

Guidance on the implications of the move to the Taught Course Regulatory Framework (TCRF) for Undergraduate and Postgraduate courses

Background

1. Academic Board on the 21 January 2015 agreed in broad terms the development of Integrated Masters awards and established a small Task and Finish Group with representation from each Institute to propose detailed regulatory matters, including shift to a single 30/15 credit framework.

Discussion

2. The Task and Finish Group met on four occasions and discussed the development of a new single regulatory framework for all taught courses at the University from Levels 4 to 8 to enable the Integrated Masters to exist and operate with existing or new postgraduate provision.
3. The main implications and changes are set out below:

Credit Size	Implementation dates/Implications
<p>At the meeting of Academic Board on the 21 January the advantages of moving to a common credit size was identified as it would facilitate the delivery of joint provision at Level 7 for PGT and Integrated Masters. The use of 15/30 credit modules was considered far less disruptive given that there are considerably more modules at Levels 4, 5 and 6 and that there had previously been a significant amount of work at these levels following the Curriculum 2013 initiatives.</p>	<p>All new Masters courses proposed from 1 September 2015 should be based on 15/30 credit modules. It was agreed that all existing Masters should be revised to reflect the new credit sizes at their next period review (or earlier). Where shared module provision is provided then course teams will need to discuss and agree this timing. This work should be completed by 2020/21 at the very latest.</p>
Reassessment	
<p>The number of reassessment opportunities for students undertaking postgraduate taught courses should be increased from two to three bringing it into line with undergraduate courses. The pattern of reassessment would change from: (1)Take (2)Reassessment or Retake (3) Reassessment To (1)Take</p>	<p>With effect from 1 September 2016</p>

<p>(2)Reassessment (3)Retake (4) Reassessment</p> <p>In addition, the timing of reassessment opportunities should be simplified by only taking place in the summer reassessment period.</p>	<p>This will make the communication with students easier regarding deadlines for this reassessment and reduce the burden on staff having to write additional reassessment tasks.</p>
<p>Grades</p>	
<p>Continuing to use Grades for UG provision and percentages for PGT provision is feasible but there would be considerable issues in delivering and assessing students on shared modules. It is therefore proposed that Grades rather than percentages should be used for all taught provision. This proposal has been widely supported by staff.</p>	<p>With effect from 1 September 2016</p> <p>Adopting grades for all taught provision makes possible the delivery of joint modules for Integrated Masters and postgraduate provision.</p> <p>Deferring this for one year allows for documentation and programme specifications to be updated in a timely manner and for appropriate staff development to be undertaken.</p>
<p>Pass Grade</p>	
<p>The current pass grades/percentage is D- (UG) and 50% (PGT). The group discussed at length what the pass grade should be at Level 7.</p> <p>The majority of members agreed that it should be D-. A smaller minority thought it should be C-.</p> <p>The arguments for adopting D- is that it would be a common grade across all levels and there would be reduced risk of student or staff misunderstanding.</p> <p>A pass grade describes that the learning outcomes have been achieved. The grade used is a 'line in the sand' and is simply nomenclature to describe when credit has been achieved.</p> <p>A mapping between grades and Pass, Merit and Distinction already exists within the regulations for HNC/D courses and could be expanded to be used for PGT courses.</p>	<p>With effect from 1 September 2016</p>
<p>Progression from Level 6 to Level 7</p>	
<p>The current progression rule from Level 4 to 5 and from 5 to 6 is that a student must pass a minimum of 90 credits at the lower level before being allowed to</p>	<p>With effect from 1 September 2016</p>

<p>progress to the next level. The group discussed at length what the progression rule should be at Level 6.</p> <p>In the paper to Academic Board in January it was proposed that the rule should be “Progression requirement for level 7 to be no trailed modules, and achievement at equivalent of 2:2 or above for level 6”</p> <p>The group agreed that the progression regulation should be a minimum of 240 credits at levels 4 and 5 (no ‘trailed’ modules) and a minimum of 90 credits at level 6. However, there was not a consensus that a student should be required to achieve a minimum profile of 2:2 or higher.</p> <p>The majority of the group considered that students would be admitted to an integrated masters course, a single course and that this is quite different to being admitted to a separate PGT course. The University uses a credit accumulation model and in no other situation do we prevent students from progressing on a course based upon performance having passed a module.</p> <p>1 September <i>Academic Board is asked to consider and agree if a minimum profile of 2:2 or higher should also be included in the progression rules.</i></p>	
<p>Classification</p> <p>In the paper to Academic Board in January it was suggested that classification should “..be classified on similar basis to BA/BSc (Hons)”</p> <p>The group discussed various models and believed that the classification methods should be based on the methods used at the end of level 6.</p> <p>It is proposed that the existing Level 5/6 and Level 6 only models should be revised to consider performance at Levels 6 and 7 and Level 7 only using the same criteria. This would be therefore consistent and easier for staff and students to understand.</p> <p>The group did recognise that further work on the classification models might be advantageous but it was agreed that the group should not be distracted by this issue at this stage and that a full review should be conducted after this first year of a recently revised classification model.</p>	<p>With effect from 1 September 2016</p>

Aegrotat Awards	
<p>When reviewing the differences between the two regulations the group noted that it is not currently possible to make an Aegrotat award to a postgraduate student.</p> <p>The group could see no reason why this should be the case and recommends that this is available to all students who encounter exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>With effect from 1 September 2015</p>