

**Faculty of Humanities
Programme Approvals Subcommittee**

**Confirmed Minutes of the meeting held on
Wednesday 22nd February 2017 in Ken Kitchen Committee Room, John Owens Building**

Present: Fiona Smyth - FS, Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning & Students (Chair), Mark Baker – MB (SEED), Ken Clarke - KC (SoSS), David Brown - DB (SALC), Thea Cameron-Faulkner - TCF (Assistant Associate Vice-Dean), Anna Goatman - AG (AMBS), Bruce Wardhaugh - BW (Law), Carol Rowlinson - CR (TLO), Nicola Lord – NL (TLO), Emma Sanders – ES (TLO), Rachel Walton – RW (TLO * Secretary), Lisa McAleese – LMc (TLO), Emma Atkins - EA (Education Officer USU), Leigh Johnson - LJ (UG Representative)

By Invitation: Peter Liddell - PL (SALC), Mark Elliot (SoSS)

1. Apologies for absence

Received: Liam Harte, Laura Tatham, Rebecca Bennett

2. Minutes of the last Meeting

Agreed: The minutes were agreed as an accurate record with one correction to the attendees; Leigh Johnson attended as UG rep not Kirsty Sutherland as recorded.

3. Matters Arising from the Minutes

None

4. NPP1 Programme Approvals “in principle”

None

5. Programme Amendments

5.1) MA Classics and Ancient History (SALC)

Reported: PL spoke to the proposal.

This proposal requests a restructure of the current programme with i) a move from 30cr to 15cr units (with the exception of the core course and one course provided by the British School at Rome) and ii) a move from a 30cr minimum Latin/Greek language units to 15-45cr.

This is deemed uncontroversial and is in line with other areas of the School.

Also requested is dispensation from Faculty policy to allow MA CIAH students to take up to 30cr of un-enhanced UG units from both level 6 and level 5.

Further dispensation is requested from Faculty Policy (for enhanced units) or University Regulations (if un-enhanced) so that an additional 15cr of UG credit may be taken in relation to the core language element only i.e. up to 45cr of UG credit total always in an ancient language.

The reasoning behind this request is that all language courses are 15cr at level 6 and there is a need to allow students to take up to 3 of these units in order to enhance their

languages, given that the type of students who wish to progress through to this MA are usually classics students with little or no language skills.

Discussed: Assessment

It was questioned whether the move to 15cr units would impact on assessment and workload. Generally 15cr units are assessed by one piece of coursework so given that this change would mean more units the Committee reminded the discipline that they would need to be mindful of assessment loads. LMc confirmed that the Faculty has an Approved Assessment Procedure and Practice policy which will shortly be circulated and made available on HUMNET.

PL will take this back and consult with Polly Law to ensure this is taken into account.

Regulations and Dispensation

The regulations state that students can study 30cr at level 6 and a further 30cr of level 6 if suitably enhanced to level 7. The Committee was concerned about the request to teach level 5 units. PL reasoned that the level 5 and 6 units are taught for strategic reasons and that they are intensive courses reflecting the level of student. The Committee noted however that MA students would be studying second year undergraduate courses as the unit is also offered to second years on the UG programmes. It is a national FHEQ requirement that a minimum of 150cr are at level 7.

Can the level 5 or 6 units not be enhanced? PL argued that if they enhance the level 5 then would have to give more credits however this is not the case. Current UG units are 20cr and Masters unit's 15cr. The credits would not simply be multiplied but the teaching would need to reflect the level of the student. It is not simply a case of adding assessment.

Faculty policy does state that "material from a lower level can be enhanced to level 7" in exceptional circumstances. SALC would argue that this request would qualify as it is a language. The Committee however was concerned that the School would in effect be offering a programme which was 135cr at level 7, 30cr at level 6 and 15cr at level 5 which does not meet the FHEQ requirement for a minimum of 150cr at level 7 for a master's programme.

Faculty policy also states that only level 7 units can be core/compulsory. In the programme specification (page 3) and the Case for Permissions paperwork it is stated these are core units. In the marketing information it is stated they are options. This needs clarifying before any exemption or enhancement could be agreed.

It is noted that the external examiner had no issue with offering 45cr of enhanced units.

SALC were concerned that if this proposal were not agreed that there is the potential to lose students.

It was questioned as to whether one of the language units could be offered as a LEAP course, however there was concern that this would not be fair on other students.

It was queried as to whether the level 5 units could be enhanced to level 7. PL felt that this would not be possible as the level 5 units are 'Intensive Greek/Latin 1'. They are followed by the level 6 units 'Intensive Greek/Latin II'. If the level 5 units are enhanced to level 7 they would therefore be out of line with the structure of the programme and ILOs.

Agreed: The proposal was NOT APPROVED at this time.

The Committee could not agree to an exemption from policy to include a level 5 unit at Masters level. It was agreed that the level 5 unit must be enhanced to level 6 and the level 6 enhanced to level 7 In order to meet FHEQ and Faculty requirements.

Action: SALC are required to re-examine the language units for the MA Classics and Ancient History programme in line with the Faculty Policy on the use of Level 6 units at Level 7 to ensure compliance with the enhancement requirements before re-presenting the proposal for consideration.

5.2) LLM International Financial Law (Law)

Reported: BW reported on behalf of Law as PGT Director.

The current structure of the LLM International Financial Law programme requires that students complete three mandatory courses which students feel is too restrictive. Given the rapidly evolving nature of financial law and its interactions with other areas of law, it is important the students are exposed to regulatory developments and approaches in as many fields as possible.

This proposal requests that these three mandatory units become options to make the stream more flexible and also make the programme more marketable to new and prospective students.

Discussed: Programme Structure

The Committee sought clarification on the programme structure provided. BW confirmed that students will still be required to take 60 credits of core units (30 credits in semester 1 and 30 credits in semester 2) and the remaining 60 credits will therefore be options. There will be no impact on the Intended Learning Outcomes of the programme.

Unit Viability

The Committee questioned whether the units would remain viable if they become options. BW confirmed that none of the units in this programme are being watched due to low numbers so there is no reason to assume that this would change.

Non-Credit Bearing Units and Terminology

The Chair queried the Non-Credit bearing Research based unit as to whether they were attended by students and why the School were offering units not for credit. BW confirmed that these units taught a methodology which is used in the dissertation and/or research papers and were therefore well attended.

ES noted that this had also been discussed at the last periodic review of Law where it had been noted that any sessions which have bearing on the ILOs must be credit bearing.

It is recommended by the Committee that the School re-examines the description and design of the non-credit bearing units as they are in effect front-loading dissertation research and should be incorporated as such.

Secretary's note - After the meeting it was confirmed that the following recommendation regarding non-credit bearing units had been made at the Periodic Review of Law in 2012/13.

"RECOMMENDATION 2: Sessions that are compulsory for students because they are an essential part of the curriculum, i.e. are essential to students achieving the ILOs of a programme, must be credit-

rated. Law could build these sessions into the 30cr of the first research paper, as structured support with timetabled contact hours."

As a result the LLM was amended in 2014 to ensure that students did receive notional credit for their attendance at Research seminars – the credit was incorporated into the 60cr Dissertation.

This is not currently reflected in the programme structure presented to PASC as part of this amendment and there has been not been any request to revert to non-credit bearing units submitted to Faculty since 2014. Therefore this needs to be amended accordingly and RW has been in contact with the School to request this notional credit is made clear in the programme structure.

Agreed: The proposal was APPROVED subject to the below action.

Action: Law to re-examine the structure of the LLM programmes and the design of the non-credit bearing research units students are expected to attend in line with the recommendations from Periodic Review 2012/213 and subsequent programme amendment in 2014.

5.3) BA Econ (SoSS)

Reported: KC reported for SoSS

This proposal is to create a non-specialised exit route for students who have failed first year pre-requisites but passed the year with compensation. As it currently stands it is possible for students, who despite having passed the year overall with compensation, to find themselves in a position where they cannot progress onto the second year of the pathway they have originally entered. They either then find themselves on a pathway of no interest or exit with a Certificate of Education. This proposal therefore seeks to allow students to progress onto a non-specialised degree of a straight BA Econ.

This route already exists for final year students who have found themselves in this position at the end of year two, and the School would like to extend this option this to second year students.

Discussed: Programme Structure

The Committee questioned whether this route would allow students to progress on a BA Econ programme that had not studied Economics. KC confirmed this would not be the case as economics is studied in year one.

It was also confirmed that students will be able to select their own options as long as they have passed the pre-requisites.

The Committee asked whether this exit route has its own Intended Learning Outcomes. It is believed that it does as the programme exists already however KC will need to check this.

Retention

The Committee asked what evidence there is that this would help improve retention, given that the route already exists for final year students. Anecdotal evidence from the programme directors indicates that this route does help retention.

Students have been consulted about this proposal and are in favour which also indicates improved retention figures.

Paperwork

The paperwork states that there are 12 entry routes to the BA Econ programme, can this be clarified? NL confirmed that this is for Campus Solutions coding for each of the pathways.

It was noted that there was no programme specification submitted with the paperwork so it is difficult to ascertain what the pathway would be and the committee sought clarification of the following:

Will it be clear to students what pre-requisites are required to study certain units?

Is it clear at what point students will progress onto this exit route?

Is it clear which are core and which are compulsory units?

KC will discuss this with the programme directors and ensure that this is in the paperwork.

Agreed: The proposal will be re-submitted for approval via Chairs Action once the required amendments to the paperwork are made.

Action : KC to check that the BA Econ exit route pathway has its own Intended Learning Outcomes SoSS to resubmit the paperwork for approval by Chairs Action including programme specification with the following questions answered:

- Will it be clear to students what pre-requisites they require to study certain units?
- Is it clear at what point students will progress onto this exit route?
- Is it clear which are core and which are compulsory units?

5.4) MusM (SALC)

Reported: DB reported the proposal from SALC to amend the programme title from MusM (Instrumental and Vocal) to MusM (Instrumental and Vocal Music).

The request to add 'music' to the pathway title is made as currently students searching for MA programmes in Music enter 'music' as the keyword search on the University web page. As the current title does not contain this word these programmes do not show up thus potentially affecting recruitment.

Discussed: The Committee queried whether adding Music after Vocal offers a different connotation which could confuse students, notably overseas students and that from a competition and marketing point of view the programmes could therefore be something different to what is advertised.

SALC do not believe that this is the case; however ES will liaise with marketing to make sure that this title cannot be misconstrued.

Agreed: The proposal was APPROVED, subject to ES confirming with marketing that the addition of Music to the title will not confuse prospective students.

6. Collaborative Proposals

To receive and discuss: Paper from ES on Taught Collaborative Activity requiring discussion at PASC

Reported: ES presented her paper on Taught Collaborative Activity and the rationale behind its design.

Due to the increase in collaborative activity it is clear that a lot of approvals are being processed without being discussed at PASC and Faculty wants to ensure that the process is transparent and that there is a shared knowledge and understanding of the partnerships and proposals being submitted and discussed.

This paper seeks to highlight what paperwork PASC should be considering for all the differing types of collaborations.

Discussed: The Committee were very much in favour of this paper and felt that it was a very useful document in aiding discussions around collaborations.

It was felt that there were areas which could be expanded on within the document.

The inclusion for Dual Awards as this has been discussed at Senate and could be developed further. It was asked as to whether this would relate to existing 2+2 agreements. FS confirmed this had been discussed and will be considered as to whether they would be included in the Dual Awards.

The Committee asked whether on Point 6 of collaboration type 1, Non-Guaranteed Articulation Agreements, where it states 'Does the proposal raise any questions about degree regulations, e.g. Our guide to the regulations says NB: "The title 'X and Y' signifies that the distinct subjects X and Y each comprise more than one third of the credits of the programme and of the credits of the final year" and whether articulating students will have fulfilled this requirement and if not does it matter?' does matter.

ES reported that yes it does, however TLSO have yet to confirm this. It was noted that students have completed the 'with' requirements as with 2+2s we APL their first two years into our first year and UoM classifies from years two and three.

It was suggested that for collaboration types 6 and 7, there be further additions to the 'are responsibilities clear for' section to include academic advising and other areas of student support.

It was also suggested that an additional column be included to indicate the potential problems a collaboration could encounter e.g appointing external examiners, which institutions regulations will be applied etc.

Action: ES to update the collaborations paper with the above suggestions to keep as a live document

6.1) Renmin - Approval to Proceed Non - Guaranteed Articulation Agreement (SoSS)

Reported: KC spoke to the proposal.

This proposal seeks Approval to Proceed into further negotiations with the School of Economics at Renmin University in China, a 1+1 non-guaranteed articulation agreement allowing a minimum of three students a year to apply to study MSc Economics and MSc Financial Economics.

This proposal would see high performing students in their first year (must have obtained at least 80% in their first year modules and have achieved the required level in the standard English Language test) apply to come to Manchester for their second year.

This agreement follows a recent visit to Renmin from SoSS and is in line with other agreements with Renmin in other areas of the Faculty (e.g. SEED and AMBS)

Discussed: The Committee questioned the 'minimum of 3 students' requirement and what would be the financial implications if only two students applied?

It was confirmed, and is stated in the draft progression agreement, that the minimum of three refers to the financial arrangement for discounted fees, therefore if only two students apply the discounted fee rate would not apply. There will not be a maximum number set.

The Committee queried why there is a request for additional Campus Solutions codes for these programmes. NL confirmed this is for reporting and fee purposes.

The proposal was APPROVED

Agreed:

7. Approval in Principle of Taught Element of proposed PhD programme

NRD1 - Data Analytics with Integrated Masters (SoSS)

Reported: ME presented the proposal.

The PhD proposal for Data Analytics with Integrated Masters is a necessary requirement of a successful ECRS -funded Centre for Doctoral Training Bid in Data Analytics and Society. The NRD1 document has been considered by the Faculties PGR Committee and PASC is being asked to consider the programme as it incorporates a 180 credit taught masters.

The framework for the proposal has been agreed by four institutions; Leeds, Manchester, Liverpool and Sheffield and each will develop and contribute a unit to the degree. This format has been deemed desirable as it will attract people from different backgrounds and incorporates the notion of involvement of external partners.

The programme is owned and administered by SoSS but will have input from SEED and AMBS as stakeholders as the degree is an interdisciplinary PhD programme.

Discussed: Programme Title

The Committee queried the use of Integrated Masters in the title as at UoM this refers to a 4-year undergraduate programme. ME noted that the programme already exists in Leeds and Sheffield as it stands and it is a common title in social sciences where the CDT model is prevalent. ME further noted that the advantage of the integrated masters is that it avoids the issue of students coming in and completing a masters then leaving without progressing to the PhD.

The Committee questioned whether there would be internal competition with the newly approved MSc Data Science programme. It is not expected this will be the case as this is designed as a research training programme, unlike the standard MSc so has a different focus. Numbers are also expected to only reach around 5 per institution. Modules would still be viable as students will attend from all institutions although the module would only be available to students on the PhD/Integrated Masters programme.

It was confirmed that the title will need to go to Senate for approval.

Programme Structure

Questions were asked over the dissertation module element and whether it can be incorporated into the thesis? ME noted that it isn't a dissertation, more a 30cr research project.

Is the programme therefore a research masters? ME stated no as each module will be taught and assessed in the same way as a standard taught programme in order to allow for progression onto the PhD.

Also noted:

Clarification is required over the 5 credit modules and assessment loads.

The programme specification and module outlines do not detail any Intended Learning Outcomes. There is no detailed exit point at the end of the first year. Is there a PG Cert exit point within year one and can students exit with PG diploma for completing 120 credits at the end of year one or year two?

Degree regulations

As course units will be taught at different institutions, the Committee queried who has responsibility for assessment and how the exam boards will work. ME confirmed that each institution will assess their own taught unit and pass marks across. There will be 1 external examiner for the programme for all institutions to allow for consistency of treatment. The Committee queried who would be responsible for funding and approving the external examiner.

Clarification is needed as to which of the contributing Universities degree regulations the course will be governed by in order to ensure consistent practice when making decisions on resits, compensation, pass marks etc. It is expected this will be clarified fully in the NRD2 and NL will work with ME to ensure this happens.

Resources

The Committee noted that on page 7, para.2 of the NRD1 proposal, it states that *“students are likely to be analysing very large datasets and would require access to shared computational resource; we anticipate however that this could be absorbed within humanities allowance”*. The question was asked as to whose budget this referred to and whether this had been discussed.

There is a requirement to establish how the programme and plan codes will be set up on Campus Solutions and whether separate codes will be required for this taught masters element.

UKVI requirements need to be complied with and there are questions as to who will be organising CASS’ and submitting the information to the border agencies.

Agreed: The Committee makes the following recommendations for the progression to NRD2:

- i) An operational document should be supplied with NRD2 to outline the following:
 - How units will be assessed locally.
 - What the process for returning marks to home institutions will be.
 - What the external examining arrangements will be including who will fund.
 - Whose degree regulations will be used.
- ii) Senate will need to approve the new award title.
- iii) Clarify how the programme plan will be set up on Campus Solutions?
- iv) Clarify whether there is a PgCert exit point and if the exit point for PgDip is at the end of year one or year two.
- v) HoS signatures are required on the NRD1 from SoSS.
- vi) Establish whether access to computational resource can be absorbed within Humanities allowance.
- vii) Ensure that the issues surrounding the UKVI requirements are flagged to other partners and resolutions found.

8. *Approvals by Panel since the last meeting

Received: Details of all approval panels since 23rd November 2016

9. *Approvals, Amendments, Suspensions and Withdrawals by Chairs Action since the last meeting

Received: Details of all Programme Approvals, Amendments, Suspensions and Withdrawals approved by Chair’s Action since 23rd November 2016

9.1) MGeog - Programme Withdrawal

Reported: MD reported that the decision had been taken to withdraw the MGeog and its associated pathways, MGeog with International Development and MGeog with Planning due to a decline in student numbers.

Recruitment for the MGeog stands at:

2013/2014 - 18

2014/2015 - 12

2015/2016 - 4

2016/2017 - 1

2017/2018 - 1

The International Development pathway currently has 11 students across the whole programme and the planning pathway 4.

It is believed that the introduction of the PGT loans has severely impacted the benefit of studying an Integrated Masters therefore these programmes are no longer viable.

Discussed: The Committee queried whether there were still applications and/or offers pending for 2017 entry and if so the programmes will still need to run for 2017 and current students must be allowed to complete the programmes.

It was questioned as to why two core units were being kept if there are no students to attend them? Faculty sets unit viability at a minimum of 10 students. MB will take this back to the Programme Directors and seek clarification.

Agreed: The withdrawal was APPROVED, subject to the following actions being completed:

Actions: MB to discuss with the programme directors the request to retain 2 core units and report back to RW.

Students with offers pending must be allowed to enter onto the MGeog programme and its associated pathways in 2017. SEED will report back to RW and the withdrawal date amended in line with this if necessary.

11. *Current Portfolio

Received: A full list of all Programme Approvals, Amendments, Suspensions, Withdrawals and Collaborations

12. *Approval of External examiner since the last meeting

Received: A list of external examiner appointments made since 23rd November 2016

13. Any other business

None

14. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 29th March 2017, 2-4pm, Whitworth Council Chamber

ACTIONS

Agenda Item	Action	By Whom
5.1	SALC are required to re-examine the language units for the MA Classics and Ancient History programme in line with the Faculty Policy on the use of Level 6 units at Level 7, to ensure compliance with the enhancement requirements before re-presenting the proposal for consideration.	PL
5.2	Law to re-examine the structure of the LLM programmes and the design of the non-credit bearing research units students are expected to attend in line with the Periodic Review recommendations of 2012/13.	BW
5.3	KC to check that the BA Econ exit route pathway has its own Intended Learning Outcomes	KC
	SoSS to resubmit the paperwork for approval by Chairs Action including programme specification with the following questions answered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it be clear to students what pre-requisites they require to study certain units? • Is it clear at what point students will progress onto the exit route? • Does the paperwork specify which are core and which are compulsory units? 	AO/SoSS
5.4	ES will liaise with SALCs Marketing Officer to clarify the addition of 'Music' to the MusM (Instrumental and Vocal) will not cause confusion to students regarding programme content.	ES
6	ES to update the Collaborations paper to incorporate the areas of student support within the 'are responsibilities clear for' column and also add an additional column to note potential problems and keep as a live document.	ES
7	NL to work with ME to ensure the following recommendations made by the Committee for the PhD Data Analysis with Integrated Masters are carried out and incorporated into the NRD2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An operational document should be supplied with the NRD2 to outline the following: How units will be assessed locally. What the process for returning marks to home institutions will be. What the external examining arrangements will be including who will fund. Whose degree regulations will be used. • Senate will need to approve the new award title. • Clarify how the programme / plan will be set up on Campus Solutions? • Clarify the whether there is a PgCert exit point and if the exit point for PgDip is at the end of year 1 or year 2. • HoS signatures are required on the NRD1 from SoSS. • Establish whether access to computational resource can be absorbed within Humanities allowance. 	NL/ME

9.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the issues surrounding the UKVI requirements are flagged to other partners and resolutions found. 	MB/RW
	<p>MB to discuss with the programme directors the reasoning behind the request to retain two core units from the MGeog, given that the programme is being withdrawn and report back to RW.</p>	
	<p>Students with offers pending on the MGeog and its associated pathways must be allowed to enter onto the programme in 2017. SEED will report back to RW and the withdrawal date of the programmes amended in line with this if necessary.</p>	MB/PDs/RW