

## **MSc/MRes Global Health Validation Outcome and Conditions**

Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2024 On Microsoft Teams

### **PANEL MEMBERSHIP**

Sally Mitchell (Chair)	Head, Centre for Innovation and Development in Education, City St George's, University of London
Dr Stephanie Chambers	Senior Lecturer in Sociology of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow
Sheetal Kavia	Digital Education Manager, City St George's, University of London
Dr Kristine Nilsen	Programme Lead MSc Global Health, University of Southampton
Dr Baba Sheba	Director of Digital Education, City St George's, University of London
Connor Togher	Student Panel Member, City St George's, University of London

### **In attendance**

Glen Delahaye	Senior Quality Assurance and Enhancement Manager, City St George's, University of London
---------------	--

### **Decision**

The Panel recommended approval of the Global Health courses for a period of five years. This included:

- The revalidation of:
  - MSc Global Health
- The validation of:
  - MRes Global Health
  - MSc Global Health (Distance Learning)

The courses would next be reviewed or revalidated in 2029/30. Several Conditions and Recommendations were agreed by the Panel and are listed below.

The course team would need to address the conditions and submit an action plan to the Chair of the Panel by the 21<sup>st</sup> November 2024. The recommendations could be responded to through routine annual monitoring processes.

### **Conditions**

1. Review the Programme-Level Outcomes to make the MRes and MSc more distinct.

The Panel noted that the programme level outcomes for the MRes and the MSc were very similar and should be reviewed to ensure that there is a clear sense of the differences between the two programmes. It was agreed that the learning outcomes of the Critical Appraisal module could be incorporated into the MRes Programme Outcomes to make it more distinct from the MSc, since only MRes students would complete the module.

2. Review the assessment method for the MRes Research Project module to ensure it reflects the 120 credit workload and expectations of the students' wider/deeper understanding.

The Panel noted that the wordcount for the Research Project was the same for both the MSc and the MRes. The wordcount appeared low for a 120 credit module.

An additional assessment for the MRes students, such as a viva or a presentation, would help to reduce the high stakes of the written research project.

3. Review Module Level Learning Outcomes, ensuring they are appropriately set at level 7 and that assessment types are well described and aligned with them. Across the programme, there should be sufficient diversity of assessment types, reflecting an appropriate balance of academic and applied real-world tasks, across compulsory and optional modules.

The Panel noted that there might not be sufficient opportunity for students to put their learning into creative and future-oriented exercises through the assessment types. The programme level learning outcomes included words like "produce", but it was not clear how that translated into the module level learning outcomes or the assessment tasks.

The two External Panel members provided the course team with examples of assessment types that were used at their own institutions (included in Annex A).

4. Ensure a consistent approach to contact hours across modules.

The Panel noted that there were inconsistencies in the number of contact hours on the modules.

## **Recommendations**

1. Develop a strategy to provide both academic and pastoral support to ensure the engagement of learners on the online programme.

The Panel understood that the role of the personal tutors would primarily be for welfare, but that for the online version of the programme, they may also need to fulfil the role of monitoring the students' engagement and providing academic support as needed.

2. Provide students with clarity around the expectations of research supervisor meetings and how frequent they should be.

While the Panel found the St George's Supervision Standards helpful, they suggested establishing more detail around what the content of supervisor meetings would be, particularly for MRes students.

They suggested developing a comparative student-facing document, showing the differences in support and expectations between the MSc and MRes.

3. Integrate student activities with the central provision across the University to provide support for student employability, across all three Global Health programmes.

Following the merger between City and St George's, the Panel suggested the course team seek opportunities from within the entire new merged institution to support the employability of Global Health students. Particularly consider how students on the distance course will access opportunities for networking and careers advice.

## **Commendations**

The Panel wished to highlight the following strengths within the Global Health courses

1. The wide range of guest lecturers

2. The richness of the programme
3. The wealth of expertise within the course team

GD/Oct2024

**Annex A:**

Examples of assessment types, as used at the external Panel member's institutions

The University of Southampton:

Research proposal	Commentary	Health sector strategic plan monitoring framework (results chain)
Critical appraisal	Position paper	
Group presentation	Blog post	Statistical report (academic article secondary analysis-toned down version),
Multiple choice exam	Policy brief	
Examination	Inequity analysis using country data	Questionnaire design.

The University of Glasgow:

Standard essays	Research proposal around developing an intervention (including what the draft intervention looks like with logic model)
Multiple choice examinations;	
Short answer papers for research design course;	A reflective portfolio
	Group presentations

For the dissertation, a 10% engagement mark around (setting up and attending supervision; setting supervision agenda; responding to feedback; asking for help; keeping to deadlines), as well as 20% oral presentation in mid-July.