Checklist of Common MOFS Errors

There are numerous common errors that often require MOFs to be sent back for corrections and so delay the approval process for Schools and Quality Teams. Many of these errors can be fixed relatively easily if you are aware of them up front. Use the following as a checklist before submitting your MOF to Board of Studies and/or Faculty Education Committee.

For more substantial concerns and errors, please see guidance on the MOFS database and on writing MOFS content.

**Core Info**

Did you select the contributors from the system (rather than adding them in manually)?

The system only displays the first ten names, but if you put in more information (e.g. name and unit), the member of staff will come up. Entering names manually will cause problems for upload.

Did you check that the semester offered and number of credits match the information provided in programme regulations?

**Learning Outcomes**

Did you check that all intended knowledge and/or skills outcomes are cited appropriately in the Teaching and Assessment activities as well as in the rationales?

Did you check that Graduate Skills Framework information accurately reflects what is assessed and/or present in the module? This is particularly important if the module assessment has been revised.

**Teaching Methods**

Did you include an appropriate amount of time (Guided Independent Study) for assessment preparation and completion?

Did you correctly tally the total hours under Teaching Activities (total should usually be 10 times the number of credits, e.g. 100 hours for a 10 credit module)?

Did you address all teaching methods in the rationale?

**Assessment**

Did you check assessments against the relevant University and/or Faculty tariff?

Did you include word count and/or duration in all relevant assessments?

Did you correctly tally assessment percentages to 100%?
Did you provide necessary additional information in the Comments box? (e.g. If components consist of multiple exercises, did you identify the exercises and their percent contributions in the Comments Box? If an assessment must be passed in order to pass the module, is this clearly specified?)

Did you address all assessments in the assessment rationale?

**General Errors**

Have you checked for grammatical and typographical errors?

Have you checked to ensure that any references to specific programmes are still relevant?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This document is primarily intended for:</th>
<th>Proposers of changes to degree programmes; Degree Programme Directors / Directors of Studies; School Administrators; Faculty Learning and Teaching Support Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact (for advice about the programme approval process)</td>
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<td><a href="mailto:ltds@ncl.ac.uk">ltds@ncl.ac.uk</a>; T: 0191 20 88491/83978</td>
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