UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON

UNIVERSITY QUALITY COMMITTEE
HLSS SQC VALIDATION PANEL 2004-2005

ACADEMIC APPROVAL RECORD Reference – 1259

CONFIRMED

Recommendation to University Quality Committee

The HLSS SQC Validation Panel was asked to Review and Revalidate undergraduate Deaf Studies and Interpreting provision and is pleased to recommend to University Quality Committee approval of the following proposals:

REVIEW

Pathway Code	Pathway Title	Final Award	Intermediate Awards	Modes of delivery	Specialist /Joint
DJ/DS	Deaf Studies	BA(Hons)	BA, DipHE, CertHE	FT, PTD, PTDE	Joint
DS/IN	Interpreting (British Sign Language /English)	BA(Hons)	BA, DipHE, CertHE Combined Studies	FT, PTD, PTDE	Specialist
DS/INF	Interpreting (British Sign Language/English) plus foundation (4 years) [1]	BA(Hons)	BA, DipHE, CertHE Combined Studies	FT	Specialist

REVALIDATIONS

Pathway Code	Pathway Title	Final Award	Intermediate Awards	Modes of delivery	Specialist /Joint
DJ/DS	Deaf Studies	BA(Hons)	BA, DipHE, CertHE	FT, PTD, PTDE	Joint
DS/IN	Interpreting (British Sign Language /English)	BA(Hons)	BA, DipHE, CertHE Combined Studies	FT, PTD, PTDE	Specialist
DS/INF	Interpreting (British Sign Language/English) plus foundation (4 years)[2]	BA(Hons)	BA, DipHE, CertHE Combined Studies	FT	Specialist

VALIDATION

Pathway Code	Pathway Title	Final Award	Intermediate Awards	Modes of delivery	Specialist /Joint
	NONE				

DELETIONS

Pathway Code	Pathway Title	List all Awards to be deleted	Modes of delivery	Specialist /Joint	Last recruitment date	Final completion date for students
DS/DS[3]	Deaf Studies	BA(Hons),	N/A	Specialist	N/A	No students have

---

[1] 05/06/07 – The pathway title was amended to reflect the title set up on SITS as confirmed by the pathway leader.

[2] 05/06/07 – The pathway title was amended to reflect the title set up on SITS as confirmed by the pathway leader.

| | | BA, DipHE, CertHE | | | | ever enrolled on this pathway |

MODULES – see appendix 9 for pathway structures

NEW MODULES

Module Code	Module Title	Level	Credits	Core/Core Option or Elective
DF3003	Deaf-blind Policy, Guiding and Communication practices	3	15	Core for Deaf Studies Core option for Interpreting
DF3000	Deaf Studies Project (15 credits)	3	15	Core option for Deaf Studies
DF3001	Deaf Studies Project (30 credits)	3	30	Core option for Deaf Studies
DF3004	Reciprocity – work and research activities in the Deaf Community	3	15	Core option for Deaf Studies

EXISTING MODULES CONTRIBUTING TO PATHWAY

Module Code	Module Title	Level	Credits	Core/Core Option or Elective
DF1000	Deaf Perspectives	1	15	Core for both Deaf Studies and Interpreting
DF1100	An Introduction to disability issues	1	15	Core for both Deaf Studies and Interpreting
DF1102	Basic British Sign Language	1	15	Core option
DF2000	Language development and deafness	2	15	Core for both Deaf Studies and Interpreting
DF2001	Targeting the Deaf Community: Research methodology	2	15	Core for both Deaf Studies and Interpreting
DF2203	Intermediate I British Sign Language Part 1	2	15	Core option
DF2205	Intermediate I British Sign Language Part 2	2	15	Core option
DF3002	Technology issues and deafness	3	15	Core for Deaf Studies Core option for Interpreting
DF3300	The Sociolinguistics of BSL	3	15	Core for Interpreting and Core option for Deaf Studies
DF3302	Intermediate II British Sign Language Part 1	3	15	Core option
DF3304	Intermediate II British Sign Language Part 2	3	15	Core option
IG0000	Basic British Sign Language Part 1	0	15	Core for DS/INF
IG0001	Basic British Sign Language Part 2	0	15	Core for DS/INF
IG0002	Elementary British Sign Language Part 1	0	15	Core for DS/INF
IG0003	Elementary British Sign Language Part 2	0	15	Core for DS/INF
IG0004	Intermediate I British Sign Language Part 1	0	15	Core for DS/INF

---

[3] A Deaf Studies specialist pathway has never been validated, however a record for this pathway exists on SITS. It was agreed during the review and revalidation process that this pathway record should be deleted from SITS.

IG0005	Intermediate I British Sign Language Part 2	0	15	Core for DS/INF
IG0006	Intermediate II British Sign Language Part 1	0	15	Core for DS/INF
IG0007	Intermediate II British Sign Language Part 2	0	15	Core for DS/INF
IG1004	Intermediate BSL enhancement for interpreters	1	30	Core
IG1100	Basic Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural skills for Interpreters - part 1	1	15	Core
IG1101	Basic Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural skills for Interpreters - part 2	1	15	Core
IG1102	Introduction to Sign Linguistics	1	15	Core for Interpreting and Core option for Deaf Studies
IG1103	Introduction to Interpreting Issues	1	15	Core
IG2002	Advanced British Sign Language Enhancement for Interpreters part 1	2	15	Core
IG2200	Advanced Bi-lingual Bi-cultural skills for Interpreters part 1	2	15	Core
IG2201	The Syntax of British Sign Language	2	15	Core for Interpreting and Core option for Deaf Studies
IG2202	Consecutive interpreting 1	2	15	Core
IG2203	Advanced Bi-Lingual/Bi-Cultural Skills for Interpreters	2	15	Core
IG2205	Consecutive Interpreting part 2	2	15	Core
IG3004	Work Placement	3	30	Core
IG3006	Advanced British Sign Language Enhancement for Interpreters part 2	3	30	Core option
IG3300	Simultaneous Interpreting 1	3	15	Core
IG3301	Interpreting in Specialist Setting and Professionalism	3	15	Core
IG3303	Simultaneous Interpretation 2	3	15	Core

MODULES FOR DELETION

Module Code	Module Title	Level	Credits	Date to be deleted
DF1001	Elementary British Sign Language	1	15	September 2005*
DF2201	Deaf Issues in Disability Policies	2	15	September 2005*
DF3301	Deaf Culture and History	3	15	September 2005*
DF3305	Independent Study in Deaf Studies	3	15	September 2005*
IG1002	NVQ Level 3 British Sign Language Part 1	1	15	September 2005*
IG1004	Intermediate British Sign Language Enhancement for Interpreters	1	30	September 2005*
IG2206	Independent Study for Interpreting (BSL)	2	15	September 2005*
IG3000	Project Interpreting (BSL) (15 Credits) (Sem 1)	3	15	September 2005*
IG3001	Project Interpreting (BSL) (15 Credits) (Sem 2)	3	15	September 2005*
IG3002	Project Interpreting (BSL) (30 Credits) (Year)	3	30	September 2005*
IG3003	Interpreting for Deaf Blind People (Sem 2)	3	15	September 2005*
IG3005	Advanced British Sign Language Enhancement for Interpreters Part 2	3	15	September 2005*
IG3305	Independent Study for Interpreting (BSL)	3	15	September 2005*

*subject to resit and retake arrangements for full and part time students as applicable.

DATE OF THE NEXT REVIEW
The next reviews of undergraduate Deaf Studies and Interpreting pathways are scheduled to take place by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year.

In support of these recommendations, the Standing Panel provides the following reports of its considerations:
- The Academic Approval Record (AAR), which provides an evaluative summary of significant issues and outcomes
- The Standing Panel Record (SPR), which provides a detailed account of the process undertaken and evidence to support the statements made in the AAR.

The Standing Panel is aware that the University Quality Committee reserves the right to review all decisions made by the Standing Panel, to ratify approvals and to follow up on any issues identified in the AAR as the Committee sees fit.

Academic Approval Record

1.   Background to the Proposal

Provide a brief context.
This review and revalidation was the very first undertaken by the HLSS SQC Validation Panel. The previous review had taken place in 99-00, with the next proposed consideration taking place in 03-04. This has subsequently been extended to 04-05. The changes proposed to the pathways were not considered to require a proposal plan to ADP.

2.   Level of Scrutiny

Provide brief details about the level of scrutiny exercised by the Panel.
This being the first review and revalidation undertaken by the HLSS SQC Validation Panel, the pathways were given thorough consideration. The school opted to undertake the review and revalidation of the Deaf Studies and Interpreting pathways alongside each other, given the overlap between the subject matter and the teaching staff involved.   The school aimed to review the pathways in semester 1 of 04-05 and once closed, to revalidate the pathways during semester 2. There was some slippage of deadlines, however the school did succeed in closing the review stage before proceeding to the revalidation stage. The Academic Approval Record for the review of the Deaf Studies and Interpreting pathways was ratified by UQC and is included as an appendix to this AAR. As a result, this AAR focuses on the revalidation stage of the process. The review AAR will be published on the HERO website for TQI purposes. The review meeting notes are also included as appendices to this AAR.

3.   Summary of findings

Provide a brief summary of the Panel's conclusions.
The Panel were happy to validate both titles subject to some amendments to the documentation and to the provision of additional supporting information.   The SQC Validation Panel learned some valuable lessons during this process, the feedback from which will feed unto subsequent Validation Panel review and validation activity.

4.   Professional, Statutory, Regulatory Body Involvement

Was a professional, statutory or regulatory body (PSRB) involved in the process?	No
Which PSRB was involved?	
Give details of accreditation / recognition processes and the PSRB's conclusions	

5.   Collaborative Arrangements

Are any collaborative partners involved with the programme?	No
If yes, what is the nature of the relationship? Please make reference to the Typology of Collaborative Academic Provision.	
Were any significant concerns about collaborative partner, the relationship or the management of the programmes raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	
If yes, please briefly note the areas of concern here and provide the specific detail in the appropriate section(s) below.	

If desired, please add any further comments about the collaborative arrangement, including any examples of good practice.

6. Programme Aims and Outcomes

Are the programme aims clearly specified?	Yes
Are the programme learning outcomes clearly described?	Yes
Do the programme learning outcomes relate to the programme aims?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about the programme aims and outcomes raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	Yes

| If yes, please describe below the concerns and the actions taken and the Panel's final decision.

Both the Deaf Studies and Interpreting staff teams were asked to resubmit pathway documentation which mapped the pathway and module learning outcomes so that progression was clearly articulated. They were also asked to review the wording and number of learning outcomes contributing to the pathways and modules.

This action was addressed in the resubmitted documentation and was closed by the Panel. |
|---|

If desired, please add any further comments about programme aims and outcomes, including any examples of good practice.

Is the assessment strategy appropriate for the programme aims and outcomes?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about the assessment strategy raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No

If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.

If desired, please add any further comments about the assessment strategy, including any examples of good practice.

7. Curricula and Assessment

a. Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation

If a periodic review has been undertaken, is there evidence that the curriculum has been kept up-to-date?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about the currency of the curriculum raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No

If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.

If desired, please add any further comments about the currency of the curriculum, including any examples of good practice.

Is the curriculum design of the provision appropriate to the programme's aims and outcomes?	Yes
Is the curriculum organisation of the provision appropriate to the programme's aims and outcomes?	Yes
Is the curriculum content of the provision appropriate to the programme's aims and outcomes?	Yes
Is the provision in line with the subject benchmark or equivalent?	Yes
Where appropriate, is the provision consistent with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about the curriculum design, organisation or content of the provision, or on the way in which the proposal addressed the subject benchmark or FHEQ raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	Yes

If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.

The Validation Panel were concerned that progression (FHEQ) was not tackled satisfactorily in the original submission documentation, however this was subsequently addressed in the resubmission documentation and the corresponding action closed.

During the revalidation stage, the Interpreting team did not submit documentation relating to level 0 of the pathway. The Validation Panel requested this be submitted. The documentation was received and following consideration by Panel members and the external adviser, the four year pathway was revalidated.

If desired, please add any further comments about the curriculum design, organisation and content of the provision, or the use made of subject or qualification benchmarks, including any examples of good practice.

The Interpreting team were commended on the design and implementation of the work placement. The Validation Panel were impressed that this module had been used as a model for work placements in other institutions.

b. Assessment

Is the assessment design and practice appropriate for the programme aims and outcomes?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about assessment design and practice raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	Yes

If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.

The team had alluded to the fact that they were considering making changes to the module assessments in the next academic year. The Validation Panel asked the Deaf Studies staff team to instead make the changes during the revalidation stage of this process.

This action was addressed in the resubmitted documentation and was closed by the Panel.

If desired, please add any further comments about assessment design and practice, including any examples of good practice.

8.   Learning Opportunities

a. Learning and Teaching

Is the learning and teaching strategy appropriate to the programme aims and outcomes?	Yes
Are the learning and learning activities appropriate to the programme aims and outcomes?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about the learning and teaching strategy or activities raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No

If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.

If desired, please add any further comments about learning an teaching strategy or activities, including any examples of good practice.

The Deaf Studies staff were commended on their use of technology supported learning in learning and teaching.

The Interpreting staff team were praised on their innovative use of technology supported learning, teaching quality and the students' contribution to research.

b. Student Progression and Achievement

Are the entry qualifications appropriate?	Yes
If a periodic review has been undertaken, is profile of the students' entry qualifications in line with the specified requirements?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about entry qualifications or their profile raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	
If desired, please add any further comments about entry qualifications or profile, including any examples of good practice.	

If a periodic review has been undertaken, are the rates of, and trends in, student progression satisfactory?	Yes
If a Revalidation has been undertaken, are the rates of and trends in student completion satisfactory?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about the rates of and trends in student progression and completion raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	
If desired, please add any further comments about rates of and trends in student progression and completion, including any examples of good practice. The Validation Panel asked the Deaf Studies staff team to provide them with staff/student ratios in their resubmitted revalidation documentation. This matter was addressed by the staff team.	

If a periodic review has been undertaken, is the level of student achievement satisfactory? *(SP's may wish to use notions of performance used in subject benchmarks, e.g. threshold / modal)*	Yes
Were any significant concerns about the level of student achievement raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	
If desired, please add any further comments about qualifications awarded or the level of student achievement, including any examples of good practice.	

c. Student Support and Guidance

Are the arrangements for admission and student induction satisfactory?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about admission and student induction raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	
If desired, please add any further comments about admission and student induction, including any examples of good practice. The Validation Panel commended the Deaf Studies staff team on the obviously well-supported students they had met with. The Interpreting staff were commended on the positive comments received from the students which the Validation Panel had met with.	

Are the arrangements for student support and guidance satisfactory?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about student support and guidance raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	

If desired, please add any further comments about student support and guidance, including any examples of good practice.

d. Learning Resources

Is the overall availability of learning resources satisfactory, e.g. learning materials, teaching accommodation, specialist equipment ICT and learning centres?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about learning resources raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	
If desired, please add any further comments about learning resources, including any examples of good practice.	

9.   Quality

Are suitable procedures in place for monitoring and evaluating the programme?	Yes
Has appropriate regard been paid to relevant sections of the QAA's Code of Practice?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about monitoring and evaluation procedures or regard to relevant sections of the Code of Practice raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	
If desired, please add any further comments about monitoring and evaluation procedures or the regard paid to relevant sections of the Code of Practice, including any examples of good practice.	

Is there evidence of the role played by External Examiners in curriculum development and quality enhancement?	Yes
Were any significant concerns arising from External Examiners or their reports raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	
If desired, please add any further comments about the contribution from External Examiners, including any examples of good practice.	

Is there evidence of the role played by student feedback in curriculum development and quality enhancement?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about the contribution and content of student feedback raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	
If desired, please add any further comments about student feedback, including any examples of good practice.	

Is there evidence of the role played by staff development in curriculum development and quality enhancement?	Yes
Is there evidence of the role played by peer review in curriculum development and quality enhancement?	Yes
Were any significant concerns about staff development or peer review raised by the Panel or the External Adviser?	No
If yes, please describe below the concerns, the action taken and the Panel's decision.	

> **If desired, please add any further comments about staff development or peer review, including any examples of good practice.**
>
> The Validation Panel commended the Deaf Studies staff team on the staff development they had undertaken. They were also congratulated on the success of their externally funded projects.
>
> The Interpreting staff tem were commended for the excellent external funding they generated.

10. Identification of issues that have institutional implications

Are there any issues, which have institutional implications?	No
If yes, please list these below:	

11. Action checklist for ongoing monitoring

Are there any issues the Panel feels should be considered further, developed or monitored?	Yes

If yes, please list these below, allocating for each issue the person or body responsible for closing out the issue, the date by which it must be done and the mechanism for closure.

Action Required	By Whom	By When	To be closed out by
To consider the student meeting feedback through annual monitoring.	Deaf Studies AMR writer	Next cycle of annual monitoring	SQC via annual monitoring.
To continue to talk to the subject librarian to ensure that the learning resources are up to date.	Interpreting Staff	Ongoing	SQC
To include references to the years PSRB visits and reports in Interpreting Annual Monitoring Reports.	Interpreting AMR writer	Future cycles of annual monitoring	SQC via annual monitoring.
To include references to the years PSRB visits and reports in Deaf Studies Annual Monitoring Reports.	Deaf Studies AMR writer	Future cycles of annual monitoring	SQC via annual monitoring.
To keep SQC informed of progress made with any proposed accreditation processed.	Subject staff	Ongoing	SQC

Signed (SQC Validation Panel Chair) ....…………… **Date** ....

Signed (SQC Chair) ....…………………............…………… **Date** ....

Validation Panel Record

Details of Panel and Participants

HLSS SQC Validation Panel

Academic Year: 2004-2005   **Chair:** Ms Jenny Rice   **Officer:** Ms Rachel Ford

HLSS SQC Membership
Membership of the Panel is on an ad hoc basis.

Validation Panel members designated to review the provision:
Ms Jenny Rice   Chair HLSS
Ms Wendy Bastable   Learning Centre
Dr Kay Biscomb   SSPAL
Dr Andy Bridges   SAS
Dr Urszula Clark

Validation Panel members designated to revalidate the provision:
Ms Jenny Rice   Chair HLSS
Ms Wendy Bastable   Learning Centre
Dr Kay Biscomb   SSPAL
Dr Andy Bridges   SAS
Mr Stuart Hanson   HLSS
Ms Debbie Orpin   HLSS

Independent External Adviser for the Revalidation:
Name: **Position:**
Prof John Richardson   Open University

Subject/Pathway Team Representative(s) from HLSS for the Review:
Mr Kristiaan Dekesel
Ms Joan Fleming

Subject/Pathway Team Representative(s) from HLSS for the Revalidation:
Mr Kristiaan Dekesel (Key Proposer)
Ms Sarah Bown
Ms Rebecca Fenton
Ms Joan Fleming
Mr John Hay
Ms Christine Jolly
Ms Sandra Pratt
Mr David Wolfe Rose

Interpreting Support provided by :
Mr Wesley Mehaffy
Ms Louise Rhodes
Mr Martin Ring
Ms Jo Taylor

Details of Process Undertaken

Summary of process:

Date	Activity
	Initial meeting
14/02/05 originally 14/01/05	Submission deadline for review documentation
24/02/05	Review documents received

04/03/05	Review meeting with staff
10/03/05 previously 25/02/05	Submission deadline for revalidation documentation
27/04/05	Revalidation documents received
12/05/05	Revalidation meeting with staff
12/05/05	Meeting with students
09/06/05	External adviser's final report received
30/06/05	Resubmission deadline for documentation
01/08/05 and 11/11/05	Resubmission documents received
24/11/05 – Interpreting 09/12/05 – Deaf Studies	All actions closed for this validation
Various	Discussed at SQC meetings

Documentation:
1. Review Document
2. Revalidation Document
3. Pathway specifications
4. Module specifications for new modules or existing modules which were amended
5. Pathway guides
6. Staff CV
7. Other Documents as applicable, were made available in the school archive

Adequacy of Documentation:
The documentation was received after the revised deadlines but was complete and fit for purpose. The Validation Panel asked for the revalidation documentation to be resubmitted, which was again submitted after the deadline.

Appendices:

Appendix	Documentation
1	Notes of initial meeting
2	Notes of meeting with students
3	Notes of review meeting with staff
4	Notes of revalidation meeting with staff
5	External adviser's comments and final report
6	HLSS SQC meetings minutes where this provision was discussed
7	Action checklist arising from the staff and student meetings
8	HERO Review AAR
9	Modules contributing to pathways

UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON

CONFIRMED BY CHAIR

School Quality Committee for School of Humanities, Languages and Social Sciences (HLSS) – 2004/2005

The review and revalidation of Deaf Studies and the review and revalidation of Interpreting have been devolved to HLSS SQC for completion during the academic year 2004-2005. On behalf of SQC, Ms Jenny Rice met with the proposing team including the Key Proposer, Mr Kristiaan Dekesel, to discuss submission documentation requirements and deadlines. The SQC Officer was not present, but agreed to record the outcome of the meeting.

Checklist of Documentation

A list of the core and other documentation to be provided to the SQC Validation Panel, either through submission or via the school archive room, is included appended to these notes.

Submission of documentation

Draft copies of the review documents will be submitted to the school by 20th December 2004. The documents will then be forwarded to the appointed readers. The school facilitator will receive feedback from the appointed readers and convey the outcome back to the Key Proposer.

The revised copies of the review document will be submitted to the school by 14th January 2005. The school will circulate copies to SQC Validation Panel members. Short meetings to discuss the review documents for Deaf Studies and Interpreting will be held, the feedback from which should be incorporated into the remaining submission documentation.

Draft copies of the remaining core documentation will be submitted to the school by 11th February 2005. The documents will then be forwarded to the appointed readers. The school facilitator will receive feedback from the appointed readers and convey the outcome back to the Key Proposer.

Revised copies of the remaining core documentation will be submitted to the school by 25th February 2005. The school will circulate copies to SQC Validation Panel members including the appointed external advisers.

Meeting dates

The Standing Panel meetings with staff to discuss the review document will be arranged for w/c 24th January 2005. It is proposed that the meetings for Deaf Studies and Interpreting are held separately, probably one in the morning and the other in the afternoon.   The school will liaise with the Key Proposer and Panel members to arrange these meetings.

The Standing Panel meetings with staff to discuss the revalidation documentation will be arranged for w/c 14th March 2005.   It is likely that there will be one meeting with Deaf Studies and Interpreting students which will take place before lunch with the two separate meetings with staff, taking place in the afternoon.   The school will liaise with the Key Proposer, Panel members and SQC Officer to arrange the meetings, the SQC Officer in turn will liaise with the external advisers regarding their attendance.

Ms J Rice will liaise with the Key Proposer regarding any additional requirements that may be needed in relation to interpreting for deaf staff and students.

External Advisers

The Key Proposer will identify two academic nominations for external advisers, one for each subject area and forward these to the Officer by Friday 19th November.

Ms J Rice will determine the role of any Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies required to be involved in the review and revalidation and will advise the SQC Validation Panel accordingly.

SITS Information

The Key Proposer will need to submit the Pathway Definition Forms and Module Definition Forms for any proposed new modules as possible to the SQC Officer.

ACTION CHECKLIST
- Review and revalidation of Deaf Studies
- Review and revalidation of Interpreting
- Mode of study : Full time and Part time day and evening
- SQC Validation Panel members – TBC and Andy Bridges

Action arising from	Responsibility	Action	Deadline date	Outcome
Submission and deadline agreement	Key Proposer	Copies of the draft review document to be submitted to the school.	20/12/04	
Submission and deadline agreement	Key Proposer	Copies of the revised review document to be submitted to the school.	14/01/05	
Submission and deadline agreement	Key Proposer	Copies of the draft remaining documents listed below to be submitted to the school.	11/02/05	
Submission and deadline agreement	Key Proposer	Copies of the remaining documents listed below to be submitted to the school.	25/02/05	
Submission and deadline agreement	School	To liaise with members of the proposing team, Validation Panel and SQC Officer to arrange a meeting with Deaf Studies staff in w/c 24th February 2005 to discuss the review document.		
Submission and deadline agreement	School	To liaise with members of the proposing team, Validation Panel and SQC Officer to arrange a meeting with Interpreting staff in w/c 24th February 2005 to discuss the review document.		
Submission and deadline agreement	School	To liaise with members of the proposing team, Validation Panel and SQC Officer to arrange a meeting with Deaf Studies staff in w/c 14th March 2005 to discuss the revalidation documentation.		
Submission and deadline agreement	School	To liaise with members of the proposing team, Validation Panel and SQC Officer to arrange a meeting with Interpreting staff in w/c 14th March 2005 to discuss the		

		revalidation documentation.		
Submission and deadline agreement	Key Proposer	To liaise with the school ensure that students attend the meeting planned with students in w/c 14th March 2005.		
Submission and deadline agreement	Ms J Rice	To liaise with the Key Proposer regarding any additional requirements that may be needed in relation to interpreting for deaf staff and students.		will
Submission and deadline agreement	Key Proposer	To advise the SQC Officer of two nominations for academic external advisers.	19/11/04	
Submission and deadline agreement	Ms J Rice	To determine the role of any Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies required to be involved in the review and revalidation and will advise the SQC Validation Panel accordingly.		
Submission and deadline agreement	Key Proposer	To arrange for the other documentation as listed below to be made available in the school archive.	W/c 14/03/04	
Submission and deadline agreement	Key Proposer	To submit MDFs and PDFs to the SQC Officer.	26/11/04	

Checklist of documentation
The documentation required for the review and revalidation of Deaf Studies and the review and revalidation of Interpreting as agreed with the SQC Validation Panel Chair.

For further details, see the review and validation handbook.

Core Documents	Submission Date	Comments
1. Proposal plan approved by the Academic Development Panel		
2. Review Document		
3. Revalidation Document		
4. Pathway specifications		
5. Module specifications for new modules or existing modules which are to be amended		
6. For current modules, module specifications or module guides		
7. Pathway guides		
8. Staff CVs		
9. Draft revised Memorandum of Co-operation		

Other Documents as applicable, these should be available in the school archive	**Comments**
10. School annual monitoring report to UQC	
11. UQC annual monitoring audit reports	
12. Assessment handbook	
13. Handbooks for students with disabilities	
14. Induction and welcome week documents	
15. Information about any school policies relevant to the Race Relations Amendment Act (RRAA), Special Education Needs Disability Act (SENDA) and the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA)	
16. Placement guides	
17. Project guides	
18. Relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body reports and correspondence	
19. School strategy documents	
20. Staff development programmes	
21. Study skills support documents	

Rachel Ford
HLSS SQC Officer

UNIVERSITY OF
WOLVERHAMPTON

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES SCHOOL QUALITY
COMMITTEE VALIDATION PANEL

Record of Validation Panel discussions with students

Proposal	**Revalidation of Deaf Studies**	Date / Time	**12th May from 12:15 p.m.**	Venue	**MC304, City Campus**
Present	**For the validation panel** – Dr Kay Biscomb (SSPAL), Ms Rachel Ford (QASD - Officer) and Prof John Richardson (Open University). Five Deaf Studies students				
Apologies	None				

Introduction

The five students present comprised 2 males and 3 females. One was studying at level 1, two at level 2 and two at level 3; all were full time. Each student was taking Deaf Studies jointly with a different subject including Sociology, Linguistics, English Language, Social Policy and Psychology. One student's domicile was overseas.

Given the limited time for the meeting, Dr Biscomb opened by asking the students why they had chosen this University and this pathway and then asked them to suggest issues they wished to raise in terms of good practice and recommendations for improvement.

STANDING PANEL QUESTIONS	RESPONSES
• Why did the students choose the University of Wolverhampton and/or their particular pathway.	Two students were from the local area and two students noted they had chosen this University because it was one of the few institutions offering Deaf Studies. One student had prior experience of BSL and wanted to pursue this further. The overseas student had chosen this University, in part, for the convenience of transport links back to their home country. One student had been impressed by the web site, which they found very helpful. Another had received good advice and information through clearing, noting that the person they spoke to had a very caring attitude and was able to discuss future prospects with them.
• Is the content of the course what they expected and relevant to the pathway they are studying?	One student noted they had found that Deaf Studies had opened their eyes and they had acquired a lot of knowledge. Some modules were felt to be more relevant than others. This student recognised the value of the transferable skills especially when applying for interviews for jobs. The year one student had only completed one semester but had found it very interesting. They had found it quite difficult to do signing practice at the same time as studying their joint subject which was new to them. Another student noted that the pathway provided a firm foundation in deaf studies which had proved interesting in the

	light of the other subject they were studying.
Programme Pathway Aims and Learning Outcomes	
• Is the content relevant to further study and prospective employment?	One student noted they had found it difficult to be able to afford to do voluntary work in the past so was now experiencing some difficulties in finding employment. In addition to a degree, this student is finding that employers expect some level of previous experience. They would have welcomed the opportunity to complete a work placement. Another student also agreed that a work placement would be helpful.
Curricula and Assessment a. Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation	
• Did the course meet the students' expectations? (e.g. flexibility/ choice/ content).	Timetabling had meant that one student could not take the Student Link module. The student noted that in retrospect they did not regret doing the modules they had chosen instead, but they would have welcomed more work placement opportunities, especially for students with limited previous experience. Some students have had paid employment during their studies but only one in a job directly linked to their studies. It was noted that most students have no other choice but to supplement their income during study.
• How relevant is what students are doing to their future aspirations ? (e.g. career or further study).	One student noted that the signing curriculum could be better in some aspects; for example less on gardening and more on issues relevant to younger people.
• Do students have any comments on the timetable or workload?	One student noted that their workload was currently quite heavy as a result of doing the deaf history module. The students were not aware that the deaf history module was not being revalidated. They supported this as they felt history was not as relevant by the time they reached year 3 of the pathway and that the subject was already adequately covered in existing modules. Generally the students prefer to study contemporary issues as opposed to historical. The modules which the students would like to see history replaced by were a work placement and deaf blind communication.
Learning Opportunities a. Learning and Teaching	
• How would students describe the quality of teaching they receive ?	One student noted that they had attended two lectures on mental health and genetics. They noted that for topics such as this they would welcome additional input from visiting speakers.
c. Student Support and Guidance • What careers advice have students received and from whom ?	One student would welcome more advice on other career options outside of interpreting and deaf support work. Another student had considered careers in speech therapy, as a learning mentor or as a youth worker as a result of studying on this pathway. They saw this as an extension of the part time work they were currently undertaking.

d. Learning Resources	
• How good are the Learning Centre services in terms of opening hours, access, user support and availability of books and journals?	The students noted that there were not always enough copies of the recommended reading in the Learning Centre. This was particularly noticeable on modules where reading lists overlap. One student also noted that it was sometimes difficult to access printers in the Learning Centre. Students have to pay to print.
• What electronic support is available e.g. TSL, on-line materials etc.?	The students noted that the resources on WOLF and in the Learning Centre are excellent.
Other	
• Do the students have any other points they wish to make?	Most of the students felt that Deaf Studies was perceived as the second class subject to Interpreting. One student who had moved from Interpreting to Deaf Studies did not feel this way. The students said this was not noticeable at the module level, but felt the Deaf Studies degree was seen as second class. The students felt the barrier was between students who could sign and those that couldn't. One student had visited another University and noted that Deaf Studies students have to be able to sign to join their course. Despite this, none of the students felt they had been marginalised. A second issue raised by the students was that they felt the research module could have less assessments. It currently has four.

Dr Biscomb thanked the students for attending the meeting and invited them to stay and enjoy the refreshments provided.

UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES AND SCHOOL OF SPORT, PERFORMING ARTS AND LEISURE STANDING PANEL

Record of Standing Panel discussions with students

Proposal	Review of Interpreting	Date Time	12/5/05	Venue	MC 304
Present	Jenny Rice, Wendy Bastable				
Apologies					

Note: *This question list is for guidance only - to inform and stimulate discussion during meetings with students. The list is by no means exhaustive and additional questions should be added as required. Standing Panel should reword questions as necessary to aid understanding.*

The questions are grouped under the headings used in the Academic Approval Record. Panel members will need to ensure that all headings listed here have been addressed at some stage during the review and validation process, but not necessarily through the staff and student meetings.

STANDING PANEL QUESTIONS	RESPONSES
Professional, Statutory, Regulatory Body Involvement	
• Are students aware of PSRB involvement on their award?	Not discussed
Collaborative Arrangements	
• Are students aware of collaborative arrangements on their award?	N/a
Programme Pathway Aims and Learning Outcomes	
• Why did the students choose the University of Wolverhampton and/or their particular pathway.	The programme has a high reputation. The students were impressed by staff they met on the Open Day. It had been an energetic day and the enthusiasm and helpfulness of staff was a big draw. Talked to ex student who is a now a member of staff.
• Is the content of the course what they expected and relevant to the pathway they are studying?	Yes
• Is the content relevant to further study and prospective employment?	Yes
• How are students made aware of learning outcomes?	
• Do students understand the relationship between learning outcomes, assessment and achievement ?	
Curricula and Assessment	
a. Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation	
• Did the course meet the students' expectations? (e.g. flexibility/ choice/ content).	Yes. One pt student said she had been able to do the course in 4 years rather than 6 years.

• What particular subject skills and knowledge have students acquired on the course ?	
• How relevant is what students are doing to their future aspirations ? (e.g. career or further study).	very
• What other skills (other than subject specific skills) have students acquired on the award ?	
• Have there been any opportunities for work placement, or working with employers ?	Yes. Good and timely advice about placements. Everyone got a work-based project near their home and came in regularly for tutorials.
• Do students have any comments on the timetable or workload?	No

b. Assessment	
• Can students describe how assessment works on their award? (e.g. methods and criteria).	
• Do students understand the assessment criteria and the methods employed?	
• What sort of feedback do students receive for assessed work ?	
• Is assessment formative as well as summative?	Comment that had to pass every module at level 0 to progress.

Learning Opportunities
a. Learning and Teaching

• Can students describe the range of learning and teaching methods used and how effective they are in helping them to acquire subject / key skills and knowledge ?	
• How would students describe the quality of teaching they receive ?	They were very positive about the support they got.
• What help is available to support study skills?	
• What guidance is provided and what support is given when students are undertaking project and/or independent study work ?	Tutorial support good.
• How would students describe the quality of course handouts (including Module and Pathway Guides) ?	

b. Student Progression and Achievement

• What are the entry qualifications for the award?	
• How would students describe the difference in demand between Levels 1, 2 and 3 (or 3 and 4 for post graduate awards) ?	
• What opportunities for further study are students aware of?	

c. Student Support and Guidance	
• Do you know who your Personal Tutor is?	Yes
• Can students describe the procedures for admission and induction ?	Yes
• How effective were these processes in helping students to settle down on the course ?	Very good
• How would students describe the quality of written guidance provided ?	Very good
• What sort of tutorial support is available?	Regular
• For anyone who has undertaken a placement or period of study abroad, what level of support was provided before and/or after their visit ?	Good preparation and regular support during placement.
• What other University support is available to you (e.g. Counselling and Careers) and has anyone used these services? If so, how useful were they ?	
• What careers advice have students received and from whom ?	
• What support is available for students returning from leave of absence?	
• What support is available for students joining at level 3?	

d. Learning Resources	
• How good are the Learning Centre services in terms of opening hours, access, user support and availability of books and journals?	
• What ICT support is there? Are opening hours, access, user support and availability of work stations and software appropriate?	
• What specialist equipment is available and does it meet student needs ?	

• Is the teaching and learning accommodation adequate ? • Is there adequate space for independent study ? • What electronic support is available e.g. TSL, on-line materials etc.?	
Quality	
• Would students recommend this award to other people ? If yes, what in particular would they single out as being good about the course ? • In what ways do staff gather the views of students ? And how do students receive feedback on issues raised by this feedback ? • Can students give examples of how their feedback has resulted in change ? • What do students know about student representation on Committees ?	
Other	
• How would students describe the quality of social and recreational space available to them ? • Do the students have any other points they wish to make?	Issue of whether to do the BSL level 2 in house or separately which costs £108

UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES SCHOOL QUALITY COMMITTEE
VALIDATION PANEL

CONFIRMED BY CHAIR

Record of Validation Panel discussions with staff

Proposal	Review of Deaf Studies	**Date / Time**	4th March 2005 from 9:30 a.m.	**Venue**	MU227, City Campus
Present	SQC Validation Panel – Ms Jenny Rice (Chair), Dr Urszula Clark (HLSS), Ms Wendy Bastable (Learning Resources) and Ms Rachel Ford (SQC Officer). Deaf Studies – Mr Kristiaan Dekesel and Ms Joan Fleming.				
Apologies	Dr Andy Bridges (SAS)				

Introduction

Ms Rice noted that this was the first meeting of the HLSS SQC Validation Panel and that members would be working through the new process and very much learning as they went along. The Officer agreed to note any lessons learned from the meeting in order that the process could be evaluated at the end of the academic year.

The Deaf Studies staff representatives were commended on the review document, which was felt to be very clear, and generally an excellent document. The Panel noted that any further documentation submitted should include page numbers.

The main omission in the document was the lack of referencing. There were mentions of good practice such as the Teacher Support Network and Student Directed Learning and references to the CACDP, however these were not backed up with evidencing. The Panel noted it would also have helped to include the aims of the pathway in the review document and to have left the guidance notes in the review template.

It was not clear from the documentation what banding level Deaf Studies attracted. Mr Dekesel noted that he had tried to find out this information himself, but had not yet received the information. Originally the funding had been at band B, however, some documents made reference to band C. It was agreed that it would be helpful to clarify this matter.

The Panel asked for clarification on the role of the professional body in relation to this pathway. The staff team submit a report to the CACDP each year, which is reviewed by an independent consultant. The CACDP also make occasional visits the University. They review the curriculum and accredit pathways. Deaf Studies staff are also part of the CACDP committee that ratifies accreditation across HE institutions. Some Deaf Studies modules contribute to the Interpreting pathway.

The Panel thought it would be helpful to included information on CACDP review and accreditation in the Annual Monitoring Report.

The staff noted that the University of Wolverhampton is currently the only university that has undergraduate accreditation from the CACDP. All other universities are accredited for their post graduate programmes.

The staff team noted that Deaf Studies was a new subject in 1992, and as such still a cutting edge subject. There are currently only three universities nationally offering Deaf Studies; there were four, but Durham closed their unit. The University of Wolverhampton is the highest recruiting university.

When it was first taught, the subject also had a role in promoting study for deaf students, addressing their language skills and campaigning on deaf issues. These are now covered, in the main, by Gateway, so Deaf Studies has moved from being an advocating subject to a more objective academic subject with a strong vocational focus.

The Panel asked what other subjects students combined Deaf Studies with. The staff noted that the Deaf Studies pathway is aimed at people who want to be signing professionals. Students study Psychology, for example, where it is important to be able to have first language contact. Other subjects in combination include Counselling, Social Care, Social Policy and Education. The third year of the pathway is vocational.

Ms Rice asked if the team had considered a Foundation Degree in Deaf Studies; they responded that they had not.

The review documentation indicated that Deaf Studies was now only offered as a joint pathway. The Officer noted that the specialist Deaf Studies pathway was still in use on SITS and agreed to find out if a deletion plan would need to be produced.

The joint pathway allows an emphasis on employability. The staff team have experienced some difficulties with timetable clashes, particularly with cross-school subjects and are currently working to address these clashes.

Ms Fleming noted that BSL is increasing in status all the time and she is encouraged that Deaf Studies students work in signing (e.g. as classroom assistants) while they study.

The Panel noted that the review document did not contain any information on student numbers. Mr Dekesel noted there were 30-35 Deaf Studies students in year 1 and that recruitment is stable. In addition, around 27 students registered on the Interpreting pathway take Deaf Studies modules.

Since the last review and revalidation, the school have rationalised the Deaf Studies and Interpreting portfolios. It was agreed that the two discrete subjects would be retained, but there had been a reduction down to 44 modules and a sharing of staff and modules across the two subjects.

Mr Dekesel noted that some Deaf Studies modules are available as electives to all students; for example Basic BSL has been taken by a student from Sport Studies.

The Panel asked what changes had been made to the curriculum to address retention issues. The staff noted that students could now see that the pathway was vocationally focussed and that there would be good job opportunities for them at the end of their studies.

The staff also noted that other measure besides curriculum changes had been used to address retention. Teaching is very student-centred and students are well supported by tutors. The assessment regime has also been changed and resits are now rare.

The Panel asked about changes made to the assessment regime since the last review. Mr Dekesel noted that there were still quite a lot of assessments in modules, however these were designed to test the different skills needed by Deaf Studies students. The Panel asked about the marking burden on staff as well as the assessment load for students. Mr Dekesel noted that the staff team meet annually to monitor the assessment workload for staff and students.

More recently the staff have introduced some computer aided assessments. Staff also use marking grids which help students determine what they need to do in their assessments and also helps staff with the marking process. Also all modules are taught and assessed by more than one staff member, which helps staff manage their marking workloads.

The staff accepted that marking of videos can be time-consuming and noted that they also use conjoint marking and moderation where staff watch student groups, facilitated by a staff member, in live discourse assessments.

Ms Fleming noted that the social learning space in MC block has proved very helpful to students and they can often be seen practicing their signing in there.

The staff noted that there is nationally a lack of deaf blind communicators, hence the plan to introduce modules in this area.

The Panel asked how research underpins teaching. It was noted that there are currently no post graduate opportunities at this university for Deaf Studies graduates.

Deaf Studies does not have a great deal of published research, as it is such a new subject. Students can be directed to psychology, linguistics and other disciplines for research resources and are also advised to find academic research and conference papers by named authors. A great deal of resources are available on the internet and on CD and students are directed to be discerning in their use of on-line material.

Students can almost be seen as being at the cutting edge of research because a lot of the work they do is being done for the first time. A number of student projects have been published and in some cases could be seen to be more post graduate than under graduate. It is quite difficult for students to underpin their studies with research when no-one has researched the subject area before.

With regard to staff research interests, these have been focussed on teaching and learning. As one of only three universities offering this subject, the staff are continuing to build on their reputation in Deaf Studies research.

Ms Bastable noted she would have liked to see a review of learning resources expenditure in the review document, along with the submission of learning resource statements.

Ms Ford asked if there were more deaf students on this pathway than other subjects. It was noted that during the early years of the subject it had attracted deaf students, however over time this had reduced to such a point that there were now no more deaf students on this pathway than any other. This was felt to be a credit to the work done by Gateway in encouraging deaf students into study.

The Panel asked how the staff team would manage an increase in student numbers given the extent of tutorial support currently offered to students.

The staff responded that while Interpreting student numbers may increase, there were no plans to grow the Deaf Studies subject area.

To help staff manage tutorial time, students are asked to email tutorial topics in advance and to come to tutorial sessions prepared to play an active role.

It was noted that income generation had been allocated to address possible student number increases, however, the staff had worked to maintain student numbers not to increase them.

In conclusion, the staff team noted that the Panel should be aware of the CACDP accreditation requirements and of likely developments in other awarding bodies.

Conclusions

The SQC Validation Panel asked the Deaf Studies staff team to resubmit the review document to include references to the supporting evidence and to include information on student numbers and retention and a review of the learning resources expenditure.

The Panel will make a recommendation in the Academic Approval Record that the Deaf Studies Annual Monitoring Report should include a reference to the years PSRB visits and reports.

The report made reference to some examples of good practice. The Panel commended the team on these and asked to see copies of the marking grid referred to in the meeting and asked for any subject policies mentioned in the review document (e.g. the Student Directed Learning document) to be made available in the school archive.

The Panel asked the Key Proposer to clarify and report back to the Panel on the funding band for Deaf Studies.

The Officer agreed to find out if a deletion plan was needed for the Deaf Studies specialist pathway.

With regard to the revalidation phase, the Panel confirmed that they would want to see separate pathway guides for Deaf Studies and Interpreting.

A nomination for the Deaf Studies external adviser is now urgent. The Key Proposer agreed to send the nomination to the Chair and Officer by 8th March 2005.

The Panel will want to meet Deaf Studies and Interpreting students and asked the Key Proposer to identify around three students per year from the Deaf Studies and Interpreting student groups.

Action Checklist

Action arising from	Responsibility	Action	Deadline date	Outcome
Review meeting 04/03/05	Staff team	To resubmit the **Deaf Studies** review document to include references to the supporting evidence and to include information on student numbers and retention and a review of the learning resources expenditure.	18/03/05	
Review meeting 04/03/05	SQC Validation Panel	To make a recommendation in the Academic Approval Record that the **Deaf Studies** Annual Monitoring Report should include a reference to the years PSRB visits and reports.	Tbc	
Review meeting 04/03/05	Staff team	To submit copies of the marking grid and to make any subject policies mentioned in the review document (e.g. the Student Directed Learning document) to be made available in the school archive.	18/03/05 Deaf Studies	
Review meeting 04/03/05	Key Proposer	To clarify and report back to the Panel on the funding band for **Deaf Studies**.	Tbc	
Review meeting 04/03/05	Officer	To find out if a deletion plan was needed for the Deaf Studies specialist pathway.	Tbc	
Review meeting 04/03/05	Key Proposer	To send the nomination for the **Deaf Studies** external adviser to the Chair and Officer.	08/03/05	

UNIVERSITY OF
WOLVERHAMPTON

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES SCHOOL QUALITY COMMITTEE
VALIDATION PANEL

CONFIRMED BY CHAIR

Record of Validation Panel discussions with staff

Proposal	Review of Interpreting	**Date / Time**	4th March 2005 from 9:30 a.m.	**Venue**	MU227, City Campus
Present	SQC Validation Panel – Ms Jenny Rice (Chair), Dr Urszula Clark (HLSS), Ms Wendy Bastable (Learning Resources) and Ms Rachel Ford (SQC Officer). Deaf Studies – Mr Kristiaan Dekesel				
Apologies	Dr Andy Bridges (SAS)				

The staff meeting for the review of Interpreting was due to follow the Deaf Studies meeting, however, it became apparent that only the Key Proposer was planning to attend the meeting. The Panel discussed rescheduling the meeting and asking that more staff attend, however the revised submission deadlines meant that the Deaf Studies and Interpreting reviews and revalidation were already behind schedule. It was also felt that most of the issues to be raised with the staff team were the same as those already discussed with the Deaf Studies staff.

It was agreed, therefore, that the Panel would hold a brief meeting with the Key Proposer to discuss the few issues specific to Interpreting and indicate which matters raised at the Deaf Studies meeting also applied to Interpreting.

The Panel asked the Key Proposer to talk about the difference between the two subjects of Deaf Studies and Interpreting. Mr Dekesel noted that students who studied Deaf Studies would expect to go on to employment as a colleague of deaf people. Interpreting students would expect to work as communicators for deaf people. With regard to the curriculum, students of both subjects study deaf culture, language development and deaf history but Deaf Studies enter with no BSL, while Interpreting students either enter via a foundation year or have stage 2 BSL. This difference in BSL skills has lead to a perception that Interpreting students are "better" than Deaf Studies students, however the staff work hard to dispel this perception.

The Officer noted that there did not appear to be any references in the review document to the Interpreting Foundation year. It was agreed that the review should include this information.

The Panel asked what feedback the staff team had received from Standing Panel members from 2000-2005 (as noted on page 8 of the review document). The Key Proposer noted that this had been received from Ms D Callery. It was noted that Ms Callery had been commenting in her capacity as SQC extra school member and not on behalf of the HLSS SSPAL Standing Panel.

The Panel noted the importance of staff taking ownership of the review and revalidation process and that they would expect the Interpreting staff to make every effort to attend the revalidation meeting.

Conclusions

The SQC Validation Panel asked the Interpreting staff team to resubmit the review document to include references to the supporting evidence and to include information on student numbers and retention, the Interpreting Foundation year and a review of the learning resources expenditure.

The Panel will make a recommendation in the Academic Approval Record that the Interpreting Annual Monitoring Report should include a reference to the years PSRB visits and reports.

The report made reference to some examples of good practice. The Panel commended the team on these and asked to see copies of the marking grid referred to in the meeting and asked for any subject policies mentioned in the review document (e.g. the Student Directed Learning document) to be made available in the school archive.

The Panel asked the Key Proposer to clarify and report back to the Panel on the funding band for Interpreting.

With regard to the revalidation phase, the Panel confirmed that they would want to see separate pathway guides for Deaf Studies and Interpreting.

A nomination for the Interpreting external adviser is now urgent. The Key Proposer agreed to send the nomination to the Chair and Officer by 8th March 2005.

The Panel will want to meet Deaf Studies and Interpreting students and asked the Key Proposer to identify around three students per year from the Deaf Studies and Interpreting student groups.

Action Checklist

Action arising from	Responsibility	Action	Deadline date	Outcome
Review meeting 04/03/05	Staff team	To resubmit the review document to include references to the supporting evidence and to include information on student numbers and retention, the Interpreting Foundation year and a review of the learning resources expenditure.	18/03/05	
Review meeting 04/03/05	SQC Validation Panel	To make a recommendation in the Academic Approval Record that the Interpreting Annual Monitoring Report should include a reference to the years PSRB visits and reports.	Tbc	
Review meeting 04/03/05	Staff team	To submit copies of the marking grid and to make any subject policies mentioned in the review document (e.g. the Student Directed Learning document) to be made available in the school archive.	18/03/05	
Review meeting 04/03/05	Key Proposer	To clarify and report back to the Panel on the funding band for Interpreting	Tbc	
Review meeting 04/03/05	Key Proposer	To send the nomination for the Interpreting external adviser to the Chair and Officer.	08/03/05	

UNIVERSITY OF
WOLVERHAMPTON

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES SCHOOL QUALITY
COMMITTEE VALIDATION PANEL

CONFIRMED BY CHAIR

Record of Validation Panel discussions with staff

Proposal	**Revalidation of Deaf Studies**	Date / Time	**12th May from 10:45 a.m.**	Venue	**MA Board Room, City Campus**
Present	**For the Validation Panel** – Ms Jenny Rice (HLSS - Chair), Ms Wendy Bastable (Learning Centre), Dr Kay Biscomb (SSPAL), Ms Rachel Ford (QASD - Officer), Mr Stuart Hanson (HLSS) and Prof John Richardson (Open University). **Deaf Studies** – Mr Kristiaan Dekesel (Key Proposer), Ms Joan Fleming, Mr John Hay, Ms Christine Jolly, Ms Louise Rhodes (Interpreter), Mr Martin Ring (Interpreter) and Mr David Wolfe Rose.				
Apologies	Dr Andy Bridges (SAS)				

Introduction

Ms J Rice thanked the staff team for the documentation submitted and noted that this meeting was now the opportunity for the Validation Panel to discuss the points of interest arising from the documentation.

Ms Rice noted that some further issues would need to be addressed outside of the meeting. These were identified as housekeeping issues which would be communicated to the staff team in writing following the meeting.

One of the housekeeping issues related to module titles being different on SITS and in the documentation; the Validation Panel suggested the team could take this opportunity to consider the appropriateness of the module titles, some of which are quite long. Mr Dekesel noted that some module titles are in line with PSRB requirements.

Professional, Statutory, Regulatory Body Involvement

Ms Rice noted that each Panel member would be leading on a particular section of the meeting. Dr Biscomb opened by asking about the accreditation referred to in the documentation, in particular how far the staff team had progressed with this.

Ms Fleming responded that the staff have been considering seeking CACDP (Council for the Advancement of Communication with Deaf People) approval for some modules. These are equivalent to NVQ level 2. If the validated modules do not map to the CACDP requirements, the team may consider BDA (British Deaf Association) or other accreditation.

It was noted that accreditation is a contentious issue in this subject area. The staff team need to consider issues such as the curriculum requirements of the accrediting body, the level of the accreditation and the requirement for smaller class sizes.

Mr Dekesel noted that, in addition to their Deaf Studies degree, employers require a clear indication of the students' sign language capabilities and as they are more familiar with external requirements than the University's modules, they often look for a professional qualification. At the moment, students are advised to study for the NVQ level 2 sign language outside of the University, although this is not an ideal situation. If the accreditation goes as planned, this process could be completed before the current level 2 students complete their degree.

Programme Pathway Aims and Learning Outcomes

Prof J Richardson noted that the Deaf Studies pathway appeared to have a lot of learning outcomes and invited the staff team to respond.

Mr Hay noted that the learning outcomes consisted of the broader pathway skills plus subject specific, intellectual and key skills.

Prof Richardson noted that the Validation Panel had queried whether some of them were really learning outcomes. Also, there were 18 learning outcomes across three modules, some of which were the same at each of levels 1-3 which made it difficult to map progression. Prof Richardson suggested the staff team take some time to consider what they are trying to achieve and articulate it more clearly in the documentation. The staff should also ensure that the two strands of theory and language (signing) are clearly differentiated. Prof Richardson noted that the Validation Panel had also had concerns over the mapping of the pathway to the module learning outcomes.

Prof Richardson noted that existing students will be able to take the new modules being validated and asked if students had been consulted.

The Validation Panel were advised that the new modules were being introduced as a result of student feedback, particularly around employability. The decision to delete the deaf history module came from MEQs (module evaluation questionnaires) after students commented on the repetition of material across a number of modules.

SENDA information suggests that deaf blind interpreters are still quite rare, so this, along with students comments on employability and their feedback on the deletion of a previous deaf blind module persuaded the staff that a module on this should be included.

Curricula and Assessment
Mr Stuart Hanson asked why the Deaf Studies pathway used IG coded project modules and not DF coded modules, especially as the IG coded modules were not required on the Interpreting pathway.

The Validation Panel were advised that this was a historical matter resulting from the time when the two subject areas merged and the staff team would welcome changing the module codes to DF. The Officer agreed to progress this matter with SITS.

With regard to Deaf Studies projects, staff align student's requests to staff expertise. Deaf Studies often do voluntary work and students have used work experience towards their project in the past. The staff confirmed that the Student Link module is a feasible elective for Deaf Studies students.

Students often undertake joint pathways with subjects from other schools. Most take three core / core option modules from each subject plus one other module from each school. For some subjects such as Psychology, students are restricted in their choice of other modules by professional body requirements.

Common joint subjects include Psychology, Education Studies, Social policy, Social Care and Linguistics. Less often students have studies joints with Drama, Law, Sport and Information Technology.

In the last year, the subject had undertaken a lot of minor modifications. The Validation Panel welcomed the rationale for doing this and asked if the changes had had the desired effect on retention and the other issues they had hoped to address.

The staff noted there had been improvements in retention and there had been a general improvement in grades. In addition, the students were more motivated when they passed modules which increased their confidence. As a result staff had not had to mark so many resits and staff acknowledged it was nice not to have to fail as many students.

The staff were asked what arrangements were in place for students who were unable, for whatever reason, to attend a live group assessment. The staff responded that another date would be arranged and volunteers would be found to make up the group. Students are allocated individual marks even for group work. It was noted that in group assessments, students are assessed on a variety of skills including the extent of their interaction and their contribution towards group etiquette.

The staff team were asked why there were no examinations in this pathway. Ms Fleming noted that learning sign language is a progressive skill and must be assessed accordingly. Learning theory better prepares students for research if they have time to learn, research and reflect while producing written work. The staff team have no desire to test a student's memory; they feel it is more important to have understanding and be able to analyse. Self directed learning feeds into this ethos. In addition student feedback suggests they don't want to have to do exams.

Dr K Biscomb asked the staff team how they would respond to a criticism that there was limited variety in the assessment methods used in this pathway and a tendency to over assess.

Ms Fleming noted that the staff did not consider the assessment methods to be limited as they used essays, reports, presentations and practicals. The staff team are currently considering implementing peer assessment and possibly on-line assessment.

With regard to over assessment, this may appear to be the case because students need to be assessed on their progress throughout the module. In the past, there was certainly over assessment but this has been addressed over the years and most modules now have between two and four assessment points.

The Panel asked if there were any ethics issues relating to the production of the questionnaire for deaf students in module DF2001. The staff responded that while students design a questionnaire, it is never used.

Learning Opportunities - Learning and Teaching
Ms W Bastable asked about the subject's Technology Supported Learning (TSL) Strategy.

It was noted that the subject's innovative use of TSL had lead to a number of teacher of the year nominations.

For theory modules, WOLF provides back up resources, links, contact information and the opportunity to chat with staff and other students. In future, the team hope to be able to include on-line formative tests and model answers.

With regard to sign language modules, there are plans, starting over the summer, to produce a dictionary of video clips.

Learning Opportunities - Student Support and Guidance
The Validation Panel asked about support for deaf staff. Mr Hay noted that interpreters are funded by Access to Work and there is note taker support for meetings. Specialist equipment is also available. Mr Hay commended the team ethos in both Interpreting and Deaf Studies, noting that the team routinely met over lunch time.

It was noted that the school are currently piloting a 6 month scheme in a new way of using interpreters. There is also a move towards using webcams. It was also noted that Deaf Awareness training is available for all University staff.

The staff were asked how students were prepared for employment. They responded that students used the University Careers Service and as part of PACE, students had regular interviews with their personal tutors and prepared progress files.

The Panel asked if students are prepared to work with hearing impaired as well as deaf people. The staff noted that issues relevant to working with people across the whole Deaf / deaf spectrum are covered in various modules.

Learning Opportunities - Student Progression and Achievement
Ms Rice noted that progression data was missing from the submission documentation and asked if it could be made available outside of the meeting. It was noted that progression data for Deaf Studies was generally better than the school average.

Ms Rice noted at this point that it was time to move on to the next meeting. There had been no time to discuss some issues which the Panel had raised beforehand and Ms Rice suggested the staff team could respond in

writing outside of the meeting if the Panel felt this was necessary. Ms Rice also asked to see a breakdown of student : staff ratios. Mr Dekesel agreed to provide this data.

Outstanding issues for comment if necessary
- Availability of resource materials;
- Working with the Learning Centre;
- How do staff update reading lists?

Conclusions
Following the meeting with the Deaf Studies students, the Validation Panel reconvened and discussed the outcome of the meetings. Representatives of the staff team then rejoined the meeting for feedback.

Good Practice
Ms J Rice congratulated the staff team on the great group of students that had attended the meeting; it was obvious from their comments that they were well supported in their studies. The staff team who had attended the meeting were a positive group and should be congratulated on the staff development they undertake, especially those who have or are completing the teaching qualification.

The Validation Panel commended the externally funded projects the staff are involved with and the team's use on TSL in learning and teaching.

Issues to be addressed
The Validation Panel confirmed the revalidation of BA(Hons) Deaf Studies subject to the following issues being addressed.

The staff team to consider the student feedback through annual monitoring with particular reference to the following :
- Work placement module
- The importance of the signing element
- The vocabulary range for social use especially for non sign language strand students
- Liaise with the subject librarian over learning resources, avoiding resource clashes across modules where possible
- The perception of the student group to the Deaf Studies and Interpreting degrees.

The staff team to map the pathway learning outcomes to the module outcomes so that progression is clearly articulated. As part of this exercise, the staff also to review the wording and number of learning outcomes.

The staff team had spoken of their intention to introduce new assessment methods. The Validation Panel would encourage the staff to complete these as part of the revalidation process rather than waiting to do them as minor modifications in the future.

The staff team to keep SQC informed of progress made with the proposed accreditation process.

The PST does not indicate what intermediate awards are available on the Deaf Studies pathway. The staff team to advise the Officer if this pathway deviates from the expected BA, DipHE and CertHE Deaf Studies awards.

The staff team to provide staff : student ratios to the Validation Panel.

The staff team to address the housekeeping issues referred to at the start of the meeting. The housekeeping matters to be made available in writing in a separate document.

Ms J Fleming thanked the Validation Panel for their support during the process and also for the contributions of Mr K Dekesel and the Deaf Studies staff team.

Action arising from	Person responsible	Action	Deadline date	Outcome
Staff meeting	Staff team	To consider the student	Ongoing	

12/05/05		meeting feedback through annual monitoring.		
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To map the pathway learning outcomes to the module outcomes so that progression is clearly articulated. As part of this exercise, the staff also to review the wording and number of learning outcomes.	30/06/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To introduce new assessment methods as part of this revalidation process rather than waiting to do them as minor modifications in the future.	30/06/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Staff team	To keep SQC informed of progress made with the proposed accreditation process.	Ongoing	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To advise the Officer if this pathway deviates from the expected BA, DipHE and CertHE Deaf Studies awards.	01/06/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To provide staff : student ratios to the Validation Panel.	01/06/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Officer	To produce a list of housekeeping issues to be addressed.	27/05/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To address the housekeeping issues.	30/06/05	

UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES SCHOOL QUALITY COMMITTEE VALIDATION PANEL

Record of Validation Panel discussions with staff

Proposal	**Revalidation of Interpreting**	Date / Time	**12th May from 3 p.m.**	Venue	**MA112, City Campus**
Present	**For the validation panel** – Ms Jenny Rice (HLSS - Chair), Ms Wendy Bastable (Learning Centre), Dr Kay Biscomb (SSPAL), Ms Rachel Ford (QASD - Officer), Mr Stuart Hanson (HLSS), Ms Debbie Orpin and Prof John Richardson (Open University). **Interpreting** – Mr Kristiaan Dekesel (Key Proposer), Ms Sarah Bown, Ms Rebecca Fenton, Mr John Hay, Mr Wesley Mehaffy (Interpreter), Ms Sandra Pratt, Ms Jo Taylor (Interpreter) and Mr David Wolfe Rose.				
Apologies	Dr Andy Bridges (SAS)				

Introduction
Ms J Rice welcomed staff members who had not been present at the morning meeting.

Programme Pathway Aims and Learning Outcomes
The Validation Panel asked the staff to describe the difference between the Deaf Studies and Interpreting pathways.

Mr K Dekesel replied that Deaf Studies is the older of the subjects with the University of Wolverhampton being one of the first institutions to offer Deaf Studies as an academic subject.

Deaf Studies and Interpreting have the obvious sign language connection, however the main difference is that students who take Deaf Studies will go on to be colleagues of deaf people whereas Interpreting graduates facilitate communication between deaf and hearing people. There is some overlap of modules and teaching across the pathway titles and all staff teach on both Deaf Studies and Interpreting.

Some universities offer BSL degrees with routes in Deaf Studies and Interpreting.

The Validation Panel noted the students' comments on their perceptions of the two pathways and asked the staff to respond.

The staff noted that in their experience, the students' perception appeared to arise from them seeing their competence in terms of their language skills. The staff try to fight against this by teaching students together and also by being united in working against the idea that Deaf Studies is the course taken by "failed" interpreters.

Obviously the team still have work to do around this issue and intend to focus on what students do together during modules.

The Panel thanked the staff for this clear answer and asked if there was a difference between the degree profile of the two subjects.

The staff noted it was difficult to compare the subjects because one is specialist only and the other is joint only. Compared to the school profile, Interpreting appears to result in more 1st class degrees, whereas the profile of second class degrees is very similar across both subjects.

The Validation Panel noted that the learning outcomes of the pathway appeared to be too detailed and not strictly learning outcomes; there were also references to module DF3301 which is to be deleted. The Panel asked if the pathway learning outcomes were constrained by the professional body.

The staff team confirmed they were, however, the Panel noted they would be recommending that the learning outcomes be revisited, but would consider the requirements of the professional body when assessing any amendments made.

Curricula and Assessment
    Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation

The Validation Panel asked if there had been any input into the curriculum from employers.

The staff team noted that when seeking employees, employers can choose to recruit graduates or those with professional qualifications such as NVQ Interpreters. Evidence suggests that employers like Wolverhampton graduates and are consistently employing our students. Also, graduates from this University are snapped up for post graduate awards.

Over the years, the pathway content has been shaped and developed by the University with input from external bodies including employers. The University of Wolverhampton's work placement has been well received and is going to be used as the model for other institutions.

The Panel noted that the Interpreting pathway does not include a project module. The staff noted that this had been reconciled with the University and professional body requirements by incorporating the project element within the work placement module. The work placement module contributes to the students' honours classification. This decision had also been in response to their experience that students were choosing to spend a year concentrating on their interpreting skills and deferring their project to the next year.

The Panel asked about the rationale for the assessments forming the work placement module. The staff responded that the first assessment was lab based so that they had more control over it.

The Panel asked if the staff considered the work placement handbook for employers provided sufficient information. It was noted that while this was all that had been provided to the Panel, the school were in contact with the employer throughout the placement preparation stage and provided additional information via telephone calls and correspondence.

Learning Opportunities
    Learning and Teaching

The Panel asked how staff draw upon their research to inform their teaching.

The staff responded that this subject area is still relatively new in the University and began with research into teaching interpreting and developing learning and teaching materials such as their interactive CD ROMs. The team are now in a position to write up the outcomes of their research. Some preliminary work in progress reports have been published in journals and the team have had some projects nominated for awards, the results of which are due over the summer. The staff continue to develop their research strategy.

The Panel asked if students experienced any difficulties in finding suitable research materials. Some students undertake their own independent research for project work, but generally there does need to be more research material for students.

Students are contributing to the body of knowledge and the staff would like to publish key projects on line. Some projects have already been published and others have been used by external examiners in research and policy documents.

    Student Progression and Achievement

With regard to the Interpreting pathway, Prof Richardson asked what was meant by "native or near native speaker" in the entry qualifications.

Ms Fenton noted that if students did not have A level English, they would be interviewed and / or be asked to produce an essay to assess their English competence. There was no expectation that students would speak in a particular way e.g. received pronunciation or regional accent, the main thing was that they could communicate clearly in English. Overseas students are required to meet the University-wide requirement of IELTS 6.

The external noted that these requirements were entirely appropriate but not clearly articulated in the documentation.

Professional, Statutory, Regulatory Body Involvement
The Validation Panel asked the staff to explain how they reconciled the University's widening participation commitment with the professional body requirements.

It was noted that there are some exemptions from the University's academic regulations, for example. the University allows compensation, however the CACDP do not.

The University grading scheme allows students to pass modules if they score between D5 and A16. The professional body, however, consider Interpreting students need to achieve grade B11 or better to be considered "safe to practice". In order to reconcile this, any students who pass modules to the University's grading scheme will be awarded their degree in Interpreting. In addition, students may apply for Trainee Interpreter or Junior Trainee Interpreter status from the professional body and this is achieved by considering the grades they achieved at levels two and three.

It was noted that the external body prefer minor changes to be made year on year rather than large changes in one go. The Panel asked if the PSRB recognised the University's six yearly review and the staff noted that they did not. The Validation Panel would nevertheless encourage the staff to complete as many changes as possible as part of the revalidation process rather than waiting to do them as minor modifications in the future.

The staff asked the Panel to note that PSRB requirements are likely to become less clear in the short term when the British Deaf Association become the third regulating body. On a positive note, University of Wolverhampton staff members are on the committees of the various professional bodies and are able to feedback to their colleagues on likely future developments.

The staff team explained that in order to avoid confusion for employers, students not completing the BA(Hons) Interpreting are awarded an intermediate award (BA, DipHE, CertHE) in Combined Awards.

Foundation year
The Validation Panel noted that insufficient documentation relating to the Interpreting Foundation year had been submitted and asked the staff team to provide some further background to this.

The staff noted that the foundation year is an intensive language development course. It was created in response to a 30% pass rate for the CACDP Stage 2. It was also the staff's experience that some students who had achieved a pass at stage 2 were not considered of a suitable standard to progress to year 1 of the Interpreting pathway.

The foundation year attracted entrants with no previous BSL experience, those who had achieved stage 1 and those who had failed stage 2. Using APA, students are streamed and gradually phased into study together, however there are opportunities for students of all competence levels to meet socially before they meet as a group of equally skilled practitioners.

The course is offered over a year through intensive delivery – 12 hours per week. At the end of the year, successful students have signing skills equivalent to CACDP stage 2, however they will not have studied the other elements of stage 2 such as culture and history etc. Delivery on the course is full time as part time study is not feasible given the module delivery.

Students comment very positively on the foundation year. They are taught linguistics which helps them with their later studies. The staff team could not provide exact figures but more than 80% of students progress from the foundation year into year 1.

Ms J Rice thanked the staff team for attending and the Panel and asked them to leave the meeting for a short time while the Panel prepared their feedback.

Conclusions

Good Practice
Ms J Rice thanked everyone for their contributions to the discussions during the meeting which had been very useful. Ms Rice congratulated the staff team on the positive comments arising from the student meeting; it was obvious that the staff team provided good support for the students and for each other. The staff were commended on their innovative use of TSL and the quality of teaching and their students' contribution to research. The Panel also applauded the work placement and the decision to use it as a model for other institutions. Ms Rice also wished to recognise the excellent external funding generated by the staff team.

Issues to be addressed
The Validation Panel confirmed the revalidation of years 1-3 of the BA(Hons) Interpreting, however insufficient documentation had been submitted to enable the Panel to revalidate the foundation year. All four years of the Interpreting pathway may be revalidated subject to the following issues being addressed.

The staff team to submit revalidation documentation for the foundation year to include
- pathway specifications for the three year and four year pathways
- module specification templates and
- a pathway guide including information relevant to the foundation year on entry requirements, module descriptions and delivery.

The staff team to produce a research plan.

The staff team to map the pathway learning outcomes to the module outcomes so that progression is clearly articulated. As part of this exercise, the staff also to review the wording and number of learning outcomes. This to be done in the light of the constraints of the professional body requirements.

The staff team to continue to talk to the subject librarian to ensure that the learning resources are up to date.

The staff team to address the housekeeping issues referred to at the start of the Deaf Studies meeting. The housekeeping matters to be made available in writing in a separate document.

Mr K Dekesel thanked Prof Richardson and the Panel members for their contribution to the revalidation. He also thanked the Interpreting staff team for all of their work.

Action arising from	Person responsible	Action	Deadline date	Outcome
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To submit pathway specifications for the three year and four year Interpreting pathways.	30/06/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To submit level 0 Interpreting module specification templates.	30/06/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To submit a pathway guide including information relevant to the foundation year on entry requirements, module descriptions and delivery.	30/06/05	

Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To produce a research plan.	30/06/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To map the pathway learning outcomes to the module outcomes so that progression is clearly articulated. As part of this exercise, the staff also to review the wording and number of learning outcomes.	30/06/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Staff team	To continue to talk to the subject librarian to ensure that the learning resources are up to date.	Ongoing	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Officer	To produce a list of housekeeping issues to be addressed.	27/05/05	
Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To address the housekeeping issues.	30/06/05	

UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON
Pro forma for external comments for the revalidation of Deaf Studies for HLSS

1) Relationship between the programme title and curriculum content

The pathway title directly reflects the curriculum content. On the one hand, the pathway covers issues related to Deaf studies in the broadest sense. On the other hand, the pathway is clearly focused on issues relevant to the Deaf community rather than on those that are more relevant to the (much larger) population of people who are deaf or hard of hearing. It would be useful to provide opportunities to learn about the characteristics, needs and aspirations of the latter. The responsibilities of organisations, institutions and professions laid down by the Disability Discrimination Act apply to this larger group and not just to the Deaf community. Discussions with staff clarified that there was no foundation degree and no part-time route.

2) Appropriateness of programme aims and outcomes

My initial feeling was that the pathway aims were clearly articulated. The learning outcomes for the pathway were clearly stated and explicitly linked to the various learning outcomes for the individual modules. However, it became apparent that the lists of learning outcomes were arguably too detailed and that they were not sufficiently differentiated across the three levels. As a result, it is hard to see from the documentation where genuine progression occurs. The move from a specialist/major pathway to a joint pathway is laudable. Specialist pathways in Deaf studies are unlikely to survive because they do not provide students with a content area through which to engage with the Deaf community. A joint pathway provides the framework within which student can acquire specialist knowledge and skills in some other field and be simultaneously considering how to apply their knowledge and skills for the benefit of the Deaf community. Hence, it also provides a framework that is directly geared to the needs of future employers. This link can be strengthened in the future by achieving accreditation with the Council for the Advancement of Communication with Deaf People.

3) Programme design, content and organisation

The internal members of the Validation Panel picked up on a large number of points where the documentation was not in accordance with the University's requirements. Nevertheless, my overall impression was that the design, content and organisation of the pathway were highly coherent and reflected contemporary understanding and issues in the field of Deaf studies. They are also highly consistent with the intended learning outcomes of the pathway. From the advance documentation, I was concerned at the proposal to replace DF3301 Deaf Culture and History by a new course on Deaf-Blind Policy and Communication Practice, as the credibility of graduates from this pathway in the Deaf community would be affected by their appreciation of Deaf history. It was also unclear whether the proposal had been raised with students. Nevertheless, I was reassured that issues relating to Deaf History were indeed covered in other modules and that the decision to drop DF3301 had been based in large part on student feedback, as was confirmed from our discussions with the students themselves.

4) Appropriateness of assessment

The assessment requirements have been streamlined and simplified over recent years without any loss of rigour. The internal members of the Validation Panel were concerned that there was a relatively narrow range of assessment methods, but I felt that the pathway team was genuinely concerned to employ a variety of assessment methods in an imaginative manner. The assessment methods being used were broadly compatible with the learning outcomes, and the assessment criteria were clearly communicated to the students.

5) Learning and teaching methods
A variety of learning and teaching methods are employed. These vary in an appropriate way across academic levels, and they show constructive alignment with the forms of assessment and intended learning outcomes. In particular, the pathway includes intensive involvement in communication through British Sign Language both in and out of the classroom.

6) Learning resources/specialist resources
The learning resources described in the documentation are generally appropriate both to the requirements of the curriculum and to the intended pathway outcomes. I am concerned that there is still widespread use of the old technology of VHS, and digital recording should be adopted as a matter of urgency.

7) Comments relating to the modules

Documentation was provided for the DF modules but not for the IG modules. Some of these were included in the modules submitted as part of the review of Interpreting, but IG3000, IG3001, IG3002 and IG3005 were not. IG3000 and IG3001 appeared to be short projects taken in the first and second semester, respectively, whereas IG3002 appeared to be a long project over two semesters. The Validation Panel was able to gain some information about the intended learning outcomes of these courses and the kinds of projects that students were expected to carry out, but this is a particular area where documentation needs to be improved.

8) Staff CVs

Two CVs were missing from the advance documentation (those for Dekesel and Fowler). Nevertheless, it was evident that the members of staff have a variety of skills, expertise and experience, and collectively they provide strong support for the delivery of this pathway.

9) Any other comments

None.

10) Recommendations

Subject to the recommendations agreed by the Validation Panel, I am happy to recommend in favour of the revalidation of this pathway.

Signed: _____(External Adviser) Date: 9 June 2005
PRINT NAME: JOHN T. E. RICHARDSON   INSTITUTION: THE OPEN UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON
Pro forma for external comments for the revalidation of Interpreting for HLSS
1) **Relationship between the programme title and curriculum content**

The pathway title directly reflects the curriculum content. The Programme Specification seems to have been adapted from that for Deaf Studies (indeed, Sections 10 and 11 are almost identical). This rather gives the impression that the acquisition of the British Sign Language constitutes a relatively small part of the overall pathway. It is true that the pathway provides a richer and deeper understanding of the lives, needs and aspirations of the Deaf community, which reflects the enhanced level of collaboration with the Deaf Studies pathway. However, the subject learning outcomes included in the Pathway Guide make it clear that advanced training in BSL is at the core of this pathway. At each level, a minimum of 75 credits are associated with IG modules.

Moreover, potential students are required to demonstrate native or near-native command of English and competence in BSL at Stage 2 (or satisfactory completion of the Foundation course). With regard to the former, the documentation gives the impression that the focus is on British or standard English rather than the many other "Englishes" spoken in the U.K. and around the world; however, the Validation Panel was assured that this was not the case. With regard to the latter, the Foundation course involves full-time study for an academic year, and so it yields a fairly sophisticated level of initial BSL competence.

2) **Appropriateness of programme aims and outcomes**

My initial feeling was that the pathway aims were clearly articulated. The learning outcomes for the pathway were clearly stated and explicitly linked to the various learning outcomes for the individual modules. However, it became apparent that the lists of learning outcomes were arguably too detailed and that they were not sufficiently differentiated across the three levels. As a result, it is hard to see from the documentation where genuine progression occurs. The links with the Council for the Advancement of Communication with Deaf People seem to be very effective.

3) **Programme design, content and organisation**

The internal members of the Validation Panel picked up on a large number of points where the documentation was not in accordance with the University's requirements. Nevertheless, my overall impression was that the design, content and organisation of the pathway were highly coherent and reflected contemporary understanding and issues in Interpreting.

4) **Appropriateness of assessment**

All language programmes involve specific issues with regard to academic assessment, but programmes in interpreting involve additional problems by virtue of the distinctive nature of sign language. These issues are addressed in a constructive and imaginative manner. The more content-based modules also use various assessment methods that are highly compatible with the intended learning outcomes.

5) **Learning and teaching methods**

A variety of learning and teaching methods are employed. These vary in an appropriate way across academic levels, and they show constructive alignment with the forms of assessment and intended learning outcomes. In particular, the pathway includes intensive involvement in communication through British Sign Language both in and out of the classroom.

6) **Learning resources/specialist resources**
The learning resources described in the documentation are generally appropriate both to the requirements of the curriculum and to the intended pathway outcomes. I am concerned that there is still widespread use of the old technology of VHS, and digital recording should be adopted as a matter of urgency.

7) **Comments relating to the modules**
On page 3 of the Pathway Guide, IG2002 is described as a core module, not as a core option. Nevertheless, on page 6, students are told that IG2002 and DF2000 are core options. Both are worth 15 credits, and students are

told that they have to choose modules worth 30 credits from a list that just consists of IG2002 and DF2000, which effectively makes them core modules. This all needs to be clarified.

There was no module outline for IG3004, although copies of the handbooks for students and employers were provided. As someone who has had extensive experience of tutoring students on work placement, my impression was that the arrangements had been well thought-out and were well explained.

8) Staff CVs
Two CVs were missing from the advance documentation (those for Dekesel and Fowler). Nevertheless, it was evident that the members of staff have a variety of skills, expertise and experience, and collectively they provide strong support for the delivery of this pathway.

9) Any other comments
None.

10) Recommendations
Subject to the recommendations agreed by the Validation Panel, I am happy to recommend in favour of the revalidation of this pathway.

Signed: _____(External Adviser) Date: 9 June 2005
PRINT NAME: JOHN T. E. RICHARDSON   INSTITUTION: THE OPEN UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

School Quality Committee
CONFIRMED

EXTRACT OF THE Minutes of the meeting of the School of Humanities, Languages and Social Sciences School Quality Committee held on **Thursday 3rd February 2005** at 10 a.m. in MC324, City Campus

Present :

Name	Present	Deputy
Dr Barbara Gwinnett (Chair)	✓	
Dr Pauline Anderson	✓	
Ms Eleanor Andrews	✓	
Dr Robert Baron	✓	
Ms Wendy Bastable (Learning Centre)	✓	
Dr George Chryssides	✓	
Mr Kristiaan Dekesel	Apologies	
Mr Mike Downs - (Acting School Administrator)	Apologies	
Mr Stuart Hanson	Apologies	
Ms Nabby Jhagra – Registry	Apologies	
Ms Alison Taylor (Student Representative)	✓	
Ms Anthea Murr	Apologies	
Mr Ken Page	X	
Dr Ruth Shade (SSPAL)	Apologies	
Mr Tony Shannon-Little	✓	
Ms Debbie Orpin	✓	
Dr Fiona Terry-Chandler	✓	
Ms Jenny Rice (Deputy Chair)	✓	
Ms Jill Williams	✓	
Ms Rachel Ford – Officer (QASD)	✓	

371   Review and Validation Activity

- **Academic and Curriculum Development / Standing Panel**

371.3   SQC received for information the latest Review and Validation workload schedule and noted the revised submission deadlines for Deaf Studies and Interpreting and the two new MA pathways.

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

School Quality Committee
CONFIRMED

EXTRACT OF THE Minutes of the meeting of the School of Humanities, Languages and Social Sciences School Quality Committee held on Thursday 17th March 2005 at 10 a.m. in MC324, City Campus

Present :

Name	Present	Deputy
Dr Barbara Gwinnett (Chair)	✓	
Dr Pauline Anderson	✓ from 3 p.m.	
Ms Eleanor Andrews	✓	
Dr Robert Baron	✓	
Ms Wendy Bastable (Learning Centre)	✓	
Dr George Chryssides	✓	
Mr Kristiaan Dekesel	X	
Mr Mike Downs - (Acting School Administrator)	Apologies	
Mr Stuart Hanson	Apologies	Mr M Scholes
Ms Nabby Jhagra – Registry	✓ until 2:20 p.m.	
Ms Anthea Murr	✓	
Ms Debbie Orpin	✓	
Ms Jenny Rice (Deputy Chair)	Apologies	
Mr Marc Scholes	✓	✓

Dr Ruth Shade (SSPAL)	✓	
Mr Tony Shannon-Little	Apologies	
Ms Alison Taylor (Student Representative)	Apologies	
Ms Fiona Taylor	✓ for agenda item 388.2	
Dr Fiona Terry-Chandler	Apologies	
Ms Jill Williams	✓	
Dr Frank Wilson	✓ for agenda item 388.1	
Ms Rachel Ford – Officer (QASD)	✓	

388   Review and Validation Activity

- **Academic and Curriculum Development / Standing Panel**

388.4   SQC were to have received a verbal update from Ms Jenny Rice on the progress of HLSS review and validation activity. In her absence, representatives from the SQC Validation Panel noted that the review meetings for Deaf Studies and Interpreting had taken place. The review stage should be closed soon, after which the Validation Panel will move onto the revalidation stage.

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

School Quality Committee
CONFIRMED

EXTRACT OF THE Minutes of the meeting of the School of Humanities, Languages and Social Sciences School Quality Committee held on Wednesday 20th April 2005, at 10.00 a.m. in MC324, City Campus.

Present :	**Name**	*Present*	*Deputy*
	Dr Barbara Gwinnett (Chair)	✓	
	Dr Pauline Anderson	Apologies	
	Ms Eleanor Andrews	✓	
	Dr Robert Baron	✓	
	Ms Wendy Bastable (Learning Centre)	✓	
	Dr George Chryssides	✓	
	Mr Kristiaan Dekesel	X	
	Mr Mike Downs - (Acting School Administrator)	✓	
	Mr Stuart Hanson	✓	
	Dr Richard Hawkins	For agenda item 404.1	
	Ms Nabby Jhagra – Registry	✓	
	Dr Rosie Miles	For agenda item 404.3	
	Ms Anthea Murr	✓	
	Ms Debbie Orpin	✓	
	Ms Jenny Rice (Deputy Chair)	✓	
	Dr Ruth Shade (SSPAL)	Apologies	
	Mr Tony Shannon-Little	Apologies	
	Ms Alison Taylor (Student Representative)	X	
	Dr Fiona Terry-Chandler	Apologies	
	Ms Jill Williams	✓ from 10:45	
	Ms Rachel Ford – Officer (QASD)	✓	

404   Review and Validation Activity

- **Academic and Curriculum Development / Standing Panel**

404.1   SQC received a verbal update from Ms Jenny Rice on the progress of HLSS review and validation activity.

Noted	Ms J Rice advised SQC that the revalidation meetings for Deaf Studies and Interpreting should be held within the next few weeks.

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

School Quality Committee
CONFIRMED

EXTRACT OF THE Minutes of the meeting of the School of Humanities, Languages and Social Sciences School Quality Committee held on Tuesday 24th May 2005, at 2.00 pm in MC324, City Campus.

Present :

Name	*Present*	*Deputy*
Dr Barbara Gwinnett (Chair)	✓	
Dr Pauline Anderson	✓	
Ms Eleanor Andrews	✓	
Dr Robert Baron	✓	
Ms Wendy Bastable (Learning Centre)	✓	
Dr Deirdre Burke (for agenda item 418)	✓	
Dr George Chryssides	Apologies	
Mr Kristiaan Dekesel	X	
Mr Mike Downs - (Acting School Administrator)	✓ from 3 p.m.	
Mr Stuart Hanson	Apologies	
Dr Paul Henderson	✓	For Dr Terry-Chandler
Ms Judith Holt (for agenda item 418.2)	✓	
Ms Nabby Jhagra – Registry	Apologies	
Ms Kate Lees (for agenda item 418.2)	✓	
Ms Anthea Murr	✓	
Ms Debbie Orpin	✓	
Ms Jenny Rice (Deputy Chair)	✓	
Dr Ruth Shade (SSPAL)	Apologies	
Mr Tony Shannon-Little	✓	
Ms Alison Taylor (Student Representative)	Apologies	
Dr Fiona Terry-Chandler	Apologies	✓
Ms Jill Williams	Apologies	
Ms Rachel Ford – Officer (QASD)	✓	

413   Issues Arising from UQC

413.2   SQC received for information the notes of the joint ADP/UQC meeting held with HLSS.

Noted   Ms Rice had concerns over the costs incurred by the School as a result of the devolved process, not least of which were the catering expenses.

Ms Rice took this opportunity to thank everyone who had been involved with this years reviews and revalidations of Deaf Studies and Interpreting.   In 2005-06, the School is expecting to undertake the review and revalidation of undergraduate Film Studies. The Officer also noted that the Standing Panel is likely to devolve the validation of the two proposed new MAs to the School after the successful validation of the previous four by the Panel.

418   Review and Validation Activity

- **Academic and Curriculum Development / Standing Panel**

418.3   SQC received for information the latest Review and Validation workload schedule.

Noted   SQC were advised that the meetings for Deaf Studies and Interpreting had taken place. The meetings for the two new MAs and WISFP had also taken place; the staff teams are currently following up the actions assigned.

Action arising from	Responsibility	Action	Deadline date	Outcome
Interpreting Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To address the housekeeping issues.	30/06/05	Response received 01/08/05. Kristiaan Dekesel's CV received 01/08/05. Advised Kate Fowler's CV to follow on 01/08/05. **CLOSED 24/11/05**
Interpreting Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To map the pathway learning outcomes to the module outcomes so that progression is clearly articulated. As part of this exercise, the staff also to review the wording and number of learning outcomes.	30/06/05	On 01/08/05, the Key Proposer responded "Pathway outcomes have been reformulated to 1. clearly articulate progression; 2. review wording; 3. reduce number of learning outcomes cf. revised pathway guide" MSTs for IG0000, 0001, 0002, 0003, 0004, 0005, 0006, 0007, 1004, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1103, 2002, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2205, 3004, 3006, 3300, 3303 received 01/08/05. MST for IG3301 received 04/08/05. Two PSTs received 01/08/05. Revised pathway guide received 01/08/05. **CLOSED 24/11/05**
Interpreting Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To produce a research plan.	30/06/05	Received 01/08/05. **CLOSED 24/11/05**
Interpreting Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To submit a pathway guide including information relevant to the foundation year on entry requirements, module descriptions and delivery.	30/06/05	Received 01/08/05. **CLOSED 24/11/05**
Interpreting Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To submit level 0 Interpreting module specification templates.	30/06/05	MSTs for IG0000, 0001, 0002, 0003, 0004, 0005, 0006 and 0007 received 01/08/05. **CLOSED 24/11/05**
Interpreting Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To submit pathway specifications for the three year and four year Interpreting pathways.	30/06/05	Two PSTs received 01/08/05. **CLOSED 24/11/05**
Interpreting Staff meeting 12/05/05	Officer	To produce a list of housekeeping issues to be addressed.	27/05/05	Forwarded to Key Proposer. **CLOSED 01/06/05**
Interpreting Staff meeting 12/05/05	Staff team	To continue to talk to the subject librarian to ensure that the learning resources are up to date.	Ongoing	Added to draft AAR. **CLOSED 03/08/05**
Deaf Studies Staff meeting	Key Proposer	To address the housekeeping issues.	30/06/05	Response received 01/08/05.

12/05/05				Revised employer work placement handbook received 01/08/05. Revised student work placement handbook received 01/08/05. **CLOSED 09/12/05**
Deaf Studies Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To advise the Officer if this pathway deviates from the expected BA, DipHE and CertHE Deaf Studies awards.	01/06/05	On 01/08/05, the Key Proposer responded "The pathway does not deviate from the expected BS, DipHE and CertHE Deaf Studies awards" **CLOSED 09/12/05**
Deaf Studies Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To introduce new assessment methods as part of this revalidation process rather than waiting to do them as minor modifications in the future.	30/06/05	On 01/08/05, the Key Proposer responded "The subject team has made changes to its current assessment methods as per advice given Cf. revised MSTs". **CLOSED 09/12/05**
Deaf Studies Staff meeting 12/05/05	Staff team	To keep SQC informed of progress made with the proposed accreditation process.	Ongoing	Added to draft AAR. **CLOSED 03/08/05**
Deaf Studies Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To map the pathway learning outcomes to the module outcomes so that progression is clearly articulated. As part of this exercise, the staff also to review the wording and number of learning outcomes.	30/06/05	On 01/08/05, the Key Proposer responded "Pathway outcomes have been reformulated to 1. clearly articulate progression; 2. review wording; 3. reduce number of learning outcomes cf. revised pathway guide" MSTs for DF1000, 1199, 1102, 2001, 2203, 2205, 3002, 3033, 3300, 3302, 3304 and 15 and 30 credit Deaf Studies project modules received 01/08/05. PST received 01/08/05. **Appears to be on old template – no PDF.** Further revised pathway specifications were received on 11/11/05. MST for DF2000 received 15/08/05. **CLOSED 09/12/05**
Deaf Studies Staff meeting 12/05/05	Key Proposer	To provide staff : student ratios to the Validation Panel.	01/06/05	On 01/08/05, the Key Proposer responded "2001-02: SSR17.07 2002-03: SSR 20.65 2003-04: SSR 17.50 2004-05 SSR 18.75 note: these are departmental SSRs (DF + IG) as no staff member is solely engaged within a single subject". **CLOSED 09/12/05**

Deaf Studies Staff meeting 12/05/05	Officer	To produce a list of housekeeping issues to be addressed.	27/05/05	Forwarded to Key Proposer. **CLOSED 01/06/05**
Deaf Studies Staff meeting 12/05/05	Staff team	To consider the student meeting feedback through annual monitoring.	Ongoing	Added to draft AAR. **CLOSED 03/08/05**

UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON

UNIVERSITY QUALITY COMMITTEE

ACADEMIC APPROVAL RECORD

CONFIRMED

| **Deleted:** DRAFT (confirmed by SQC) |

Periodic Programme Review

1. Details of Programme(s) under Review

Pathway Code	Pathway Title	Final Award	Intermediate Awards	Mode(s) of delivery	Specialist and/or Joint degree
DJ.DS	Deaf Studies	BA(Hons)	BA, DipHE, CertHE	FT, PTD, PTDE	Joint
DS/IN	Interpreting (British Sign Language /English)	BA(Hons)	BA, DipHE, CertHE Combined Studies	FT, PTD, PTDE	Specialist
DS/INF	Interpreting British Sign Language plus foundation (4 years)	BA(Hons)	BA, DipHE, CertHE Combined Studies	FT	Specialist

2. Review Date

Undergraduate Deaf Studies and Interpreting pathways were reviewed and revalidated during the 2004-2005 academic year.

It was agreed that all undergraduate pathways for both Deaf Studies and Interpreting would be approved for a period of 6 years subject to the successful completion of the revalidation stage due to take place following the review. The last action for the review was closed on 3rd August 2005.

| **Deleted:** 6 |

3. Review Objectives

The objectives for the review were to
- to make judgements about the quality and standards, currency and validity of the pathways under review
- to identify aspects of the pathway(s) which are particularly innovative or which represent good practice
- to identify any shortcomings and recommend actions to remedy these
- to recommend actions to further enhance quality and standards

4. Review Process

The Deaf Studies and Interpreting staff teams were asked to submit review documents on the standard University template. These were circulated to SQC Validation Panel members. On 4th March 2005, representatives of the Validation Panel met with members of the staff teams and used this opportunity to raise with them any issues arising from the review documents. Notes of the meeting were produced by the SQC Officer and these included recommendations for actions to be addressed. Some of the actions were to be resolved before the review phase would be closed and other actions were to be considered during the subsequent revalidation process.

5. Evidence base

The SQC Validation Panel received a hard copy of two review documents, one each for Deaf Studies and Interpreting. The Panel also had the opportunity to view the documentation stored in the school archive for Deaf Studies and Interpreting. These included

- School annual monitoring report to UQC
- UQC annual monitoring audit reports
- Assessment handbook
- Handbooks for students with disabilities
- Induction and welcome week documents
- External examiner reports and examples of student work
- Information about any school policies relevant to the Race Relations Amendment Act (RRAA), Special Education Needs Disability Act (SENDA) and the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA)

- Placement guides
- Project guides
- Study skills support documents
- School strategy documents
- Staff development programmes
- Relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body reports and correspondence

6. External (Peer) Advisers

Dr Andy Bridges from the School of Applied Sciences was a member of the SQC Validation Panel during the review phase. During the revalidation phase Prof John Richardson of the Open University worked with the Validation Panel.

At the meeting with the staff teams, the Panel noted that a nomination for an external adviser was now becoming urgent and the Key Proposer agreed to send the nomination to the Chair and Officer by 8th March 2005.

7. Overview of main characteristics of the programme(s)

Deaf Studies and Interpreting degrees are offered at only a very few universities. The University of Wolverhampton was one of the first universities to offer these two pathways.

Since the last review, the main developments of the Deaf Studies pathway has been a move away from offering a specialist/major provision and a move towards the creation of promoted study combinations with Deaf Studies focussed on employability (partly due to the influence from Interpreting: (BSL/Eng) staff) e.g. Social Policy, Special Needs, Education, Early Childhood Studies, Psychology, Linguistics and Social Care, aimed at specific vocational routes and professional outcomes. This is in direct contrast with other HE providers that have maintained a specialist route.

For Interpreting, the main developments have included professional accreditation/recognition by The Council for Advancement of Communication with Deaf People (CACDP), the Independent Registration Panel (IRP) and the Association of Sign Language Interpreters (ASLI). The pathway has seen a consistent and stable recruitment and retention pattern and 100% employment of Interpreting: (BSL/Eng) graduates, with a considerable number prior to graduation offered employment prospects during work placement. Three staff members have achieved teacher of the year awards in the area of innovation in Teaching and Learning and Technology Supported Learning and three have obtained post-graduate teaching qualifications. Interpreting have also been awarded internal (CELT), regional (e.g. Black Country Pathfinder and Aim Higher) and national (Department of Work and Pensions and The Foreign and Commonwealth Office) funded projects.

8. Conclusions on Innovation and Good Practice

The report review documents made reference to some examples of good practice. The Panel commended the team on these and asked to see copies of the marking grid referred to in the meeting and asked for any subject policies mentioned in the review document (e.g. the Student Directed Learning document) to be made available in the school archive.

9.   Conclusions on Quality and Standards

These reviews were the first undertaken by the SQC Validation Panel following the implementation of the new devolved process.   The review process was thorough and adhered to University processes, however some lessons were learned which will be incorporated into future reviews.

- The Validation Panel will make a recommendation in the Academic Approval Record that the Deaf Studies Annual Monitoring Report should include a reference to the years PSRB visits and reports.
- The Officer agreed to find out if a deletion plan was needed for the Deaf Studies specialist pathway.

10. Conclusions on whether the pathways remain current and valid

The Validation Panel concluded that the Deaf Studies and Interpreting pathways remained current with respect to
- developing knowledge in the discipline
- practice in the application of that knowledge
- developments in teaching and learning

11. Recommendations for actions

The SQC Validation Panel asked both the Deaf Studies and Interpreting staff teams to resubmit the review document to include references to the supporting evidence and to include information on student numbers and retention and a review of the learning resources expenditure. The Interpreting staff were asked to also include information on the pathway which includes an Interpreting Foundation year .

The review team noted they would make a recommendation in the Academic Approval Record that the Interpreting Annual Monitoring Report should include a reference to the years PSRB visits and reports.

The Panel asked the Key Proposer to clarify and report back to the Panel on the funding band for Deaf Studies and Interpreting. Also to submit copies of the marking grid and to make any subject policies mentioned in the review documents (e.g. the Student Directed Learning document) to be made available in the school archive.

12. Actions taken within the University in response to the Review

None.

13. Date of next Review

2010-2011 Academic Year.

14. Status of Report

Approved by Validation Panel

Signature of Chair   Date

Approved by School Quality Committee

Signature of Chair   Date

Ratified by UQC   08/06/06

Signature of Chair   Date

JOINT DEAF STUDIES PATHWAY

Core modules – level 1

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by
1	Existing	DF1000	Deaf Perspectives	15	University
1	Existing	DF1100	An Introduction to disability issues	15	University

Core Option modules – level 1
Core Option rule - Select min. of 15 Credits group A

Semester	New/ existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	CO Group	Delivered by
2	Existing	DF1102	Basic British Sign Language	15	A	University
2	Existing	IG1102	Introduction to Sign Linguistics	15	A	University

Elective modules – level 1
None

Core modules – level 2

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by
2	Existing	DF2000	Language development and deafness	15	University
1	Existing	DF2001	Targeting the Deaf Community: Research methodology	15	University

Core Option modules – level 2
Core Option rule - Select min. of 15 Credits group A

Semester	New/ existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	CO Group	Delivered by
1	Existing	DF2203	Intermediate I British Sign Language Part 1	15	A	University
2	Existing	DF2205	Intermediate I British Sign Language Part 2	15	A	University
1	Existing	IG2201	The Syntax of British Sign Language	15	A	

Elective modules – level 2
None

Core modules – level 3

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by
2	New	DF3003	Deaf-blind Policy, Guiding and Communication practices	15	University
1	Existing	DF3002	Technology issues and deafness	15	University

Core Option modules – level 3
Core Option rule - Select min. of 15 Credits group A

Semester	New/ existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	CO Group	Delivered by

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits		Delivered by
1 or 2	New	DF3000	Deaf Studies Project (15 credits)	15	A	University
1 and 2	New	DF3001	Deaf Studies Project (30 credits)	30	A	University
2	New	DF3004	Reciprocity – work and research activities in the Deaf Community	15	A	University
1	Existing	DF3300	The Sociolinguistics of BSL	15	A	University
1	Existing	DF3302	Intermediate II British Sign Language Part 1	15	A	University
2	Existing	DF3304	Intermediate II British Sign Language Part 2	15	A	University

Elective modules – level 3
None

SPECIALIST INTERPRETING (BRITISH SIGN LANGUAGE /ENGLISH)PATHWAY

Core modules – level 1

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by
1	Existing	DF1000	Deaf Perspectives	15	University
1	Existing	DF1100	An Introduction to disability issues	15	University
1 and 2	Existing	IG1004	Intermediate BSL enhancement for interpreters	30	University
1	Existing	IG1100	Basic Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural skills for Interpreters - part 1	15	University
2	Existing	IG1101	Basic Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural skills for Interpreters - part 2	15	University
2	Existing	IG1102	Introduction to Sign Linguistics	15	University
2	Existing	IG1103	Introduction to Interpreting Issues	15	University

Core Option modules – level 1
None

Elective modules – level 1
None

Core modules – level 2

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by

2	Existing	DF2000	Language development and deafness	15	University
1	Existing	DF2001	Targeting the Deaf Community: Research methodology	15	University
2	Existing	IG2002	Advanced British Sign Language Enhancement for Interpreters part 1	15	University
1	Existing	IG2200	Advanced Bi-lingual Bi-cultural skills for Interpreters part 1	15	University
1	Existing	IG2201	The Syntax of British Sign Language	15	University
2	Existing	IG2202	Consecutive interpreting 1	15	University
1	Existing	IG2203	Advanced Bi-Lingual/Bi-Cultural Skills for Interpreters	15	University
2	Existing	IG2205	Consecutive Interpreting part 2	15	University

Core Option modules – level 2
None

Elective modules – level 2
None

Core modules – level 3

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by
1	Existing	DF3300	The Sociolinguistics of BSL	15	University
2	Existing	IG3004	Work Placement	30	University
1	Existing	IG3300	Simultaneous Interpreting 1	15	University
2	Existing	IG3301	Interpreting in Specialist Setting and Professionalism	15	University
1	Existing	IG3303	Simultaneous Interpretation 2	15	University

Core Option modules – level 3
Core Option rule - Select min. of 30 Credits group A

Semester	New/ existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	CO Group	Delivered by
1	Existing	DF3002	Technology issues and deafness	15	A	University
2	New	DF3003	Deaf-blind Policy, Guiding and Communication practices	15	A	University
1 and 2	Existing	IG3006	Advanced British Sign Language Enhancement for Interpreters part 2	30	A	University

Elective modules – level 3
None

SPECIALIST INTERPRETING BRITISH SIGN LANGUAGE PLUS FOUNDATION (4 YEARS) PATHWAY

Core modules – level 0

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by

1	Existing	IG0000	Basic British Sign Language Part 1	15	University
1	Existing	IG0001	Basic British Sign Language Part 2	15	University
1	Existing	IG0002	Elementary British Sign Language Part 1	15	University
1	Existing	IG0003	Elementary British Sign Language Part 2	15	University
2	Existing	IG0004	Intermediate I British Sign Language Part 1	15	University
2	Existing	IG0005	Intermediate I British Sign Language Part 2	15	University
2	Existing	IG0006	Intermediate II British Sign Language Part 1	15	University
2	Existing	IG0007	Intermediate II British Sign Language Part 2	15	University

Core Option modules – level 0
None

Elective modules – level 0
None

Core modules – level 1

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by
1	Existing	DF1000	Deaf Perspectives	15	University
1	Existing	DF1100	An Introduction to disability issues	15	University
1 and 2	Existing	IG1004	Intermediate BSL enhancement for interpreters	30	University
1	Existing	IG1100	Basic Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural skills for Interpreters - part 1	15	University
2	Existing	IG1101	Basic Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural skills for Interpreters - part 2	15	University
2	Existing	IG1102	Introduction to Sign Linguistics	15	University
2	Existing	IG1103	Introduction to Interpreting Issues	15	University

Core Option modules – level 1
None

Elective modules – level 1
None

Core modules – level 2

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by

2	Existing	DF2000	Language development and deafness	15	University
1	Existing	DF2001	Targeting the Deaf Community: Research methodology	15	University
2	Existing	IG2002	Advanced British Sign Language Enhancement for Interpreters part 1	15	University
1	Existing	IG2200	Advanced Bi-lingual Bi-cultural skills for Interpreters part 1	15	University
1	Existing	IG2201	The Syntax of British Sign Language	15	University
2	Existing	IG2202	Consecutive interpreting 1	15	University
1	Existing	IG2203	Advanced Bi-Lingual/Bi-Cultural Skills for Interpreters	15	University
2	Existing	IG2205	Consecutive Interpreting part 2	15	University

Core Option modules – level 2
None

Elective modules – level 2
None

Core modules – level 3

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	Delivered by
1	Existing	DF3300	The Sociolinguistics of BSL	15	University
2	Existing	IG3004	Work Placement	30	University
1	Existing	IG3300	Simultaneous Interpreting 1	15	University
2	Existing	IG3301	Interpreting in Specialist Setting and Professionalism	15	University
1	Existing	IG3303	Simultaneous Interpretation 2	15	University

Core Option modules – level 3
Core Option rule - Select min. of 30 Credits group A

Semester	New/existing	Module Code	Module Title	Credits	CO Group	Delivered by
1	Existing	DF3002	Technology issues and deafness	15	A	University
2	New	DF3003	Deaf-blind Policy, Guiding and Communication practices	15	A	University
1 and 2	Existing	IG3006	Advanced British Sign Language Enhancement for Interpreters part 2	30	A	University

Elective modules – level 3
None