

UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER

TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on 13 December 2011 at the Jordanstown campus

PRESENT

Professor D A McAlister (Chair), Professor A Adair, Ms S Alexander, Professor R R Barnett, Mr S Cannell, Professor P Carmichael, Miss C Cochrane, Professor C Curran, Dr D Gray, Professor N McClenaghan, Professor M McColgan, Professor M McHugh, Dr A McKillop, Dr A Melvin, Professor R J Millar, Professor I Montgomery, Professor A Moran, Dr I Taylor, Dr J A C Webb

APOLOGIES

Professor K Greenan, Mr L McCurry, Mr D McGivern, Professor H McKenna, Ms R Mullan, Professor P Ó Dochartaigh, Mrs U Quinn

IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs C G Avery, Mr A G Faulkner

UNRESERVED

11.126 MINUTES

The Chair reported that, with regard to Appendix 2 of the minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2011, the Schedule to Ordinance XXIX: Recognition of Institutions, the location of two courses at Belfast Metropolitan College had now been confirmed as the Titanic Quarter campus. Subject to FdEng Industrial Electronic Engineering at South West College being amended to read FdEng Engineering with Industrial Electronic Engineering, the confirmed minutes of the meeting were signed by the Chair.

MATTERS ARISING

11.127 BSc Hons Accounting – Level 5 Contribution Pilot Study (Mins 10.171 & 10.181)

Professor McAlister reported that she had discussed with Mr Peter Green his initial analysis of the results from two graduating cohorts (2010 and 2011) for which a Level 5 contribution to the award classification had been permitted. As the study could influence the University's policy on the basis of classification of Honours degrees, and the data were currently inconclusive, it was proposed that the pilot be extended for a further two years in order to gather additional data for analysis.

AGREED: that the pilot be extended to include the 2012 and 2013 graduating cohorts and that a report on the pilot be considered by the Committee at its October 2013 meeting.

#### 11.128 Terms of Reference and Membership (Mins 11.93 & 11.101 iii)

The Chair reported that Senate had agreed, at its November meeting, to delegate authority to the Committee for shorter periods of approval and extensions to approval for courses as well as changes in course titles. Term 2a) of the Committee's terms of reference had been amended to read "to grant approval to new and revalidated programmes of study".

The Committee noted that Ms Honan, Student Engagement Manager, had requested that Ms Rachel Mullan, the new Academic Representation and Research Co-ordinator in the Students' Union, replace her on the Committee as a co-opted member.

AGREED: that Ms Mullan be co-opted to the Committee.

#### 11.129 Teaching and Learning Strategy Action Plan 2011/12 (Min 11.115 ii)

The Committee received the outstanding draft action plan from the Faculty of Arts (Paper No TLC/11/42). It was noted that not many additional Faculty-specific actions were planned, as the Faculty would concentrate on the identified University-wide actions.

It was noted that all Faculties and lead agents were to provide reports by late May on progress on the achievement of objectives for consideration by the Committee at its June 2012 meeting.

AGREED: that the Faculty of Arts plan be endorsed.

#### CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

#### 11.130 Education for Sustainability

At the October meeting the Committee had revised the Statement of Graduate Qualities to include appreciation of sustainability matters (min 11.97 refers) and in the 2011/12 Teaching and Learning Strategy action plan Faculties were to develop implementation plans to embed the Qualities (Aim 4) as well as to consider sustainability issues in their curricula (Aim 3). The Committee received, for information, a tabled copy of 'Education for Sustainability: A Guide for Educators on Teaching and Learning Approaches' produced by the University of Gloucestershire through a HEFCE-funded project: <http://insight.glos.ac.uk/sustainability/Education/Documents/EfS%20Educators%20Guide%20FINAL%20July11.pdf>. It encouraged the use of familiar curriculum entry points, and prioritised participatory pedagogies which could align with other enhancement priorities such as internationalisation and employability. The Committee noted that the approaches described reflected the University's own expectations and this matter should not pose a major challenge to course teams.

AGREED: that Teaching and Learning Co-ordinators disseminate the guide in their Faculty.

#### 11.131 SUB-COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYABILITY

Professor Millar presented the report of the meeting held on 23 November 2011 (Paper No TLC/11/43).

#### 11.132 NUS Skills Award

The Committee noted that the Students' Union was hoping that 20 students would successfully complete the NUS Skills Award this year. The scheme was also being piloted in 19 other Unions, and it was considered to be complementary to the University's EDGE Award.

#### 11.133 Placement Employer of the Year Awards

Overall the numbers of student and employer nominations were at a similar level as at the same time last year. The commissioning of an Award Crystal to be designed by a student in the School of Art and Design for the student-nominated category was being investigated.

#### 11.134 Professional Experience Programme

The Committee noted the list of 30 graduate internships under the scheme. Over 350 graduates had registered and all had submitted work for the first module of the Graduate Certificate in Professional Practice. As winter graduates were currently excluded, a review of eligibility was to be undertaken. Companies were also to be monitored to ensure that the graduate internships were not offered at the expense of undergraduate placement-year opportunities.

#### 11.135 Self-Employed Placement

The Committee noted that the Faculty of Art, Design and the Built Environment and the Ulster Business School with the Office of Innovation were progressing the development of the self-employed placement option with the support of InvestNI. Three students were currently involved in a pilot. The Committee had previously endorsed guidelines for the approval, monitoring and assessment of the self-employed option (min 11.37 refers) and the Sub-Committee intended to forward the proposed module description for introduction in 2012/13.

#### 11.136 Monitoring Placement

The Committee noted that a working group had identified inaccuracies in reporting data arising from incorrect progress coding at examination boards. Guidelines to be included in Examination Board Procedures would be considered and forwarded to the Committee for approval in due course.

#### 11.137 Assessment of Placement

The Committee noted that a change from a percentage mark to a pass/fail assessment scheme had been broadly supported by a working group established to review how best to assess placement (min 11.72 refers), and that a short questionnaire would obtain the views of Placement Tutors. An interim report

would be presented to the March meeting of the Committee before a final report was provided in June 2012.

#### 11.138 Academic Planning and Progression from Year 2

The Committee noted the interim report from a working group on academic planning and progression pathways. The group had explored the issues around a decision point for year 2 students, either to proceed to a placement year or to enter final year under the exceptional rule for students without placement. (Students also had the option of requesting leave of absence in the hope of finding a late placement.) The restriction on MaSN coupled with the economic downturn had made this a more critical matter for academic planning, complicated by the fact that a high proportion of courses had changed the placement year's status from compulsory to optional.

The Sub-Committee had considered two alternative dates, 31 July or 31 August. The former was not considered to be desirable as an early cut-off point could have a negative impact on the numbers taking up placement, increasing those entering directly into final year or seeking leave of absence. The latter date was considered to be preferable but could lead to the loss of late placement opportunities.

The Sub-Committee had also suggested integrating the ongoing monitoring of placement take-up more closely with the management of the academic plan, which would allow better alignment to the latter's targets and clear decision-making in respect of those students allowed to take Leave of Absence who subsequently sought permission to enrol on year 3P if they secured a placement in-year. It had also discussed bringing forward internal processes such as supplementary examinations so that progression decisions for students with resits were known sooner.

The Committee noted the value of placement in terms of the student learning experience. The Committee also considered that it was important for students to be clear about their position before the start of the academic year and that the August deadline should be applied. Although the placement and planning processes had been managed well this summer, the Chair emphasised that there would be less flexibility in 2012 and that close oversight would be required by Faculties in view of the severe financial penalties imposed for an overshoot in student numbers.

It was noted that the implications of the cut-off date would need to be communicated early to staff, students and placement providers. Although there might be limited opportunity for discretion after the cut-off date, the University could not guarantee enrolment in the placement year for the DPP award after that time.

The Vice-Chancellor raised the matter of the need for Faculties to ensure that appropriate arrangements were in place to support placements, in view of student expectation of value for the fee charged, with a clear assumption of staff contact and visits.

AGREED that:

- i) 31 August be set as the decision point for progression to placement or final year and that Faculties ensure that monitoring was integrated with the academic planning process;
- ii) the Sub-Committee ensure clear and early communication to staff, students and employers about the options available to students, the deadline for decisions and the use of discretion thereafter;
- iii) the matter of staff visits to students during placement and compliance with University guidelines in this regard be revisited by the Sub-Committee.

#### 11.139 Diploma in International Academic Studies

The Committee received a CA3, endorsed by all Faculties, to update the generic module description for the study-year abroad leading to the award of DIAS (min 11.72 refers). It covered ISEP, Study USA, Erasmus and other study abroad schemes.

Faculties were reminded that a tailored module description should be provided in validation documents, to include the specific contributions to the assessment schemes from study at the host institution abroad and for the University project.

AGREED: that the generic module description be approved.

#### 11.140 WORKING GROUP ON PLAGIARISM

The Chair presented the proposed terms of reference and membership for the Working Group on Plagiarism (Paper No TLC/11/44) which had been drawn up in consultation with the Chair, Professor Sandy Steacy. The proposed membership had been agreed by Deans and included two representatives from the Students' Union.

The Group would liaise, as necessary, with Research Degrees Committee, Student Administration and Staff Development and was expected to report back to the March or June 2012 meeting of the Committee.

The Committee noted the issue of a mismatch between central and Faculty records, partly attributed to the timing of input to the register and reporting dates. Faculties were reminded of the need to record offences at the time of detection.

AGREED: that the terms of reference and membership be endorsed.

#### 11.141 REPORT ON UK QUALITY CODE: CHAPTER B7: EXTERNAL EXAMINING

In June 2011, the Committee had agreed to implement the UUK/GuildHE Review recommendations on appointment of external examiners and had made a number of adjustments to the University's Code of Practice on External Examining with immediate effect (min 11.82 refers). The QAA had taken account of the UUK/GuildHE Review recommendations in its updated guidance on external examining published in October 2011. This had now been incorporated into the

new 'UK Quality Code for Higher Education', which restructured the content of the 'Academic Infrastructure', at Chapter B7. The Quality Code had been launched in December 2011.

The Chair presented Paper No TLC/11/45 which reviewed the Chapter and its implications for the University's arrangements including its own Code of Practice. These already reflected many of the principles in the 18 Indicators. It was noted that the QAA Chapter appeared to allow greater flexibility than had the UUK/GuildHE recommendations, for example in the employment of validation panels members and the appointment of the same external examiner to a cognate programme.

The Committee considered the seven recommendations for adjustments and other matters where further consideration was required. The Committee agreed to adopt the recommendations and to align the University's Code of Practice to the QAA Chapter rather than the stricter UUK/GuildHE proposals. The Chair emphasised that Faculties should seek to adopt the spirit of the earlier proposals. Nominations which did not meet the appointment criteria and cases for extensions should be genuinely exceptional and limited in number.

The Chair suggested to Faculties that in nominating external examiners they should consider staff in the senior lecturer or reader grade rather than more senior staff, as they would be currently active in teaching, learning and assessment processes. Staff should also be encouraged to be more proactive in networking to assist in the identification of suitable external examiners.

## **Indicator 2**

### Maintaining Academic Standards

The Chapter indicated that the external examiner should provide feedback as to whether, inter alia, 'the programme reflects PSRB requirements' and whether assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification were 'set at the appropriate level'. It was noted that some professional and regulatory bodies had their own criteria for the appointment of external examiners and would receive copies of their reports. External examiners would be expected to be familiar with the professional standards. While this matter and the reference to assessment level were implicit in the University's report form, they were not explicitly mentioned and it was proposed to revise the form accordingly.

### Comparability of Standards and Student Performance

The Chapter stated that institutions should determine 'whether, when and how it was appropriate to provide external examiners with quantitative data to support their evaluation of student performance' and noted that boards might be provided with statistical analyses for each cohort at module and programme level. The Committee discussed the extent to which external examiners at the University were provided with quantitative data and noted that there appeared to be some variability in practice. Although reports on means and standard deviations were currently available by module within year within programme through Faculty/School support staff from the Student Records System, they were not routinely provided to all Boards or external examiners.

Members considered it desirable that external examiners and Boards be better informed through the provision of quantitative data and agreed that this matter should be discussed further with Student Administration and Faculties.

#### **Indicator 4**

##### Termination of Contract

The Chapter expected institutions to have procedures for early termination of contract by either party. The University's External Examiners' Handbook did not currently advise external examiners how they might resign from the post. The Committee agreed that this should be done in writing, addressed at University level.

#### **Indicator 5**

##### Appointment Criteria

The Committee endorsed a number of revisions to the University's Code of Practice to reflect the QAA criteria.

It was noted that the UUK/GuildHE review had prohibited the use of a nominee who had previously acted as a member of a validation panel and that the University's Code of Practice had been adjusted accordingly. The QAA's guidance now expected institutions to ensure that they balanced the benefits of engaging someone who was familiar with the programme with any risk to their ability to provide a fully independent perspective.

The QAA Chapter stated the occasions when exceptions and extensions might be allowed. These corresponded to the circumstances identified in the University's previous Code of Practice but removed in June to reflect UUK/GuildHE guidance. These would be reinstated.

##### Exceptions and Special Cases

The Chapter emphasised that institutions should ensure that there was a rigorous and transparent process for effective oversight of decisions and monitoring of trends in the case of external examiners who did not meet all the appointment criteria. In order to assist the Committee in monitoring such occurrences it was proposed to extend the period of analysis in the annual report on appointments and to provide more detail on the nature of exceptions.

It was also noted that, while in practice the University permitted exceptions and a procedure for their consideration had been approved, the University's Code of Practice itself did not allow for departures. Consequently, it was proposed to make explicit this possibility and to require a full supporting statement from the nominating Faculty on how the expectations for the role would be fulfilled.

## **Indicator 7**

### Responsibilities

The Chair reminded members that an outstanding matter from the QAA Institutional Audit (March 2010) related to whether the University should require external examiners to be involved in the moderation of Level 3/4 (Year 1) modules in Honours degrees. Although this was encouraged, it was currently not a University requirement, unless the modules contributed to another final award such as CertHE or it was expected by a PSRB.

The Committee noted that the involvement of external examiners in the first year could be valuable in supporting Faculties' strategies to improve retention, for developmental purposes and also for Honours degrees validated in partner institutions. It was, however, suggested that an enforced increase in the external's workload might deter some nominees, as the fee paid functioned more as an honorarium than recompense for the work involved. Nevertheless, as many courses had now introduced exit awards, moderation by the external examiner was required in these cases and had not presented difficulties.

The QAA guidance stated that there should be clarity about the circumstances in which externals were not used and noted that some institutions might state explicitly that any student achievement contributing to an award would be moderated by an external examiner. Alternatively, an institution might deem that, in confirming the standards of the final award, the external examiner confirmed that he/she had scrutinised the level and standard of all its component parts.

It was agreed that the University's policy should remain as currently stated, viz in honours and non-honours degrees all Level 5 and 6 modules should be moderated by the external examiner as should all modules contributing to the classification of exit awards, and that, while external examiners may elect not to be involved in other Level 3/4 modules in the degree, their involvement was welcome and encouraged.

## **Indicator 8**

### Details of External Examiners

In order to ensure transparency in the process and to support student involvement in quality management processes, the Chapter expected students to be informed of the identity and current position of the external examiner associated with their course, in line with the earlier UUK/GuildHE recommendation. The Committee had agreed in June 2011 that this information should be included in the course handbook (min 11.85 refers). The UUK/GuildHE review and QAA guidance had emphasised that students should not contact the external examiner directly. It was proposed that external examiners be advised to refer any direct contact received from students to the University.

The Chair reported that the meeting of the Academic Development and Enhancement Committee earlier that day had agreed that every internal programme should use its course management area within the VLE, Blackboard

Learn, to publish external examiner reports and responses and other course-related business for the information of students.

The Committee agreed that the site should include information on the external examiner but should also emphasise that it was inappropriate to contact external examiners directly and that the appeals and complaints processes were available.

## **Indicator 7 and Indicator 9**

### Examination Board Responsibilities; Endorsement of Decisions

The Committee noted that the QAA Chapter stated that as members of examination boards external examiners were rarely considered to be the final arbiter for the award of marks/grades either within a module or for the final award and that such decisions were the collective responsibility of the examination board. The Chapter expected that institutional procedures should make clear what would happen in the event that an external was unwilling to provide endorsement of the board's decisions.

The Chair stressed that the University did not expect external examiners to have the role of third markers. The Committee noted that the current University regulation stated that, where there was disagreement in the board of examiners about results or classifications, the view of the external examiners would prevail (Regulation 14). The Committee agreed that this rule could be interpreted in a way which did not reflect the collective decision-making process of the board. Accordingly it proposed to remove the sentence from the Regulations.

## **Indicator 11**

### Recognition of the Work of External Examiners

The Chapter emphasised the importance of institutions supporting staff who wished to become external examiners, and noted that they might provide development opportunities. The Chapter also mentioned the possibility of maintaining an overview at institutional level of external examining undertaken by staff.

The Chair reported that the Academic Development and Enhancement Committee had agreed that Staff Development should consider opportunities to support staff in their understanding of the role of external examiners, which could also serve to encourage their engagement externally. It was considered that institutional oversight might be deemed intrusive and could be counter-productive.

## **Indicator 18**

### QAA Concerns Scheme

The Chapter referred to procedures for an external who had a serious concern and had exhausted internal institutional mechanisms by reference to the QAA's 'concerns scheme' or the processes of the relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body. The University's External Examiners' Handbook referred to the availability of the QAA scheme but did not mention PSRB processes. It was

proposed to add a reference that there may be occasions where a concern was properly a matter for the applicable professional body rather than for QAA.

AGREED that:

i) the following recommendations be endorsed:

Indicator 2: that references to 'PSRB requirements' as appropriate and the 'level of assessment' be added explicitly to the rubric of specific sections of the external examiner's report form, as set out in the paper;

Indicator 4: that the External Examiners' Handbook should inform external examiners that, should they wish to resign, formal communication should be made in writing and that this should be addressed to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning);

Indicator 5: that the University's Code of Practice on External Examining be revised to:

- add explicitly an expectation that nominees were familiar with UK HE reference points;
- remove the prohibitions on the appointment of individuals who had served on a validation panel for the course and on appointment to a cognate course;
- reinstate the identification of circumstances where an extension might be permitted, viz continuity or where a course was being discontinued;
- remove the clause about the appointment of retired staff;
- reflect the exact wording of the Indicator in regard to appointment criteria;
- provide for exceptions and departures.

Indicator 8: that information on the identity of external examiners and the inappropriateness of direct contact by students be included in course management areas in the VLE and external examiners be advised in the External Examiners' Handbook to refer any direct contact from students to the University;

Indicator 18: that the External Examiners' Handbook include the option for external examiners to inform the relevant PSRB about a serious concern;

ii) the analysis in the annual report on external examiner appointments be extended to a three-year period and differentiate between exceptional appointments and extensions as permitted by the University's revised Code of Practice and departures from the Code;

iii) it be recommended to Senate that Regulation 14 of the Regulations Governing Examinations in Programmes of Study be revised to remove the

sentence 'Where there is disagreement in the Board of Examiners about results or classifications the view of the external examiners shall prevail';

- iv) further consideration be given to the quantitative data provided to Boards of Examiners and external examiners to assist them in discharging their functions and to whether this information should be routinely provided;
- v) the changes be implemented fully from the academic year 2012/13 but applied as far as possible during 2011/12;
- vi) no change be made to the University's position on external examiners' involvement in moderation of Level 3/4 in Honours and non-Honours degrees.

## COMBINED STUDIES PROGRAMME

### 11.142 Reports from Chief External Examiners and responses from Campus Coordinating Groups

The Committee received the 2010/11 reports from the Chief External Examiners for the combined undergraduate provision on the Coleraine, Jordanstown and Magee campuses and the responses from the Coleraine and Magee Campus Co-ordinating Groups (Paper No TLC/11/46a). A formal response from the Jordanstown Campus Co-ordinating Group had not yet been received. The Committee noted that all three reports were very positive and that issues raised had been or were being addressed.

The Coleraine Chief External Examiner had raised the matter of different practices in Faculties in interpreting the T2 academic standing code (transfer on educational grounds to another course; progress on current course not permitted). The Campus Co-ordinating Group had agreed that the code should be applied consistently but noted that different structural arrangements in individual Faculties made the adoption of a unified approach across the campus problematic.

### 11.143 Annual report: 2010/11

The Committee received the annual report from the three Campus Co-ordinating Groups (Paper No TLC/11/46b).

It was noted that enrolments had risen to reach almost 1200, and that there had been rationalisation of combinations on all campuses.

Matters being considered for the future included the enrolment and appeals processes at Magee, management of timetabling at Coleraine, and performance in combined degrees compared to Single Honours at Jordanstown. The Committee considered that it would be worthwhile to review the terms of reference of the Campus Co-ordinating Groups, now that they had been in place for over ten years.

**AGREED:** that the Directors of Combined Studies be asked to review the terms of reference of the Campus Co-ordinating Group.

#### 11.144 PSRB ACCREDITATION

The Committee received accreditation visit reports from the Energy Institute in respect of BEng/MEng Energy and Building Services and MSc Renewable Energy Management and the Joint Institution of Mechanical Engineers and Institution of Engineering and Technology in respect of a range of Engineering BEng, MEng and MSc courses together with responses from the Faculties of Art, Design and the Built Environment and Computing and Engineering respectively (Paper No TLC/11/47a and Paper No TLC/11/47b).

Although all provision had been successfully accredited or provisionally accredited, the Chair expressed some disappointment with regard to the requirements/conditions and recommendations made by each body, some of which related to standards matters, in view of the University's focus on professional education. The Committee noted that the reports and responses had been prepared in 2010/11 and should have been received on a more timely basis by the Committee.

The Chair reminded Deans that, in accordance with the University's Protocol for the Management of PSRB relations, all such reports and responses were considered by the Committee. These were provided to it through the Quality Management and Audit Unit. If a less than favourable report had been received, Faculties would find it helpful to provide their draft response to QMAU for consideration before submission.

The Committee noted that the Engineering Council had recently written to universities to encourage institutions which had achieved accredited status for their degrees to publicise this fact on their websites and in prospectuses. The Council had developed a logo to assist in this. Relevant Faculties and Student Marketing had been asked to ensure that this matter was addressed.

#### 11.145 VIEWPOINTS PROJECT

The Committee considered the proposed implementation plan (Paper No TLC/11/48) to embed and sustain the curriculum design resources and skills developed through the project across the University (min 11.79 refers).

The Committee noted that this would be undertaken in two main phases. Phase 1 (January – March 2012) would involve staff in core departments being targeted for training and development to continue dissemination and embedding. Phase 2 (March – June 2012) would see the training and development of a wider community of champions and facilitators with an educational leadership role.

AGREED that:

- i) the implementation plan be endorsed;
- ii) progress be reported through the Teaching and Learning Strategy Action Plan in June 2012.

## 11.146 PRIZES AND AWARDS

The Committee received Paper No TLC/11/49 which proposed seven new prizes, one in the Faculty of Computing and Engineering and six in the Ulster Business School.

AGREED: that it be recommended to Council, through Communications and External Affairs Committee, that the new prizes be approved.

## 11.147 VARIATIONS AND DEPARTURES FROM THE UNIVERSITY'S REGULATORY FRAMEWORK: BEng Hons/MEng ENERGY AND BUILDING SERVICES ENGINEERING

The Committee, at its October meeting, had approved proposed arrangements for entry to and progression from the BEng to the MEng Energy and Building Services Engineering (min 11.123 refers). The Faculty's proposal regarding classification of the BEng and MEng had been deferred to the December meeting so that this could be considered together with its proposal for a BEng Hons exit award for students who failed to complete the MEng. The Committee received Paper No TLC/11/50.

### Proposed Basis of Classification of BEng Hons and MEng

The Committee noted that the CIBSE and EI accreditation visit had recommended that classification include a 20% contribution from the penultimate year. To meet the professional body expectation the Faculty proposed the following scheme:

MEng: 80% Level 7 + 20% Level 6  
BEng Hons: 80% Level 6 + 20% Level 5

### BEng Hons and BSc (non-Hons) Exit Awards from MEng

Since Year 4 of the MEng degree was not identical to the final year of BEng Hons, as it did not include a dissertation/major design project (which was a professional body expectation for the BEng), the Faculty now proposed two exit awards for students who failed to complete successfully certain modules in the final year.

It was proposed that students who had failed in modules of more than 40 credit points, but passed the MEng Dissertation (30 credit points) and the Advanced Building Design module (30 credit points) and all Level 6, would be eligible for the award of BEng Hons, based on 20% Level 7, 60% Level 6 and 20% Level 5. Other students who failed more than 40 credit points would be eligible for the award of a non-Honours BSc. Classification would be based on 80% Level 6 and 20% Level 5.

### CertHE Exit Award

The Faculty also proposed to introduce a CertHE exit award for successful completion of Level 4.

The Committee noted that CertHE exit awards were being considered across the whole School and that the external examiner had agreed with the concept of an

exit award, but a different subject title of 'Energy and Building Services Science' was proposed.

The Committee noted that at its October meeting it had agreed that titles of exit awards in Combined degrees should be the same as for the main award (min 11.102 refers). It was suggested that there should be sufficient coverage of Engineering at Level 4 to justify its inclusion in the title.

AGREED that:

- i) the basis of classification of the BEng Hons and MEng Hons Engineering awards and the BEng Hons and BSc (non-Honours) exit awards be approved;
- ii) the introduction of a CertHE exit award be approved, subject to the provision of a coherent set of learning outcomes at programme level, but that the title of the exit award be referred back to the Faculty for further consideration.

Duration 2 hours 40 mins

4 January 2012

AGF/CA/lh