHE is intending to encourage its students to enrol on this external programme in addition to the UEA programme or whether CHE is using the content to guide its own approach to employability content in modules. Employability skills in the are inferred rather than explicit.
- v) The number of exam hours is useful. However, there does not appear to be consistency between cognate courses (for instance F152 and F153 where the latter has a year abroad and a lower number of exam hours. Whilst this may be a consequence of the year abroad and the nature of the assessment thereof, it does raise the issue of why different methods are employed). There also appears to be a miscalculation in F100 and in F153.
- vi) Approach to presentation of feedback instances needs to be consistent. Some modules count oral feedback whilst others take no account of it;
- vii) Careful use of language with regard to levels is strongly recommended. For example, is it appropriate to describe the aim of a level 2 or 3 module (eg CHE3F8Y) as 'to introduce..... ' Other modules use 'to introduce and develop...'

**Specific points on individual programme specifications**

- viii) **F100:** 1F1Y is in the list of defined choices, so there is a need to clarify how students not selecting this option meet the learning outcome; presentation of Stage 3 (bottom of page 8) should be checked – not legible on-screen; it would be helpful to clarify the Stage 3 Course profile which at first sight appears incompatible with NAM until it becomes clear that defined choice is a route for candidates scoring < 50% in Stage 2; CHE 1S1Y needs a reading list (unless this is a purposeful omission); it is suggested that employability skills are addressed in module 3G0Y but not every student will take this module if they do not obtain 50% or above in Stage 2 (see also general point iv) above);
- ix) **F103:** confirm that regulations permit the award of an honours degree where the final year is spent abroad; insert learning outcome which refers to honours level award (cf F101 where this criterion is explicit in Stage 3 learning outcomes);
- x) **F104:** confirm that the assessment of performance in the work placement will have

criteria set by the School, that the line manager will be fully briefed on these and clarify whether there will be any academic input into the assessment other than via the Board of Examiners;

- xi) **F125:** not sure what is meant by 'class announcements' as formative feedback?
- xii) **F152:** there appears to be no summative assessment at 'M' level. Is this appropriate? BSc learning outcomes need to be inserted (see similar comment for F103 above);
- xiii) **F154:** can the BSc honours outcomes be delivered via work placement – the performance of which is evaluated by the line manager?
- xiv) **F190:** is there an opportunity for BSc honours, as per other programmes? Number of instances of formative feedback in CHE1C24 appears to be 12, not 13 (et passim). Stage 2 appears to add up to 140 credits and thus may need additional explanation. Stage 4 has one 'defined' choice' module, so is it really a choice?
- xv) **F191:** is there an opportunity for BSc honours, as per other programmes? Is the number of feedback instances in CHE3F2Y bracketed because there is oral feedback? Consistency of convention would be helpful;
- xvi) **FF31:** the use, in Stage 3, of asterisks needs explanation especially if the specification is to be published. The number of hours of examination is higher in the BSc than in the MChem routes (see general comment v) above);
- xvii) **FF41:** should perhaps be presented as two routes to be consistent with other programmes: one including a year abroad and one UEA-based. It was only when reading the course profile that it was evident that two routes were on offer.

*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 immediately.*

Name of reviewer	Alison Rhodes	Date	13 June, 2012
------------------	---------------	------	---------------

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	CMP		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All		
<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.		
None detectable. A rather minimalistic approach has been taken with most of the proposals with little or no overall explanation, illustration or explanation.			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
None detectable.			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
None in evidence.			
d	Any further comments		
Some of the forms aren’t quite complete (e.g. NBS modules aren’t included) and for some, Section 4 is in a separate document. However, from the proposals presented, there is no evidence that the proposals do not comply with the requirements of NAM.			
<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	Ros Boar	Date	14 June 2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>	
School of Study	ENV
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	ALL UG
Course Titles	<p>Climate Science/with year abroad/Integrated Masters</p> <p>Environmental Geophysics/with year abroad/Integrated Masters</p> <p>Environmental Science/with year abroad/Integrated Masters</p> <p>Meteorology and Oceanography /with year abroad/Integrated Masters</p> <p>Environmental Geography/with year abroad/Integrated Masters</p> <p>Environmental Geography and International Development</p>
<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.
<p>Section 2 is well mapped in all proposals and it is useful to see the skills, knowledge and understanding subdivided in this way.</p> <p>The form itself does not really lend itself to creativity for large schools like ENV with a lot of programmes and a lot of modules – for instance it is difficult to see the relationship between the modules on the different ENV programmes. It is recommended that for PGT proposals each school should provide a ‘map’ of modules showing links/using colour coding rather than list them. ENV have done what they can to demonstrate progression given the constraints of the form.</p>	
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)
ENV have reduced the number of first year modules by consolidating the learning and this looks to be sensibly done. This is apparent from their additional submission – describing the rationale for change. For the PGT NAM form I recommend all courses submit a ‘rationale for change’ statement	

similar to this at the beginning of their submission.

There look to be good links between formative and summative assessment although it is sometimes not possible to see to what extent a piece of formative assessment is a 'rehearsal' for summative assessment rather than a supportive stage in the learning process of itself. For the PGT NAM form it would be useful if there was space to express as 'assessment policy' to encapsulate what the course team are trying to achieve through the use of formative assessment.

c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.
---	---

The way the courses are set up with each having an option for year abroad/in industry and a Integrated Masters option looks well organised. Again, a pictorial 'map' would have represented this aspect well, rather than a form with lots of boxes.

There are no M-level benchmarks for Environmental Studies although the IM modules look to meet the general requirements of the QAA M-level characteristics appropriately.

d	Any further comments
---	----------------------

ENV have done a good job getting the complexity of their courses onto these forms. They appear to be meeting the requirements of the NAM well.

The suggestions for changes noted here are about the restriction of the NAM form rather than what ENV have done with it.

*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 immediately.*

Name of reviewer	Helena Gillespie Rosie Doy	Date	11/6/12
------------------	-------------------------------	------	---------

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	FTV		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All		
<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.		
The form has been used to good effect in all programmes with a few exceptions noted in (d) below. The detail on Feedback systems is particularly well done for all courses within FTV			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
For the most part the courses in FTV are largely unchanged. However, they do conform to the requirements of the NAM. There may be a slight missed opportunity in that there remain relatively few modules within the course that could be regarded as ‘large’. However, it may also be that the predominance of 20 and 30 credit modules is most academically appropriate for the discipline.			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
The breakdown of learning outcomes is very thorough and for the most part is articulated in terms of the programme as a whole. There are some examples (Media Studies) of outcomes that are very focused on the module content and it would be useful if these could be restated in programme terms.			
d	Any further comments		
There is further work needed regarding the Year abroad where programmes contain this element, specifically in terms of feedback processes that will be in place.			
<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	Jon Sharp	Date	12/06/12

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@ueg.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@ueg.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	HIS		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	V100, V100PT, V140, VL12		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	History, History and Politics, Modern History		
<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 (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
Some 60 credit modules in Y3			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
d	Any further comments		
Use of early feedback in Y1; use of feedback in tutorials on drafts (Sect. 7). Few changes to modules. It wasn’t clear to me what the defined choice modules in Y2 comprised – are they listed elsewhere? At the moment they are just described as ‘approved’. Courses will run in essentially this form in 12-13, and will need to be looked at again in light of that experience.			
<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	Thomas Ward	Date	12/6/12

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>	
School of Study	LAW
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	ALL M100 WITH M120, M121, M123
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	ALL Law M100 Law with European Legal Systems M120 Law with French Law and Language M121 Law with American Law M123
<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.
<p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>Highlights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core model M100, with extended variants M120, M121, M123 is clearly set out</li> <li>• Specific areas of innovation in line with NAM are explicitly highlighted</li> <li>• Rationale for revision and innovation concisely explained</li> </ul>	
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)
<p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>Highlights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diagnostic essay (week 5 year 1) linked to year heads, pastoral advisory system and DoS</li> <li>• Extension to standard seminar time (2 hours) to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) increase student contact time</li> <li>(ii) enable more intensive small-group working</li> <li>(iii) extend opportunity for in-depth exploration and discussion of issues</li> <li>(iv) enhance scope for use of range of tasks/methods during sessions (e.g. break-out groups)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ditto some credit re-combinations (30 to 2x20)</li> <li>• Podcasts for formative feedback (answers <i>and</i> explanations)</li> <li>• Time limited take home examination</li> <li>• Improved range of Level 3 module options to aid specialisation</li> <li>• Appropriate emphasis on learning, developing and practising skills has been informed by direct soundings with employers</li> <li>• Feedback and feedforward for subject specific and generic skills</li> </ul>	

c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
<p><u>Highlights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year heads to coordinate formative and summative assessments</li> <li>• Year heads to work closely with pastoral tutors</li> <li>• Module organisers encouraged to provide examiners notes on all assessments alongside individual feedback</li> <li>• Year abroad well woven into structure</li> <li>• Programme level outcomes show clear progression</li> <li>• Generally good mix of assessment formats across years and modules</li> </ul>			
d	Any further comments		
<p>Plenty of good examples of creativity, innovation and best practice, especially given that the nature and content of programmes is prescribed to an extent by Law society, Bar Council and Joint Academic Stage Board requirements.</p>			
<p><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></p>			
Name of reviewer	Dr Victoria Scaife SWP	Date	14-06-12

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>	
School of Study	Languages and Communication Studies (LCS)
Course code/s ('All' if commenting on whole School)	Revised LCS Modern Languages Double Honours (Japanese-French) U1T901403X NAM (starts 2012/3); Revised LCS Modern Languages Double Honours (Japanese-Spanish) U1T901404X NAM(starts 2012/3); Revised LCS Modern Languages French (Ab Initio) U1T901401FA NAM (3); Revised LCS Modern Languages French or Spanish (3 Year) U1T902302 NAM (1); Revised LCS Modern Languages French U1T901401 NAM (26); Revised LCS Modern Languages Japanese U1T901401J NAM Approved (starts 2012/3); Revised LCS Modern Languages Spanish (Ab Initio) U1T901401HA NAM (2); Revised LCS Modern Languages Spanish U1T901401H NAM (20); Revised LCS Spanish and Film and Television Studies U1RP4J401 NAM (2); Revised LCS Cross-Cultural Communication with Business Management U1Q9N2301 NAM (11); Revised LCS French and Film and Television Studies U1RP1J401 NAM (0); Revised LCS French Honours Language with International Development Studies U1R1L9401 NAM (4)
<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.
The map of learning outcomes against module assessment type for <u>ALL</u> LCS modules relevant to language programmes is easy to follow and helps the reader understand the overall learning outcomes for the discipline.	
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)
Good use of formative assessment and oral feedback will continue (it is already in place). All students benefit from a period of study abroad, and from the large number of visiting student exchanges which add to the resource of the School.	

c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
d	Any further comments		
<p>I am not sure what 'NB. That learning outcomes may be met by means other than assessment' means!</p> <p>Further guidance on the meaning of 'introductory, intermediate and advanced' levels would be helpful, especially in the generic skill outcomes. For example, how would you judge the difference between intermediate and advanced notetaking?</p> <p>I am not clear on the differences in expectations between the <i>ab initio</i> and the post-A level languages in terms of introductory (level 1) learning outcomes.</p> <p>There are a large number of courses to accommodate the different language combinations and I note that some of the courses currently have very low enrolment numbers (although I understand that the Japanese course won't start until 2012-3) (numbers in brackets in the list of courses above). Has some thought been given to combining the four year courses, in the same way that the 3-year course covers two languages?</p> <p>The joint courses proposals do not cover the out-of-school module information, so I am unable to comment fully on these programmes. I cannot ascertain how students on these programmes will be assessed across the programme without the details of the other school. I would expect the 'rationale for change' for these joint courses to be specific to the course, to give the overall aims of the joint course, but it is the standard LCS statements in all cases. I would hope that overall programme aims and learning outcomes for these programmes will be considered at written in due course.</p>			
<p><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></p>			
Name of reviewer	Caroline Sauverin	Date	14/6/12

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

*One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.*

School of Study	Languages and Communication Studies (LCS)
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	Revised LCS Translation Media and French U1RP13401 NAM Revised LCS Translation Media and Japanese U1QP9J401 NAM Revised LCS Translation Media and Spanish U1RP43401 NAM Revised LCS Translation Media and Spanish (3 Year) U1RP4H301 NAM Revised LCS Translation Media and Spanish (Ab Initio) U1RP4H301 NAM Revised LCS Translation Media with French and Spanish U1RP93401 NAM Revised LCS Translation Media and Spanish (Ab Initio) U1RP93401HF NAM Revised LCS Translation Media with Japanese and French U1Q9PH401 NAM Revised LCS Translation Media with Japanese and Spanish U1Q9PH401 NAM Revised LCS Spanish Language (Ab Initio) with Management Studies U1R9N2401HA NAM Revised LCS Spanish Language with Management Studies U1R9N2401H NAM Revised LCS Translation and Interpreting with Double Honours Language (French and Spanish) U1Q9NR8401NAM Revised LCS Modern Language Double Honours (French-Spanish) U1T901420X NAM
<p><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></p>	
a	<p>Clever use of the NAM Programme Proposal template, with particularly clear, accessible ways of explaining, showing, describing, illustrating etc.</p> <p>(1) Clear map of modules to course level learning outcomes.</p>
b	<p>Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)</p> <p>(1) A good mix and range of assessment types. (2) A good number of formative assessments across the courses.</p>

c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
d	Any further comments		
<p>(1) Overall an impressive set of documents. The course learning outcomes and relationship to the modules is very well laid out.</p> <p>(2) Is it possible to rationalise the high number of undergraduate courses on offer by the School and reduce the overall number of courses?</p> <p>(3) All of the LCS courses have option enrolment choices at level one.</p>			
<p><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></p>			
Name of reviewer	John Tully	Date	17 July 2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	MED		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	U1A100501		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	Bachelor of Medicine / Bachelor of Surgery (MBBS)		
<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.		
<p>The mapping of the NAM programme template against the Tomorrows Doctors competence framework provided an excellent additional insight into the assessment strategy for the MBBS. It gave a clear sense of how the School is seeking to make explicit what students need to know and do at each stage.</p>			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
<p>The range of assessment types is very striking and one gets the impression of very frequent opportunities for feedback to students.</p>			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
<p>No specific comments.</p>			
d	Any further comments		
<p>I note in passing that this seems to be still to some extent a work in progress, with comments from earlier critical readers still attached to the text.</p>			
<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	Paul Levy	Date	19 June 2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@ueg.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@ueg.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	NBS		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All		
<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.		
<p>The programmes have all been mapped out very clearly. The specific market issues facing NBS in terms of professional accreditation are laid out in an accompanying statement and it may be that there is scope to consider reviewing the template to allow the inclusion of this type of information</p>			
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
<p>There is nothing particularly innovative in terms of a direct response to the NAM requirements, but the focus on employability has been sharpened and the inclusion of formative assessments for all modules is welcome. There may be scope for further development around assessment strategies in terms of presentations or more project based assessments.</p>			
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
d	Any further comments		
<p>The market in which NBS operates requires that the programmes offered meet particular student expectations such as the existence of potential exemption entitlements for students when they move into their graduate careers.</p> <p>NBS have adjusted their programmes to both align comfortably with the NAM without endangering their market position</p>			
<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	Dr N Spalding, Mr C J Sharp	Date	02/07/2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>	
School of Study	Philosophy (PHI)
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All
<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.
<p>The School has utilised the proforma in an effective manner to make explicit the way in which programme level outcomes are mapped against modules and individual forms of assessment. It is clear that there is a strong alignment of credit level and Stage of study, with students only engaging in level 1 modules in Stage 1 etc.</p> <p>It isn’t clear, however, how EEC modules are integrated (if at all) into the course profile? Will the School be providing any EEC modules aimed at students outside the School or even the HUM Faculty?</p>	
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)
<p>The core modules all appear to be 20 credits or more, which is in keeping with the NAM. Some modules are 30 credits.</p> <p>It is clear that the School is using a range of both formative and summative assessment methods. It is also clear that formative assessment is given considerable emphasis with most modules integrating between one and four formative exercises of different kinds – this should ensure that students have the opportunity to ‘practice’ their skills/understandings prior to undertaking their summative assignments.</p> <p>It is difficult to judge just how ‘innovative’ some of the individual assignments are, since little detail is provided (or required) on the proforma, but the cycle of feedback indicates that the School has given considerable thought to how to build feedback into modules in order to maximise student learning. It is clear that the School is not reliant on essays (though these have a prominent role in the assessment strategy as one might expect), and is integrating a wider range of assessment methods into its courses.</p> <p>In a few cases (e.g. <i>Reasoning and Logic</i>) there are large numbers of summative assignments. In the module in question these take the form of weekly tests. Perhaps some of these could be converted to ‘formative’, with last 2 being summative? Perhaps some of the formative examples could be peer-assessed? Experience in other disciplines shows that this kind of strategy can be very effective in enhancing student learning whilst reducing marking workloads for tutor(s).</p>	

c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The School has clearly given the role of LCS language modules a great deal of thought and options from LCS are prominent within the course profile.</li> <li>• A great deal of ‘choice’ or option ranges are available in levels (stages) 2 and especially 3.</li> <li>• Whilst this flexibility provides students with a huge amount of control and freedom in constructing their degree studies in stages 2 and 3, it also means that PHI will find it difficult to articulate which skills and what disciplinary knowledge students will develop by the end of their studies, since this will depend on the particular collection of modules they have chosen.</li> <li>• The School has carefully managed the number of exams, with a norm of around 14 hrs in total. This is to be welcomed.</li> </ul>			
d	Any further comments		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a ‘tension’ between the NAM and the culture of choice within HUM. The NAM’s emphasis on course level planning and coordination is at odds with the well-established culture within PHI of providing students with huge amounts of choice – what appears to be a kind of ‘pick n’ mix’ approach to programme design in level 2, and level 3 in particular.</li> <li>• Essentially there appears to be little ‘structure’ to Stage 3 at all – students simply choose from a wide range of options. The implications of this seem to be that the School does not believe that there is any ‘core’ content/skills that should be developed beyond Stage 2. Is this really the case? Is this consistent with approaches to programme design in Philosophy in other HEI’s? Is what is provided actually a ‘programme’ at all? Or just a collection of modules?</li> <li>• As a reviewer I am playing ‘Devil’s advocate’ here (quite deliberately), but it is important that the School has a clear rationale and defence of the particular approach it has adopted in terms of programme design. Yes, there are some advantages to the proposed structure, but it also brings considerable challenges in terms of ensuring a coherent <u>programme</u> of study for students.</li> <li>• It isn’t entirely clear where/how employability skills and the development of ‘translatable’ skills are developed within the programme – e.g. modules which might enable students to develop team-working skills, negotiation skills, etc.</li> </ul>			
<p><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></p>			
Name of reviewer	Adam Longcroft	Date	15 July 2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>	
School of Study	Political, Social and International Studies (PSI)
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	All
<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	<p>Clever use of the NAM Programme Proposal template, with particularly clear, accessible ways of explaining, showing, describing, illustrating etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The School has utilised the proforma in an effective manner to make explicit the way in which programme level outcomes are mapped against modules and individual forms of assessment. It is clear that there is a strong alignment of credit level and Stage of study, with students only engaging in level 1 modules in Stage 1 etc.</li> <li>• It is clear that in designing the programmes around the NAM, that much careful thought has been given to the role, level, credit-weighting and assessment of a number of modules, with new modules being integrated, old ones being phased-out and some being merged or changed in their ‘level’ etc.</li> <li>• It is also clear that the School has taken the opportunity to revisit and revise the way in which programme learning outcomes are articulated – the move towards a differentiated set of outcomes (according to different levels/stages) is to be welcomed.</li> <li>• The School is clearly starting to re-think the role and importance of formative assessment as a way of building student learning and confidence. 14 out of 21 modules involve formative assessments in Stage 2, and 12 out of 22 in Stage 3.</li> <li>• The use of a ‘pre-arrival’ formative assignment is, in the reviewer’s view, an excellent example of innovative/creative assessment and deserves to be considered more widely within the Faculty.</li> <li>• The School has created a Stage 1 programme which is highly prescriptive (this is a very welcome development), but choice rapidly expands in Stages 2 and 3. My only concern is whether there is ‘too much’ choice at Stage 3?</li> <li>• The progression from 20 credit &amp; 40 modules in Stages 1 and 2, to 30 credit modules in Stage 3 involves an increasing emphasis on larger modules. This is entirely in keeping with the NAM.</li> <li>• Exams normally limited to max of 18-22 hrs (total).</li> </ul>
b	<p>Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The core modules all appear to be 20/40 credits which is in keeping with the NAM. Stage 3 modules are 30 credits.</li> <li>• It is clear that the School is using a range of both formative and summative assessment</li> </ul>

	<p>methods. It is also clear that formative assessment is given considerable emphasis with most modules integrating between one and four formative exercises of different kinds – this should ensure that students have the opportunity to ‘practice’ their skills/understandings prior to undertaking their summative assignments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is difficult to judge just how ‘innovative’ some of the individual assignments are, since little detail is provided (or required) on the proforma, but the cycle of feedback indicates that the School has given considerable thought to how to build feedback into modules in order to maximise student learning. It is clear that the School is not reliant on essays (though these have a prominent role in the assessment strategy as one might expect), and is integrating a wider range of assessment methods into its courses.</li> <li>• The School should be congratulated for the manner in which it has responded to the challenges of the NAM by embracing larger modules and formative assessment, feedback cycles, and should be encouraged to consider ways in which formative assessment could/might be integrated into modules where it currently doesn’t figure.</li> </ul>
c	<p>Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The School has clearly given the role of LCS language modules a great deal of thought and options from LCS are prominent within the course profile.</li> <li>• A great deal of ‘choice’ or option ranges are available in levels (stages) 2 and especially 3.</li> <li>• Whilst this flexibility provides students with a huge amount of control and freedom in constructing their degree studies in stages 2 and 3, it also means that PHI will find it difficult to articulate which skills and what disciplinary knowledge students will develop by the end of their studies, since this will depend on the particular collection of modules they have chosen.</li> <li>• The School has carefully managed the number of exams, with a norm of around 14 hrs in total. This is to be welcomed.</li> <li>• Opportunities for students to engage with LCS Language modules have been built into the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 3 programme profiles.</li> </ul>
d	<p>Any further comments</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It isn’t clear how EEC modules are integrated into the course profile? Will the School be providing any EEC modules aimed at students outside the School or even the HUM Faculty? The School has indicated that other ‘employability’ modules and ‘placement’ modules might be employed in future – it will be interesting to see how these are articulated within the existing programme.</li> <li>• However, whilst EEC modules are not clearly identified, it <u>is</u> clear that work placement and internships feature prominently within the programmes, normally within Defined Choice.</li> <li>• There is a ‘tension’ between the NAM and the culture of choice within HUM. The NAM’s emphasis on course level planning and coordination is at odds with the well-established culture within PSI of providing students with huge amounts of choice – what appears to be a kind of ‘pick n’ mix’ approach to programme design in Stage 3 in particular, where students choose modules from A &amp; B option ranges. This may, indeed, ensure a balance between ‘IR’ and ‘media’ modules but it is open to debate as to whether what is provided is a</li> </ul>

'programme' or just a collection of loosely related modules.

- The implications of this seem to be that the School does not believe that there is any 'core' content/skills that should be developed beyond Stage 2. Is this really the case? Is this consistent with approaches to programme design in Politics/Internal Studies in other HEI's?
- As a reviewer I am playing 'Devil's advocate' here (quite deliberately), but it is important that the School has a clear rationale and defence of the particular approach it has adopted in terms of programme design. Yes, there are some advantages to the proposed structure, but it also brings considerable challenges in terms of ensuring a coherent programme of study for students.

*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 immediately.*

Name of reviewer	Adam Longcroft	Date	15 July 2012
------------------	----------------	------	--------------

***Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012***

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>			
School of Study	SWP		
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	U1C800301		
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	BSc Psychology		
<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.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for adding the sections on the programme aims and learning outcomes – very useful!</li> <li>• The mapping of learning outcomes against modules is extremely comprehensive.</li> <li>• Similarly, the feedback cycle section contains a great deal of useful information and the content should prove for demonstrating to students just how much feedback they receive.</li> </ul>		
b	Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consolidation and integration of existing modules, particularly in Year 2.</li> <li>• Good use of formative assessment.</li> <li>• Very good induction activities, which carry on throughout the course to enhance academic and career development.</li> </ul>		
c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nature of the programme and the requirements of the professional body mean that the programme is very coherent and well coordinated, leading to programme level outcomes.</li> <li>• All Year 1 modules are compulsory, and 100 credits of Year 2 modules are compulsory. In Year 3 students have the opportunity to specialise in the area that interests them. As well as the Psychology modules on offer, the School is working on integrating appropriate defined choice modules from other Schools into the course timetable.</li> </ul>		
d	Any further comments		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very detailed and clear proposal – thank you!</li> </ul>		
<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	Julia Jones	Date	16 July 2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals – May/June 2012

<i>One form can be used to give feedback for a whole School, but please identify any individual courses, if appropriate, when recording your comments.</i>	
School of Study	SWP
Course code/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	U1L501301
Course title/s (‘All’ if commenting on whole School)	BA (Hons) Social Work
<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	<p>Clever use of the NAM Programme Proposal template, with particularly clear, accessible ways of explaining, showing, describing, illustrating etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The accompanying document giving an overview of changes was extremely helpful.</li> <li>• Within the form, the mapping of learning outcomes against modules clearly demonstrates progression.</li> <li>• The feedback cycle section of the form explains clearly the way in which feedback informs further assignments on the module and work on subsequent modules and beyond (ie professional practice after graduation).</li> <li>• The section on programme level outcomes and the year-on-year steps taken to achieve these is exemplary.</li> </ul>
b	<p>Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The School has increased formative assessment and is making good use of synoptic assessment. Examinations have been kept to a minimum (this is in keeping with the nature of the course).</li> <li>• Consolidation of modules with module credit sizes being increased.</li> <li>• The larger modules should help with the assessment and feedback cycles.</li> <li>• Students are encouraged to be proactive, to take responsibility for their own learning and to help and encourage their peers; for example, via the Stage 3 Professional Development module where each student presents ideas for their Case Study to a Case Discussion group, the Dissertation module where each student presents ideas for their Dissertation to a workshop/discussion group, and the Year 3 Working with Service Users module with its student-led (with staff facilitation) exam preparation workshops. These will provide excellent preparation for students’ professional careers.</li> </ul>

c	Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The School has seized the opportunity offered by the coincidence of the revision of the Professional Capabilities Framework and the implementation of the NAM to emphasise programme level outcomes and holistic professional development, which have been clearly articulated and coordinated.</li> <li>• This is a professional programme so all modules are compulsory and students will be required to pass all components.</li> </ul>			
d	Any further comments		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very clearly laid out form! In retrospect, we should have added a section for Schools to give an overview of the changes, so thank you to SWP for including this.</li> </ul>			
<p><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></p>			
Name of reviewer	Julia Jones	Date	16 July 2012

**Please return this form to Julia Jones, LTS ([Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Julia.Jones@uea.ac.uk)) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012**