

**LTC12D106**

**Title:** Reviews of New Academic Model Undergraduate course proposals  
**Author:** Julia Jones  
**Date:** 6 March 2013  
**Circulation:** Learning and Teaching Committee- 20 March 2013  
**Agenda:** LTC12A004  
**Version:** Final  
**Status:** Open

---

**Issue**

To receive reviews of New Academic Model Undergraduate course proposals: CHE (revised), NSC (Pre-reg nursing and ODP), PHA

**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 – Follow-up December, 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<br>(‘All’ if commenting on whole School)  | All except F100, F125 and FF31 that were in the original pack  |
| Course title/s<br>(‘All’ if commenting on whole School)   | All except F100. F125 and FF31 as per above  |
| <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.  |
| Nothing to add to previous comments   |  |
| b   | Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy) |
| Nothing to add to previous comments   |  |
| c   | Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.  |
| Nothing to add to previous comments   |  |
| d   | Any further comments   |
| <b>General points</b>   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) It would have been helpful to have had a summary as to what changes CHE has made (or why it has not made done so) in relation to previous comments;</li> <li>ii) It seems that there has been little or no external consultation (eg with external examiners).<br/>Is this the case?</li> <li>iii) The section on equality and diversity has not been addressed in detail. It is therefore assumed that CHE considers that all its courses attract a range of students from a variety of backgrounds. Is this correct?</li> <li>iv) The standard comment about DHE’s approach to the development of a ‘community of scholars’ remains somewhat negatively couched which is inappropriate if the programme specification are to be made public. This section would benefit from re-casting into a more positive presentation of CHE’s views;</li> <li>v) It is still unclear how CHE will use the RSA’s new on-line module to develop business awareness. Is CHE intending to encourage students to enrol on this external programme in addition to the UEA programme of is it using this content to guide its own approach to employability content in modules. A short note of clarification would be welcome;</li> <li>vi) There appear to be a few aspects tidy up with regard to the number of examination hours</li> </ul> |  |

(see below);

- vii) In general, the use of language with regard to use of levels is appropriate;
- viii) The module descriptions of new modules CHEMF33 and MF31 which appear in several Specifications require completion;
- ix) None of the specifications has space for language options – is this an issue for the NAM?
- x) Should the learning outcomes make explicit reference to acquisition of Cert/Dip/Honours awards at each stage? Some do; others are silent. How consistent should they be?

#### Specific points on the programme specifications

- xi) **F101:** 1F1Y is in the list of defined choices, so there remains a need to clarify how students not taking this module will meet the identified learning outcome of ‘critical assessment and understanding of relevant academic literature’; module 1S1Y still needs a reading list; profile is clear apart from Stage 3 where it appears that a student could potentially select more than 30 credits at L5; details of ENV modules’ learning outcomes need to be inserted;
- xii) **F104:** check total of exam hours under defined choice (6 not 8?)
- xiii) **F152:** check total of exam hours of compulsory modules (32 not 30?). This programme appears highly assessed compared with other programmes;
- xiv) **F153:** check total of exam hours (26 not 14?)
- xv) **F154:** check total of exam hours (26 not 14?); also clarify the assessment of 31BY which is listed in the feedback schedule as an examined module (which in a broad sense it is) – but it also refers to dissertation. Which is correct?
- xvi) **F190:** number of feedback points for module CHE1C24 should be checked (12 not 13); profile is clear apart from Stage 2 where it appears that a student could potentially select 140 credits (ie status of defined choice ENV module needs to be clarified);
- xvii) **F191:** profile is clear apart from Stage 2 where it appears that a student could potentially select 140 credits (ie status of defined choice ENV module needs to be clarified);
- xviii) **FF41:** it was previously suggested that this profile should be split into two: the UEA route and the route offering a study abroad option in year 3. In this regard, retaining the one profile is out of kilter with practice adopted in other specifications. Further, relative lack of visibility of the study abroad option may impact on recruitment. The profile for year 3 is clearer in presentation but there is little else to indicate that there are two routes here. The recommendation remains that consideration be given to splitting these. There is a lengthy list of learning outcomes too which, together with the two routes, gives an overly complex ‘feel’ to the specification. Module 3F8Y is listed in the profile but not in the assessment feedback; module 31FY is shown in the assessment feedback but not in the profile. This needs to be checked and clarified.

*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, DUS (FMH & PPE) | Date | 19 November, 2012 |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------|-------------------|

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

## 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  | NSC  |      |         |
| Course code/s<br>(‘All’ if commenting on whole School)   | U1B740302S, U1B730302S, U1B761302S,<br>U1B760302S  |      |         |
| Course title/s<br>(‘All’ if commenting on whole School)  | Bachelor of Science (Hons): Adult Nursing, Children’s<br>Nursing, Learning Disabilities Nursing, Mental Health<br>Nursing                          |      |         |
| <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.  |      |         |
| There is not really anything to say here, other than that the course team completed the form as required. It was easy to read.   |  |      |         |
| b  | Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy) |      |         |
| This course has only large compulsory modules, which means it is very clear how learning outcomes will be met.   |  |      |         |
| c  | Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.  |      |         |
| There is progression, learning outcomes are clear and feedback cycles clearly documented.  |  |      |         |
| d  | Any further comments   |      |         |
| This looks like a carefully planned course which has received positive feedback from the external examiner. It complies with the 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   | S Inthorn  | Date | 3.12.12 |

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

## 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  | NSC  |      |         |
| Course code/s<br>(‘All’ if commenting on whole School)   |  |      |         |
| Course title/s<br>(‘All’ if commenting on whole School)  | Diploma of Higher Education (Operating Department Practice)  |      |         |
| <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.  |      |         |
| There is not really anything to say here, other than that the course team completed the form as required. It was easy to read.   |  |      |         |
| b  | Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy) |      |         |
| This course has only large compulsory modules, which means it is very clear how learning outcomes will be met.   |  |      |         |
| c  | Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.  |      |         |
| There is progression, learning outcomes are clear and feedback cycles clearly documented.  |  |      |         |
| d  | Any further comments   |      |         |
| This looks like a carefully planned course which has received positive feedback from the external examiner. It complies with the 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   | S Inthorn  | Date | 3.12.12 |

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

## Learning and Teaching Committee

### Feedback on UG New Academic Model Course proposals

|   |  |      |               |
|---|--|------|---------------|
| <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   | PHA  |      |               |
| Course code/s<br>(‘All’ if commenting on whole School)  | U1B230401  |      |               |
| Course title/s<br>(‘All’ if commenting on whole School)   | MPharm, BSc Pharmaceutical Science, Diploma<br>Pharmaceutical Science, Certificate Pharmaceutical 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.  |      |               |
| The template is clearly laid out and demonstrates progression clearly. The level of detail is exemplary and the mapping is both comprehensive and clear.  |  |      |               |
| b   | Particularly creative and innovative approaches to interpreting the NAM requirements (e.g., use of larger modules, innovative assessment strategy) |      |               |
| Modules have been repackaged as part of the NAM process and there is a commendable use of formative assessment and feed forward.  |  |      |               |
| c   | Examples of best practice in terms of clearly articulated planning/coordination at programme level.  |      |               |
| A well planned programme, which is accredited by the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC)- determining the programme level outcomes at masters as UG level. The range of assessments both formative and summative has been clearly thought through to offer a stimulating range of types of assessment, so that, whilst there are a number of examinations there is also a more holistic approach to the strategy overall all. |  |      |               |
| d   | Any further comments   |      |               |
| The use of a business case as a summative assessment at Stage 4 is a very contemporary approach in tune with current service requirements and thinking.   |  |      |               |
| <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  | Rosie Doy  | Date | 11 March 2013 |

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