

## UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER

### TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on 25 April 2007 at the Magee campus

#### PRESENT

Professor D A McAlister (Chair), Professor R R Barnett, Professor N D Black, Dr E Boyle, Miss C Cochrane, Mrs H Farley, Mr P Fleming, Dr P Hanna, Dr D A Heenan, Professor D Hunter, Professor R Hutchinson, Professor E M Lillie, Dr P J Lundy, Mr L McCurry, Mr D McGivern, Mr T McLernon, Professor R J Millar, Professor A Moran, Ms M C M Roulston

#### APOLOGIES

Dr T Cook, Professor J Gillespie, Professor D Hunter, Professor R Hutchinson, Ms P Kane, Ms L McMaw, Ms N O'Hagan, Professor C W Mulholland, Professor R Welch

#### IN ATTENDANCE

Ms C Browning (for minutes 07.81 – 07.85), Mr H Deighan (for minutes 07.76 - 07.80), Mr A G Faulkner, Dr N Waddell

#### UNRESERVED BUSINESS

Ms Roulston was welcomed to her first meeting of the Committee.

#### 07.43 MINUTES

The Committee noted that in minute 07.14 the recommended extension to the period of approval granted for the following provision should have included the '2008' intake and not the '2007' intake:

American Studies (Single Honours/Major/Main/Minor)  
International Politics (Single Honours/Major/Main/Minor)  
Postgraduate Diploma/MA American Studies  
Postgraduate Diploma/MA Local History  
Postgraduate Diploma/MA Peace and Conflict Studies

The Committee also noted that in relation to minute 07.25 the Academic Office had subsequently been advised that the draft response had not been sent informally to RIBA by the Faculty.

Subject to these amendments, the confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2007 were signed by the Chair.

## MATTERS ARISING

### 07.44 Review of Quality Assurance Framework (Mins 07.28 – 07.30)

The Committee noted that, with regard to the publication of University quality and standards information, Professor Black had made arrangements through the Student Website Working Group to create the identified links on the University's 'Prospective Students' website. Governance Services had also added relevant URLs to the University's Freedom of Information publication scheme website.

The Committee noted that the question of ways of sharing external examiner reports with students would be considered at the next meeting.

## CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

### 07.45 Edexcel Institutional Review Report 2005/6

The Chair reported that the 2005/6 annual report had been forwarded to Edexcel at the end of March. The University had been thanked for a comprehensive report.

### 07.46 Higher Education Authority: NI Digest

The first edition of the HEA Digest for Northern Ireland was tabled. The Committee noted that it was intended for all those interested in the development of HE in Ireland. It was hoped that an editorial group would be established and contributions for future editions were invited.

### 07.47 2007 National Student Survey

The Chair reported that DEL had written to the University regarding the current response rate to the 2007 NSS and the threshold for the publication of results on the revised TQI website. The Department had noted that the recent review of the Quality Assurance Framework had concluded that the NSS and TQI initiatives could make a valuable contribution to student choice. Maintaining a high response rate was consequently considered to be extremely important to the funding council and the HE sector.

The Committee noted that DEL hoped that all subjects would achieve last year's UK average response rate of 56%. In response to a number of pro-active interventions by the University to increase the response rate, as of 20 April, the QMAU had established that the UU average for the main sample was 55.68% (58.11% UK) and 31.2% (35.73% UK) for the NHS sample. A 50% rate had been achieved in 21 out of 32 subjects. A further nine were close to this level, with ten days remaining.

The Committee noted that HEFCE had recently consulted on whether the current publication threshold for the NSS results should be reduced from a 50% response rate and 30 students responding, to 40% and 20 students. HEFCE was taking further advice from an expert group and the publication threshold would remain at 50% for this year.

07.48 Learning Resource Centre at Coleraine

The Committee noted that, as part of the development of the Learning Resource Centre at Coleraine, Central Buildings Library would close on 25 May with service being delivered from the South Building Library. The work was due for completion by 17 September.

All staff and students had been emailed regarding the development and service arrangements.

07.49 QAA Audit: Hong Kong

The Committee noted that the QAA audit team had visited the University on 6 – 7 March 2007 and that Hong Kong College of Technology would be visited on 21 May.

07.50 British Council Seminar

The Committee noted that a British Council Seminar on Enhancing the Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment had been held on 25 – 30 March at the Belfast campus. Thirty-five participants from across the world had attended and contributions had been made by four members of the Committee, Professor Barnett, Dr Heenan, Professor Hunter and Mr McLernon, as well as Mr S L Fawcett and Ms S E A Griffiths.

07.51 New Teaching and Learning Strategy

The Chair outlined the following consultation process and timeframe for development of the new Teaching and Learning Strategy:

Phase 1: April – May: Delphi questionnaire used to identify key priorities and ranking by panel of experts comprising University and Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee representatives.

Phase 2: June: consultation meetings on emergent themes involving Faculties, the Students' Union and relevant Departments.

Phase 3: September – October: formal consultation on draft Strategy.

It was noted that other contributions would come from various sources including the Senior Staff Conference, the STAR Retention Conference, and the Working Group on Creativity and Innovation in the Curriculum. The process had been outlined to all staff in *Inside* magazine.

The final version of the Strategy would be received by the December meeting of the Committee before being forwarded to Senate for approval.

07.52 IET Academic Accreditation Visit

The Chair reported that the University had received the confidential report of the Institution of Engineers and Technologists' Academic Accreditation Visit for Chartered Engineer status for BEng Hons/MEng Engineering, BEng Hons

Electronics, Communications and Software and BEng Hons Engineering Management, following a visit held on 15 – 16 November 2006. Accreditation had been granted for three years, 2006 – 2008 intakes.

The Committee noted that QMAU had been asked to comment on the Faculty's response directly to the course team. The Chair reminded Faculties of the benefits of central review of draft responses by the Unit, not least in terms of house style and consistency. This matter would be discussed further at the next meeting in the review of the Protocol (min 07.27 refers).

#### 07.53 COURSE APPROVAL SUB-COMMITTEE

The Chair presented the report of the meeting held on 22 March 2007 (TLC/07/19).

#### 07.54 Course Approval (Item 1)

The Committee noted the revisions (Annex to Appendix 1) approved by Faculties and course withdrawals. The Sub-Committee had considered the reports of evaluation and revalidation panels.

##### Arts

##### Revalidation Subject Unit 2A: Art and Design (Magee)

The Committee noted the poor quality of the documentation received and that the Faculty had been asked to put in place procedures to ensure that documentation for future events was of an appropriate standard.

The Committee noted that the PGD/MDes Design Communication was to be placed on Faculty's risk register as no external examiner reports had been received in two successive years. A report on this provision would be included in the ASM report next year.

##### Business and Management

The Committee noted the successful evaluation of the new programmes in Advertising (Single Honours/Major/Main/Minor). Accreditation was being sought from relevant professional bodies.

##### Revalidation Unit 15A: Hospitality, Leisure and Consumer Studies

The Committee noted that the unit had now been split into two and that revalidation of all undergraduate provision in the School had been brought forward to the 2007/8 academic year at the School's request, in order that the curriculum would be established before the School's relocation to Belfast and Coleraine campuses.

## Engineering

### Integrated Foundation Years

The Committee noted that the Integrated Foundation Year for eight Honours degree programmes at the Jordanstown campus had been successfully validated.

### BSc Construction Engineering (with DIS/DAS)

The Committee noted that the Sub-Committee had considered a CA1 proposal to reintroduce (without revalidation) a non-Honours degree programme at the Jordanstown campus. This degree and the non-Honours degree in Civil Engineering had been withdrawn following the agreement to transfer Intermediate level provision to the FE sector.

Non-Honours degrees were designated 'Intermediate' within the FHEQ although they contained a small component at Honours level. The University's current Framework, reflecting existing structures, expected 360 credit points of study for such award, 60 credit points above the 300 point national minimum. The non-honours degree awards pre-dated the introduction of Intermediate-level Foundation degrees.

The Sub-Committee had also noted the high entry standard (acceptable for Honours in other programmes) and the considerable overlap in content and level with the related Honours degrees, and had questioned the appropriateness of the qualification as currently configured.

The Committee noted that non-Honours awards no longer figure explicitly in the education frameworks of the relevant professional bodies for Incorporated Engineer status.

The Course Approval Sub-Committee had agreed that, if Academic Planning Sub-Committee supported the retention of the degree within the Academic Plan, the Faculty should be asked to make a case to the Teaching and Learning Committee clarifying the rationale for the qualification and that Teaching and Learning Committee should decide whether the course might be reinstated without revalidation.

The Academic Planning Sub-Committee on 29 March, which had considered CA1 proposals for both the BSc Construction Engineering and a re-titled BSc Civil Engineering Technology, had proposed that Teaching and Learning Committee be asked to recommend a one-year final extension to allow the School time to develop new proposals.

## Social Sciences

### Undergraduate Honours Subject Unit: Law (Major) (Jordanstown and Magee)

New Single Honours degrees had been successfully evaluated as part of the revalidation of provision. The Faculty had subsequently submitted a satisfactory

statement in support of the optional status for the dissertation in the Major programmes (min 07.39 refers).

07.55 ADSSC Business (Item 2)

The Committee noted that the Academic Planning Sub-Committee had supported two late proposals for September 2007 start – BSc Hons Sports Technology (FT/JN) and PGD Procurement (PT/JN). The Academic Office had since been advised that the Postgraduate Diploma in Procurement would now have a January 2008 start and that the Faculty wished this course to be evaluated as part of the revalidation of Subject Unit 5C in November 2007. Arrangements were being made exceptionally to evaluate the new undergraduate in Sports Technology degree in June.

AGREED that it be recommended to Senate:

- i) that the recommendations regarding course approval be endorsed as set out in Appendix 1;
- ii) that a one year extension to the period of approval be granted for the following provision in Subject Unit 3D: Food, Nutrition and Dietetics to include the 2008 intake:

BSc Hons Dietetics  
BSc Hons Food and Nutrition  
BSc Hons Human Nutrition  
PgDip/MSc Human Nutrition  
PgDip/MSc Dietetics

- iii) that the non-Honours BSc Construction Engineering and BSc Civil Engineering be approved for the 2007 intake only without revalidation, subject to provision of evidence of confirmation from an external source that the degrees represent coherent and current programmes of study appropriate to the award.

07.56 FACULTY HEADS OF COLLABORATIVE COURSES FORUM

Dr Hanna presented the report of the meeting of the Faculty Heads of Collaborative Courses Forum held on 21 March 2007 (TLC/07/20).

07.57 Course Revision (Item 1)

The Committee noted that the Forum had requested that the CA3 form be revised to alert the Faculty Head of Collaborative Courses if a course revision in an Honours degree might affect a related Foundation degree.

The Committee discussed the merits of reminding course/subject directors through the CA3 form of the need to consider whether a revision would have implications for any other provision, but decided that such a statement would be too general to be of practical use.

AGREED: that the CA3 form be amended to include a tick-box to alert the FHCC to course revisions which might have consequences for linked external programmes.

07.58 Monitoring of Library Resources (Item 2)

It was reported that there was considered to be an element of confusion and overlap between the roles of the FHCC, the revalidation unit co-ordinator and the Faculty Sub-Librarian in the monitoring of library resources at partner institutions.

AGREED: that a working group be set up by the FHCC Forum to clarify issues surrounding the monitoring of library and IT resources in partner institutions.

07.59 Staff Trained to Chair Examination Boards (Item 4)

The Committee noted that training in the chairing of examination boards had been provided for staff at partner institutions in March 2006. If necessary, these trained staff were expected to 'cascade' training in their own institutions. It was now recommended that all further training be undertaken by the University. The Chair reported that the QAA's report of the Collaborative Provision Audit (2006) had recommended that University-delivered training continue to be provided for all partner/institution staff who chair examination boards (min 07.73 refers).

The Forum had agreed that all colleges would be advised of the new arrangement in writing and that, if possible, the names of staff who had been trained to chair boards should be held on the collaborative provision database.

AGREED: that any further training of chairs of examination boards only be undertaken by the University.

07.60 REPORT FROM SUB-COMMITTEE ON WORK-BASED LEARNING

Professor Millar presented a report of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 14 February 2007 (TLC/07/21).

07.61 Guidelines on Bullying and Harassment (Item 2)

The Committee noted the draft guidelines in respect of bullying and harassment which had been drawn up for placement tutors (Appendix to report), following approval of guidelines for students on placement (min 06.220 refers). In discussion, it was noted that a student suffering bullying or harassment might refer the problem to a range of University staff and the individual contacted must recognise his/her duty of care in such circumstances. In addition, it was noted that each Faculty had its own arrangements for the management and support of placement, with possibly distinct roles for those involved in co-ordinating activity, supervising and visiting students. While recognising the generic nature of the guidelines, the Committee considered that it would be important to be clear about the meaning of the term 'placement tutor'. The guidelines would benefit from rewording to reflect the possibility of different roles.

The guidelines stated that the University would ensure appropriate training for all placement tutors. It was noted that such training focused on raising awareness and served to protect staff as well as support them in the discharge of their duties. Thirty-five staff had so far attended training sessions.

Professor Lillie asked whether the guidelines might be extended to include staff overseeing study-abroad arrangements.

AGREED:

- i) that the guidelines be endorsed in principle, subject to appropriate rewording to acknowledge wider staff responsibility and the different roles relating to placement assigned by Faculties, and extension to include study aboard;
- ii) that the Staff Development Unit facilitate appropriate training.

07.62 SEND0 (Item 6)

The Committee at its meeting in December 2006 had asked the Sub-Committee to consider the implications of SEND0 for University guidance on placement (min 06.285 refers). The Committee noted that the Head of Equality Policy and Practice would draft additional information for inclusion in the guidelines. The Sub-Committee will consider these at its May meeting and a paper would be forwarded to the Committee in June.

07.63 Insurance Cover for Students on Placement (Item 7)

The Committee noted that Governance Services had now reviewed the University's indemnity form for students on placement. The Central Services Agency had been contacted and it had deemed the standard form acceptable. It was hoped that in the future a single standard form would be in use.

07.64 CHARTER DEVELOPMENT 2006/7

The Committee received the annual report from the Charter Review Group (TLC/07/22).

07.65 Review (Item 1)

It was noted that the Review Group proposed a number of revisions to its terms of reference to reflect the completion of the development phase for the seven support charters. It was also proposed that the review of the Student Charter be undertaken biennially rather than on the current annual basis.

07.66 Support Charters – Monitoring Performance Indicators (Item 3)

The Group had reviewed performance against targets set in the support charters. Outcomes were generally positive, with only a small number of areas below target. The Committee noted that many departments had been cautious in target setting, particularly as this had been their first year of using such targets. The Group suggested that for next year targets should be increased over and above

the revised standards proposed by departments. If achieved, this would demonstrate enhancements to current levels of satisfaction and service delivery.

AGREED:

- i) that the revised terms of reference of the Charter Review Group be approved as detailed in Appendix 2;
- ii) that a central marketing representative and the Student Representation Officer from the Students' Union be added to the membership of the Charter Review Group;
- iii) that all departments responsible for support charters review their performance measures for 2007 with a view to setting more challenging targets.

07.67 **PROGRESS FILES/INDUCTION, RETENTION AND PROGRESS WORKING GROUP**

Professor Millar presented the report of the meeting of the Working Group held on 17 January 2007 (TLC/07/23).

07.68 **PDSystem Usage (Item 1)**

It was reported that between September 2005 and May 2006 a total of 12,097 students, 707 staff and 35 guest users had used the PD System. Faculties had welcomed the report and the working group had encouraged the provision of an annual statistical report to Faculties.

07.69 **Guidelines for the Respective Use of WebCT and PDSystem/OPUS (Item 2)**

It had been brought to the attention of the PDP team that there was some confusion around the use of the PDSystem/OPUS and WebCT. Guidelines to illustrate the distinction between these systems would be drafted and presented to the next meeting of the Working Group.

07.70 **PDP Evaluation (Item 3)**

A detailed analysis of the evaluative questionnaire issued to undergraduate students was appended to the report. A total of 360 valid responses had been received. It was noted that students strongly believed that PDP improved their employability and helped their formal studies. While considered a useful tool, it was recognised that the PDSystem was not the sole means for reflective activity.

07.71 **PDP Policy (Item 5)**

The Committee noted that the current policy document on PDP had been revised in consultation with Faculty and School Co-ordinators, the PDP team, Progress Files Working Group and the Equality Unit. The revisions were presented to the Committee for endorsement. The changes (in bold at Appendix 3) mainly related to the University's new strategic aims and supporting objectives, and the use of alternatives to the PDSystem.

AGREED: that the revised PDP Policy document (Appendix 3) be endorsed.

07.72 Induction/Retention/Progression (Item 10)

The Committee noted that a number of factors affecting retention and progression had been identified and a recommendation made that enhancements be aimed at the whole first year experience, rather than particular students. Faculties had been asked to provide an update on the implementation of the Transition Policy by late April 2007. A report would be forwarded to the Committee for consideration at its June meeting.

07.73 QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY: COLLABORATIVE PROVISION AUDIT

Professor McAlister presented the report of the 2006 Collaborative Provision Audit received on 9 April 2007 together with a commentary on the recommendations and a draft University statement in response (TLC/07/24). The QAA would publish the report and the University's response in May 2007.

It was noted that the University was commended on a number of aspects of its collaborative provision and had received a judgement of broad confidence.

The QAA Audit Team had made four recommendations. The audit team considered it advisable that the University:

- i) resolve ambiguities concerning the University's definition of Collaborative Provision (CP) by establishing and maintaining a publicly available, up-to-date and authoritative record of all partnerships and courses 'delivered and/or supported and/or assessed through an arrangement with a partner organisation'. The record of CP should include all those types of arrangement referred to in Sections E and G of the University's Guide to Collaboration (paragraph 44).

The audit team considered it desirable that the University:

- ii) bring to a coherent and timely conclusion its deliberations on the right of CP students to appeal to the University (paragraph 46);
- iii) continue to provide a University-delivered training course for all partner staff who chair examination boards (paragraph 52);
- iv) further improve consistency by partners in meeting the requirements of the University's annual course review process (paragraph 72).

It was noted that the first recommendation was being considered in the context of the Change Academy project and the development of the new student records system. The second had been addressed at the Committee's February meeting (min 07.23 refers), subject to final consideration of the position in overseas partners (see min 07.74). Recommendation iii) on the training of chairs of boards of examiners was considered at min 07.59 above.

With regard to recommendation iv), the Chair proposed that, as part of the Annual Course Review process, the University should in future meet with partners in a forum to discuss the Annual Course Review report. This would help disseminate good practice and facilitate discussion of issues in a supportive environment. If further action was deemed necessary for individual partners, then this could be taken by way of private meetings, as at present.

AGREED: that, subject to inclusion of the decision in relation to training of chairs of Boards of Examiners, the University's response to the collaborative provision audit report be endorsed.

#### 07.74 FINAL RIGHT OF APPEAL OF STUDENTS IN OVERSEAS PARTNER INSTITUTIONS

The Committee received a paper on the final right of appeal of students in overseas partner institutions (TLC/07/25). At its February meeting the Committee had reaffirmed that students should have access to appropriate appeals processes within their own institution, that this information should be made known to students and that the responsibility of the University to ensure the availability of such a process was clearly distinguished from the responsibility of partners to provide it. The Committee had also confirmed that, if a final right of appeal to an independent party outside the institution did not exist, this should be made explicit in the institution's literature for students. The Committee had agreed that these points be emphasised in the next edition of the Guide and had asked QMAU to confirm arrangements with overseas partners (min 07.23 refers).

The Committee noted the details of arrangements with the University's current overseas partners. Of the four, only Hong Kong College of Technology provided for appeal outside the institution but students were not informed of this. Only the School of International Hotel and Tourism Management, Switzerland informed students that they had no right of external appeal, but this was not documented. Two of the four partners, HKCT and SCAU, had now withdrawn their provision.

The Committee endorsed the recommendation that the Guide include a section stating that where students have no final right of appeal to an external independent body then they must be advised of this in writing. This was a re-affirmation of the decision the Committee had taken in February.

#### 07.75 RESIDUAL OBLIGATIONS TO STUDENTS IN THE EVENT OF COURSE CLOSURE OR TERMINATION OF AN AGREEMENT WITH A PARTNER INSTITUTION

The Committee received a paper dealing with the residual obligations to students in the event of course closure or termination of an agreement with a partner institution (TLC/07/26). This matter had arisen from preparatory work for the Collaborative Provision Audit. The paper outlined the current position for the University's own courses and those offered by partner institutions, and proposed a set of principles to formalise explicitly the steps Faculties or partners should take to advise current and prospective students in the event of course closure and to see out the course as follows:

- prospective and current students should be informed as soon as practicable;
- applicants should be advised of suitable alternatives in the University or, where these do not exist, of suitable alternatives elsewhere if known, and the UCAS procedures for full-time undergraduate courses;
- the course should continue to be delivered to current students in accordance with the approved curriculum and regulations (including first sit and resit opportunities);
- current students should be consulted about any proposed changes to the form of delivery, and the CA3 process used to notify the University;
- requests for leave of absence for first year students, for whom no cohort would exist to rejoin, should not normally be granted.

A policy statement from the University of Nottingham was provided by way of example.

The Committee acknowledged that in terms of modus operandi, the University's internal arrangements should be no less robust than those it expected of partner institutions.

The paper set out the general termination clauses which appeared in the legal agreements of this and other universities. The Committee noted that the University's standard Recognition Agreement adopted the phrase 'with the agreement of the [College]' in the context of the partner institution's continued responsibility for delivery of the course in the event of course closure (CA5 withdrawal) or termination of an agreement where due notice had been given.

The Committee believed that, although the phrase was intended to recognise that institutions might seek appropriate alternatives to continued delivery, it should be removed, as it might be construed as giving partner institutions the option of refusing to continue delivery.

AGREED:

- i) that the statement of principles be endorsed and be incorporated with additional guidance into the Programme Approval, Management and Review Handbook and Guide to Collaboration in the Provision of Programmes of Study;
- ii) that Faculties and partner institutions be routinely reminded in writing of these principles and the residual obligations in the event of course closure;
- iii) that the phrase 'with the agreement of the [College]' be removed from future Memoranda of Recognition and Recognition Agreements.

## 07.76 ANNUAL REVIEW OF COLLABORATIVE COURSES (2005/6)

Mr H Deighan presented the report from the 2005/6 Annual Review of Collaborative Courses (TLC/07/27). The report provided an update on action following the 2004/5 review, a summary of the review process in 2005/6, a statement of general issues, issues to be addressed at Faculty level, and proposed revisions for the 2006/7 review.

### 07.77 Process

It was noted that ongoing industrial action within the FE sector had meant that some Colleges did not complete Self-Evaluation Reviews (SERs). In these cases the Teaching and Learning Committee Sub-Group had only scrutinised External Examiner and FHCC reports. Consequently the Sub-Group were not able to assess to their full satisfaction whether partner institutions were taking appropriate action to monitor standards and the quality of the student learning experience. With industrial action continuing, college input to the 2006/7 review was likely to be similar, resulting in incomplete records for two years.

It was recommended, therefore, that a review group be set up to assess the effectiveness of the Self Evaluation Reports in the light of the new area-based college structures.

### 07.78 General Issues

General issues had related to the standard of documentation submitted, course planning and approval (in particular with regard to courses with low enrolments or a high proportion of early leavers, and meaningful employer engagement), inconsistent approaches to delivery and extenuating circumstances, anonymous marking and plagiarism and APEL arrangements. Recommendations had been made, many of which would be taken forward though a staff development event in October 2007.

A number of instances of best practice had been identified and the FHCC Forum had been asked to disseminate these across partner institutions.

The Sub-Group noted the poor recording of issues raised through Staff/Student Consultative Committee meetings and the absence of detailed information on follow-up action taken and feedback provided to students. It was recommended that partner institutions continue to be encouraged to use the standard templates for agendas and minutes now available on the QMAU website. The Sub-Group also recommended that the agenda for Boards of Examiners should explicitly note changes made to module profiles.

The Committee also noted the poor progression record evident from BIFHE to the University. Access students tended to progress to QUB. The CertHE in Community Development also had low progression despite providing entry to Year 2 of a degree. The Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences reported a number of initiatives to strengthen progression routes.

A recommendation was made to introduce a 70% Distinction award in Access courses. It was noted that this matter was being kept under review as the

Committee had previously agreed that the appropriate grade bands in undergraduate courses would be considered following the outcome of the Burgess review of the Honours degree classification system (min 05.214 refers).

07.79 South China Agricultural University

The Sub-Group had recommended that specialist advice be sought on the new APCL agreement with South China Agricultural University (SCAU) but the Committee noted that the agreement had already been approved by Governance Services before being sent to SCAU.

07.80 2006/7 Review

The proposed terms of reference and composition of the 2006/7 Annual Course Review Sub-Group were received. While the review process for non-FE partners would be conducted in the normal way, it was proposed to adapt it for the FE sector to respond to the circumstances arising from the regional college mergers and the continued industrial action. The Committee was asked to approve the development of a pro forma which would require senior management in local FE colleges to comment on key performance indicators and how the risks identified were being managed. The Sub-Group would review the reports of external examiner and Faculty Head of Collaborative Courses and require senior managers to address any substantive issues identified.

AGREED:

- i) that the following recommendations for action by the Faculty Head of Collaborative Courses Forum/QMAU be endorsed:
  - a) that, a review group be established to assess the effectiveness of Self-Evaluation Reports (SERs);
  - b) that staff in partner institutions continue to be encouraged to use the standard templates for agendas and minutes of Staff/Student Consultative Committee meetings and Course Committee meetings;
  - c) that course teams continue to be encouraged to engage actively with employers in the development, delivery and review of programmes, particularly Foundation degrees;
  - d) that FHCCs continue to monitor the treatment of extenuating circumstances across subject networks;
  - e) that FHCCs remind Course Directors of the University's policy on anonymous marking, and monitor that this policy is rigorously adhered to;
  - f) that the University's new policy on plagiarism be forwarded to partner institutions for information;

- g) that FHCCs remind Course Directors of the requirement that all members of teaching staff should attend Course Committee meetings;
- h) that staff development be provided to staff in partner institutions on the importance of proper academic governance (course committees);
- i) that staff development be provided on the University's policy and procedures for Accreditation of Prior Learning;
- ii) that the template Agenda for Boards of Examiners be revised explicitly to include a specific item 'to note any changes to overall module marks following moderation'. [This will apply to University and partner institution Boards.]
- iii) that a report on follow-up action to the 2005/6 review be forwarded to the June meeting;
- iv) that the process, terms of reference and membership of the Sub-Group for the 2006/7 review be approved.

#### 07.81 ANNUAL SUBJECT MONITORING 2005/06: REPORT OF THE SUB-GROUP

Ms C Browning presented the report of the Sub-Group of the Committee which had considered Faculty Monitoring reports for 2005/6 and the six specific courses/subjects which had been reviewed in detail (TLC/07/28).

The Committee noted the update on action taken in relation to outstanding or ongoing issues from the Sub-Group's report for the 2004/5 exercise.

#### 07.82 Faculty Processes

The Committee noted that the Sub-Group had reviewed the various Faculty methodologies for annual monitoring with a view to assuring itself that the Faculty reports provided evidence that the process had been undertaken robustly and that staff were using the quality indicators available to inform the process. A number of recommendations had been made for each Faculty.

#### 07.83 University Objective for 2005/6

The Sub-Group had reviewed the achievement of the University objective, viz to outline and evaluate formal mechanisms for consideration of PSRB reports and responses to such reports at course, school and Faculty level. It was noted that three Faculties considered it appropriate for a Faculty committee to review or receive PSRB reports and responses. The remaining two Faculties did not follow this practice. As the majority of Faculty comments had not reflected on the University's Protocol for the management of PSRB links, it was not possible to tell whether Faculty policies were compliant with the Protocol.

The Committee was due to receive a report on the Protocol from QMAU at its June meeting (min 07.52 refers).

The Committee noted that engagement with PSRBs must be conducted with the utmost professionalism. When difficulties arise with any such body it could be extremely difficult to redress the situation.

#### 07.84 Specific Courses

The Committee noted the following in relation to the six course/subject-level reviews undertaken by the Sub-Group:

BA Hons Architecture: in view of the high attrition rate, the Sub-Group recommended that the course team ensure that potential students were made aware of the course's intensity, its studio-based culture and the particular nature of the subject at the University.

BA Hons International Politics: the Sub-Group was content with the course team's actions to address the high attrition rate on this course.

BA Hons Hospitality and Tourism Management: the course team was asked to provide further reassurance about the development of assessment criteria and the monitoring of arrangements and to invite the external examiner to comment in advance on assessment briefs and their level.

MSc Communication, Advertising and Public Relations: the Sub-Group had asked the Faculty to give further consideration to its use of part-time staff to undertake supervision of dissertations during the summer and to report to the Teaching and Learning Committee.

Modular Law: in view of external examiner concerns about student performance in one module, the Sub-Group recommended that the teaching and learning strategy for the module be reviewed and that students be provided with a clear explanation of its expectations at the start of the module. The subject team was also asked to explore further with students the use and value of PDP and the PDS system and report on this matter to the PDP Working Group.

Postgraduate Certificate in Further/Higher Education: it was recommended that the Faculty provide a response to the Teaching and Learning Committee on how the subject report had been considered and whether the Faculty was content with progress.

#### 07.85 Matters Raised by Faculties for Teaching and Learning Committee

Ten recommendations for consideration at University-level had been made from a range of issues raised by Faculties.

The Committee had been asked to review the purpose of module monitoring with particular reference to the nomenclature used. Rather than referring to modules "at risk", it was suggested that the terminology "module review" be used to reflect the purpose of the exercise, which was intended to consider 'outliers' in terms of student performance on modules. This encompassed modules both with significantly lower and significantly higher than expected student performance.

The Committee noted that recommendations had been made to enhance practice in relation to the Assessment of Teaching Student Questionnaire, by clarifying the instructions to students, providing the results earlier and improving feedback to students. While recognising that the questionnaire was the only direct means available to assess the quality of individual staff's teaching and that it was a robust instrument, the Committee was concerned that the exercise as currently conducted was not as useful as it might be in contributing to the enhancement of teaching and the student learning experience. There might be more focussed and strategic approaches which could be used. The Committee would welcome discussions with the trade union on this matter.

The Sub-Group had recommended that the use of group work, particularly at Level 3 and Level M, should be the subject of a themed audit. It had also endorsed a proposal that additional guidance be provided on feedback to students (particularly in the first year). The Committee noted the work undertaken in the University on this topic and current staff development in the Faculty of Social Sciences. It asked Dr Heenan to contribute to a review of the relevant chapter in the Assessment Handbook.

#### AGREED:

- i) that the specific recommendations made for Faculties be endorsed and that Faculty reports on their responses be provided to the June meeting of the Committee;
- ii) that the terminology used in respect of module monitoring be revised and 'module review' be adopted;
- iii) that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) advise the Director of Human Resources of the Committee's views about the Student Questionnaire and that discussions be held with the UCU through the Joint Negotiating Committee;
- iv) that, pending the conclusion of the review at iii), a working group be established to look at and make recommendations in relation to student feedback on the quality of teaching;
- v) that the Assessment Handbook be revised to include additional guidance on feedback to students;
- vi) that group work be added to the schedule of themed audits;
- vii) that the attention of the Director of Physical Resources be drawn to the difficulties experienced by the Faculty of Social Sciences in relation to teaching accommodation for large classes so that they might be considered in the concept planning for the re-development of the Jordanstown campus;

viii) that the review process be enhanced by:

- asking the Planning Department to make available in July statistics for individual undergraduate programmes based on first sit data and to explore the potential for the new student records system to provide modular subject data;
- QMAU providing guidance on the areas which should be included in the Faculty Overview Report and revising the pro formas used by the Teaching and Learning Committee Sub-Group to place greater emphasis on PSRB and employer engagement;
- all Faculties reflecting on the nature of student complaints and assessing whether there were any generic issues for Faculty consideration or to be raised at University-level.

## PROPOSED REVISIONS TO REGULATIONS

### 07.86 Ownership of Assessed Work

The Committee received a paper on the ownership of students' assessed work (TLC/07/29). It was noted that currently there was no explicit University regulation on this matter except in relation to the final copies of Master's dissertations held in the Library being the property of the University, and the regulations for research degrees.

The Committee considered a proposed revision to the regulations to clarify that, while an assignment once submitted becomes the physical property of the University, the copyright and intellectual property were retained by the student. The proposed wording was adapted from a regulation at the University of Middlesex.

AGREED: that it be recommended to Senate that the General Regulations for Students be revised as follows:

New 20 Save as otherwise provided within regulations, a student shall hold the intellectual property of any work he or she has submitted for any form of assessment. The material so produced shall become the property of the University. It may be returned to the student in accordance with the Regulations Governing Examinations in Programmes of Study.

21 As current regulation 20.

[Re-number remaining.]

07.87 Examination and Coursework in Level A/1 in Undergraduate Degrees and DipHEs

The Committee received a paper on examination and coursework in level A/1 of undergraduate degrees and the DipHE (TLC/07/30).

It was noted that the Regulations for Degrees and Honours Degrees and for Foundation degrees, Associate Bachelor's degrees and DipHEs contained a regulation which required 'at least 50% of the modules' normally to be assessed by a combination of written examination and coursework.

This principle was formally introduced in 1990 and pre-dated the modular and credit-based system which started in 1992. Initially it referred only to Year 1 of degrees and DipHEs. This was subsequently changed to Level 1 at the time of modularisation to ensure parity of treatment for part-time students. Level A was also added when the revised University's Qualifications Framework permitted such lower level modules in undergraduate degrees from 2001.

At a recent evaluation event for a full-time Foundation degree which included Level 1 modules (2 x 10 credit points) in the second year of the degree, it was noted that the course fulfilled the expectation of the regulation when the first year of the full-time degree was considered but not when the two Level 1 modules in second year were included in the count.

As the intention of the original regulation related to the student experience in Year 1 only in full-time courses, it was proposed to clarify the regulation accordingly.

AGREED: that it be recommended to Senate that Regulation 11 of the Regulations for Degrees and Honours Degrees and Regulation 10 of the Regulations for Foundation Degrees and Associate Bachelor Degrees and the Diploma of Higher Education be reworded as below:

At Level A/1 at least 50% of the modules modules amounting to 60 credit points shall normally be assessed by a combination of written examination and coursework with the remainder assessed by either examination or coursework or a combination of examination and coursework. Level A modules may be counted within the Level 1 modules in order to fulfil this requirement.

07.88 STUDIES ADVICE

The Committee received a paper on Studies Advice (TLC/07/31) from a Working Group chaired by Dr C Curran which had been established to reconsider the principles of studies advice within programmes of study and the implementation of an effective studies advice service, as part of the Wharton senior staff initiative.

The Committee noted that the Working Group had undertaken a survey which indicated broad satisfaction with the current system, the balance between academic and pastoral support, and the University's Code of Practice for

Advisers of Studies. It was noted that specialist counselling support was accessible as appropriate. However, the report concluded that the overall effectiveness of the policy depended on the priority and resources accorded by individual schools.

Mr McGivern reported that, although the Committee had agreed that Faculties should record the names of studies advisers on the student records system (min 03.59 refers), only a quarter of advisers were identified. He proposed that the Faculties' responsibility in this regard be explicitly added to the Code of Practice.

AGREED:

- i) that the following recommendations be endorsed:
  - a) that the topic of studies advice be a standing item on the agendas of staff/student consultative committees for subsequent report to the course/subject committee;
  - b) that an analysis of this activity for each subject area be a required component of the Annual Subject Monitoring exercise, and that opportunities for sharing good practice and innovative approaches be exploited within the ASM process;
  - c) that the interface between PDP and studies advice be exploited at the level of each School;
  - d) that it be reaffirmed that all members of academic staff were eligible to fulfil the role of adviser of studies, but that the determination of individual staff members' responsibilities was a matter for the Head of School;
- ii) that the Code of Practice be amended to specify Faculties' responsibility to record names of Advisers of Studies in the student records system.

#### 07.89 NEW PRIZES

The Committee received a paper (TLC/07/32) on proposed new prizes, three in the Faculty of Engineering, two in the Faculty of Life and Health Sciences and one each in the Faculties of Arts, Business and Management and Social Sciences. The association of some of the prizes with pre-final year study was welcomed.

AGREED: that it be recommended to Senate that the proposed new prizes be established (Appendix 4).

#### VARIATIONS WITHIN UNIVERSITY REGULATORY AND MODULAR FRAMEWORK

#### 07.90 Master of Fine Art (TLC/07/33)

The Committee received paper TLC/07/33 from the Faculty of Arts requesting the inclusion of two 40-credit point modules and one 120-credit point module in the

Master of Fine Arts programme. It was noted that the course had a volume of 240 credit points, 60 more than the standard Master's degree.

AGREED: that the proposal be approved.

07.91 BSc Hons Professional Development in Social Work

The Committee received paper TLC/07/34 from the Faculty of Social Sciences requesting the inclusion of a 60-credit point module in the 'agency-based route' within the BSc Hons Professional Development in Social Work. The Committee was also asked to consider a request to depart from the University's regulatory framework in respect of the normal expectation of a dissertation in the final level of an Honours degree.

The Committee noted two issues, one concerning the size of the module (60 credit points) and the second about whether or not the learning outcomes could be achieved through the work-based practice component and portfolio preparation.

The Committee considered that a mapping exercise needed to be conducted to establish that the learning outcomes of the undergraduate dissertation module in the University-based route were met through the 60-point module.

AGREED: that the Faculty be asked to provide satisfactory evidence of equivalence through a mapping exercise.

07.92 Revalidation Subject Unit 28M: Health Professionals Council Provision

The Committee received paper TLC/07/35 from the Faculty of Life and Health Sciences requesting approval of the following variations within the University's regulatory and modular framework.

- a) Level 2 Contribution to Honours Classification (BSc Hons Occupational Therapy, BSc Hons Physiotherapy, BSc Hons Radiography, BSc Hons Speech and Language Therapy)

The Committee noted that University regulations stipulated that the calculation of honours degree classifications is based entirely on final year Level 3 modules and that an exception to this principle may only be permitted where a professional body require pre-final year level study to contribute to the honours classification for recognition purposes.

The Committee acknowledged the importance of the achievement of Year 2 outcomes for the fulfilment of the requirements of the degrees, but noted that evidence had not been provided that the four professional bodies involved required Level 2 contributions. (Such evidence had been provided in 2001.)

AGREED: that the Faculty be asked to confirm the professional bodies' expectations in this regard.

- b) Dissertation (BSc Hons Occupational Therapy, BSc Hons Physiotherapy, BSc Hons Radiography, BSc Hons Speech and Language Therapy)

The Committee considered the case presented by the Faculty to omit a dissertation module in all four programmes. Evidence was provided that the learning outcomes typically associated with a dissertation would be achieved in the Evidence-Based Practice module.

AGREED: that the proposal be approved.

- c) 40-Point Placement Module (BSc Hons Radiography and BSc Hons Speech and Language Therapy)

The Committee considered the case for 40-point placement modules in two programmes. The teams' view that the complexity of, and student effort hours, in the placement modules warranted 40-credit points was noted.

AGREED: that the proposal be approved.

- d) Resit Opportunities – BSc Hons Occupational Therapy and BSc Hons Speech and Language Therapy

University regulations for Honours degrees permit students in pre-final years to repeat specified examinations and/or coursework following failure at a second attempt, thus providing three attempts in total. The Committee considered cases from the Faculty to vary from these regulations in relation to two programmes as follows:

BSc Hons Occupational Therapy – that failure in a practice placement and academic modules should normally be permitted to be retrieved on one occasion only (save in extenuating circumstances). This was an educational standard laid down by the College of Occupational Therapists.

BSc Hons Speech and Language Therapy – that normally one resit only should be allowed for the professional practice components (save in extenuating circumstances). The Northern Ireland Education Partnership had agreed with the course team that, as students were individually supported in clinical learning, it was considered important that students were able to acquire the necessary knowledge and competences within a specified timescale. The limited availability of placements was also a factor.

AGREED that it be recommended to Senate that:

- i) that the proposals to restrict resit opportunities in pre-final years at d) above be approved;
- ii) that the final clause of Regulation 25 of the Regulations for Degrees and Honours Degrees (which sets out the consequences of failure in pre-final years) be revised as follows:

'...The consequences of failure in BSc/BSc Hons Nursing and BSc Hons Nursing Studies shall be as specified in the programme regulations. *ADD* Candidates for the BSc Hons Occupational Therapy and BSc Hons Speech and Language Therapy who fail at the second attempt in placement modules shall normally be required to withdraw from the programme.'

Duration: 3 hours 15 minutes

14 May 2007

AG/NW/lh

## REPORT FROM THE COURSE APPROVAL SUB-COMMITTEE (22.3.07)

## COURSE APPROVAL (Item 1)

The Sub-Committee considered business from each Faculty and noted revisions approved by the Faculties as detailed in the Annex. The Sub-Committee considered reports from evaluation and revalidation panels.

## FACULTY OF ARTS

Revalidation Subject Unit 2A: Art and Design (Magee)

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the Panel being met, the following provision within Subject Unit 2A be approved for a further period of five years (intakes 2007 – 2011):

Undergraduate Hons Subject: (Multimedia) Design (Main)  
BDes (Hons) Design and Communication (FT)  
PgDip/MDes Design Communication (FT & PT).

AGREED: (i) that, given the absence of external examiner reports for 2004/05 and 2005/06 for the PgDip/MDes Design Communication, this programme be placed on the Faculty's risk register and a report on this provision be included in next year's Annual Subject Monitoring report;

(ii) that a section focusing on the student experience, with reference to assessment, be included in next year's ASM report with regard to the BDes (Hons) Design and Communication programme.

Revalidation Subject Unit 2B: Art and Design (Postgraduate/Belfast)

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the Panel being met, the following provision within Unit 2B be approved for a further period of five years (intakes 2007 – 2011):

PgDip/MA Irish Visual Culture  
Master of Fine Art.

## FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT

Undergraduate Honours Subject: Advertising (Single Honours/Major/Main/Minor)

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the Panel being met, the programme be approved for a period of five years (intakes 2007 – 2011), with an initial offer standard of 240 UCAS points to include grades CC.

## Revalidation Subject Unit 5I: Business and Management – Level 2 at BIFHE

- NOTED:
- (a) that the Dean had endorsed a four-year period of approval, which would bring the period of approval into line with the revalidation schedule for the University programmes in revalidation units 5A and 5B;
  - (b) that, based on the resources available at BIFHE, the Faculty had recommended a maximum cohort size of 30 students for the part-time BSc Hons Business Studies (Level 2) programme.

RECOMMENDED: that the maximum cohort size for the part-time BSc Hons Business Studies (Level 2) programme be 30 students.

## FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

### Integrated Foundation Year (IFY) for Eight Honours Degree Programmes in the School of Electrical and Mechanical Engineering

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the condition of the Panel being met, the programme be approved for a period of three years (intakes 2007 – 2009), in line with the revalidation schedule for Subject Unit 10A1, with an initial offer standard of 120 UCAS points.

### Course Withdrawals

NOTED: that the following courses had been withdrawn:

CerTHE Computing for Education at Causeway Institute of Further and Higher Education  
HND Computing (Software Engineering) at Castlereagh College of Further and Higher Education  
FdSc Computing for Education at Causeway Institute of Further and Higher Education  
FdSc Computing at Lisburn Institute of Further and Higher Education  
AB Computing (CE)  
AB Computing Science (JN).

## FACULTY OF LIFE AND HEALTH SCIENCES

### Revalidation Subject Unit 25C: PgDip/MSc Careers Guidance

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the condition of the Panel being met, the PgDip/MSc Careers Guidance be approved for a further period of five years (intakes 2007 – 2011).

### Revalidation Subject Unit 3B2: Forensic Medicine

NOTED: (a) that the provision was currently offered on a part-time basis by distance learning;

- (b) that a new entry route of Postgraduate Certificate (previously an exit point) had been proposed for the existing PgDip/MSc Forensic Medicine programme and that the revalidation event had also included a proposal for a new part-time, stand-alone Postgraduate Certificate in Forensic Studies with no progression route currently available;
- (c) that, in line with the Panel's recommendation, the Team now wished to change the title of the PgDip/MSc Forensic Medicine to PgCert/PgDip/MSc Forensic and Legal Medicine.

- RECOMMENDED:
- (i) that, subject to the conditions of the Panel being met, the PgDip/MSc Forensic and Legal Medicine be approved for a further period of five years (intakes 2007 – 2011) and that the Postgraduate Certificate, previously an exit award only, be approved as an entry point;
  - (ii) that, subject to the conditions of the Panel being met, the Postgraduate Certificate in Forensic Studies be approved for a period of five years (intakes 2007 – 2011).

Revalidation Subject Unit 3D: Food, Nutrition and Dietetics

RECEIVED: a request from the Faculty for a one-year extension to the period of approval for the provision within Unit 3D.

- NOTED:
- (a) that the British Dietetic Association's revised Guidelines for Education and Training would not be available until April 2008;
  - (b) that the request for a one-year extension related to all the provision within Unit 3D as a substantial number of modules were shared across the programmes;
  - (c) that all programmes had received consistently positive external examiner reports and that issues raised by the Annual Subject Monitoring exercise had been addressed;
  - (d) that the professional courses had been visited by HPC in December 2006 and had been granted open-ended approval subject to routine annual monitoring.

AGREED: that the Faculty's proposal be endorsed.

RECOMMENDED: that the period of approval for the following provision be extended to include the 2008 intake:

BSc Hons Dietetics  
 BSc Hons Food and Nutrition  
 BSc Hons Human Nutrition

PgDip/MSc Human Nutrition  
PgDip/MSc Dietetics.

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Revalidation Subject Unit 26H: Women's Opportunities

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the Panel being met, the following provision be approved for a further period of up to five years (intakes 2007 – 2011) – the actual period being subject to confirmation of funding and staff resources:

CertHE in Telematics and Management Studies (Full-time)  
PgDip/MSc in Professional and Management Development  
(PgDip: full-time; MSc component: full-time and part-time).

Revalidation Subject Unit 18A: Law

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the Panel being met, the following provision be approved for a further period of five years (intakes 2007 – 2011):

Undergraduate Honours Subject: Law (Single Honours/Major)  
(PT & FT) at Jordanstown and Magee  
LLM Human Rights Law (with Postgraduate Diploma exit  
award) at Jordanstown and Magee.

Course Withdrawal

NOTED: that the following course had been withdrawn:

PgDip/MSc Psychological Trauma Management  
(Jordanstown).

COURSE APPROVAL SUB-COMMITTEE

22 March 2007

**FACULTY OF ARTS**

**BA Hons Media Arts / Media Studies**

To replace module MED303C2 by a choice from three optional modules;

**BA Hons Irish History and Politics**

To introduce an additional element of assessment for a web-based assignment and to alter the assessment weightings for coursework in module HIS538M2, 'Unionism under the Union, 1800-1922';

**Undergraduate Hons Subject: Drama**

To introduce three additional optional level 3 modules.

**FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT**

**Advanced Diploma in Management Practice (DRD)**

To assign a separate course code for DRD cohorts;

**BSc Hons Accounting (FT/PT) at Jordanstown and NKIFHE**

To revise module ACF322J2;

**BSc Hons Business (FT/PT) and Major**

To change the optional module 'Research Methods' (BMG410C2) from a level 2 module taught in the second semester, to a level 3 module taught in the first semester; to introduce module BMG411C2 as an optional semester 1 module;

**BSc Hons Business and Major; BSc Hons Business Finance and Investment**

To make six level 1 modules available in semesters 1, 2 and 3;

**BSc Hons International Hotel & Tourism Management (CE – Portrush and NKIFHE outcentre)**

To reinstate an optional level 3 module: 'Environmental Issues in Business';

**PgDip/MSc Business Improvement**

To tailor the above course for a British Telecom cohort, by dividing an existing module into two and by introducing two new modules.

**FACULTY OF ENGINEERING**

**FdSc Computing and Network Systems at NKIFHE**

To revise the content of three modules;

**BEng Electronics, Communications and Software**

To replace modules EEE001J1 and EEE138J2 by 'Physical Principles I' and 'Physical Principles IIB';

**BEng/BEng Hons Electronics, Communications and Software (PT/FT)**

To change pre-requisite for module EEE305J1; to revise syllabus for EEE320J2; to associate the AB exit award with this course title rather than Electronics and Software;

**BEng Electronics, Communications and Software**

To replace optional module EEE510J2 by MEC501J2;

**BEng Hons Electronics and Software (PT)**

To replace module EEE308J1A by EEE307J1;

**BSc Hons Software Engineering; BSc Hons Computing Science; BSc Hons Information and Communication Technologies; BSc Hons Mathematics with Computing**

To revise module COM571J1;

**BSc Hons Environmental Health (with DIS)**

To revise the assessment weightings in three modules;

**BSc Hons Computer Science; Undergraduate Hons Subject: Computing (ME)**

To remove module COM326M1 as a pre-requisite for COM565M1;

**BSc Hons Property Investment and Development (FT)**

To replace the two 20-point dissertation modules with a single long-thin 40-point dissertation module;

**BSc Hons Construction Engineering and Management (with DIS)**

To amend the assessment strategy in module BLD322J4, the placement year;

**BEng Hons Civil Engineering (with DIS)**

To revise the assessment strategy in module CIV324J4A (placement year); to introduce an AB exit award;

**PgDip/MSc Informatics; PgDip/MSc Web Information Systems (FT/PT)**

To provide revised version of module COM913J1;

**MSc e-Learning: Interactive Teaching Technologies**

To amend course regulations formally to recognise the Postgraduate Certificate in Further and Higher Education (four specified modules), as meeting the requirements of 60 credits within the degree; to amend the regulations to allow any four modules to contribute to a PgCert exit award.

**FACULTY OF LIFE AND HEALTH SCIENCES**

**CertHE/FdSc Rural and Countryside Management (PT) at CAFRE**

To make some modules available in the evening and during semester 3;

**Master of Clinical Research**

To amend the regulations for the degree.

## CHARTER REVIEW GROUP: TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Terms of Reference

- 1 To review the Student Charter biennially to ensure currency and accuracy and to make any appropriate enhancements.
- 2 To monitor and review progress against the key performance indicators as set out in the University's Support Charters.
- 3 To keep under review the relationship and appropriate cross-referencing between draft support Charters, the Student Charter and other published statements on University regulations, policies and procedures.
- 4 To report conclusions and recommendations to the Teaching and Learning Committee.

In reaching decisions the Group will have due regard to their impact on, and implications for, the University's commitment to ensuring equality of opportunity and good relations as outlined in its Equality Scheme, and associated policies, and where possible and practicable the Group will ensure that its actions are proactive in this respect.

CHARTER REVIEW GROUP: PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP FOR 2007/08

<u>Composition</u>	<u>Membership</u>
Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) (Chair)	Professor D McAlister
President of Students' Union	Miss A Fearon
Two additional Students' Union nominees	Chris McDermott Oran McGonagle
Student Representation and Development Officer (SU)	Ms L McMaw
Two representatives from areas with Support Charters:	
Career Development Centre	Mr D McGivern
Research Students	Ms R Donnelly Ms G McCracken/Ms R Haughey Professor S McClean
Residential Services Student Welfare Services E-learning	Mr G Kennedy Ms S Steging Mrs D Sloan
Information Services	Mrs Catherine O'Donnell Mr K Livingston
International Office	Mr C Cregan Ms J Reilly Mrs C Kane
Representatives from each Faculty:	
Arts	Dr B Dass
Business and Management Engineering	Mr T O'Neill Mr W Johnston Mr I Taylor
Life and Health Sciences Social Sciences	Dr P Naughton Dr D Hazlett Mr L Carswell
One nominee from each department whose work interrelates with the review of the Charter/Support Charters:	
Academic Registry	Dr A Scott
Equality Physical Resources	Ms S Hunter Mr F Liddle
Finance Marketing	Ms H Hogg tbc
Secretariat	Ms C Browning Ms J Clements

## **Personal Development Planning Policy Document December 2006**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

The concept for Personal Development Planning (PDP) springs from the Dearing review (NCIHE, 1997)<sup>1</sup> recommendation that institutions develop ‘a means by which students can monitor, build and reflect upon their personal development’ (Dearing recommendation 20).

Since that time Universities UK, SCOP, Quality Assurance Agency and LTSN have developed the HE Progress Files concept and policy. In a joint policy statement from these bodies the Personal Development Planning aspect of HE Progress Files has been defined as:

*‘A structured and supported process undertaken by an individual to reflect upon their learning, performance and/or achievements and to plan for their personal, educational and career development.’* (Guidelines for Progress Files. QAA, Feb.2001a).

The over-arching teaching and learning strategy for the University recognises the importance of the underpinning aims of PDP and includes commitments to:

- encourage and facilitate teaching which supports a culture of understanding and progressively equips and allows students to take responsibility for their own learning.
- encourage and support students to reflect on their learning, including where appropriate work-based (practice-based) learning in preparation for future learning and employment.
- an overall PDP policy to start in September 2005 for all first-year undergraduate students and to be rolled out to all undergraduates as this cohort of students progresses through University.

(Teaching & Learning Strategy 2004, p 6,15)

### **2. PURPOSE OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING (PDP)**

***One of the five core strategic aims of the University’s Corporate Plan 2006/7 – 2010/11 is to “provide excellent learning opportunities which are student centred and client focused”.*** The primary purpose of PDP is to improve the capacity of students to understand what and how they are learning by making the outcomes of learning more explicit, and to encourage them to review, plan and take responsibility for their own learning. (QAA Feb. 2001,p2)

***A key supporting objective of this core strategic aim is “to provide a relevant range of personal support mechanisms to students throughout their studies to encourage them to achieve their full potential once admitted to the University”.***

The key objective for PDP within the University of Ulster is to support students to become more effective, independent and autonomous learners through:

- Taking responsibility for their own development during their time at university and beyond;
- Recognising and availing of the opportunities for learning and personal development within and outside the formal curriculum;
- Developing skills of reflection on their progress in achieving the learning outcomes that programmes have specified and on their personal and professional development;
- Increasing the self-awareness of their skills, qualities, attitudes and capabilities;
- Setting goals and planning actions to develop, monitor and review their own progress;
- Compiling a record of learning experiences and achievements, with progress reviews, personal reflections and action plans and sharing these with third parties; and
- Preparing for employment and professional practice by managing their own career development.

### **3. UNIVERSITY PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PDP**

The University's PDP model reconciles the need for consistency across the University with the need for diverse Faculty, School and Programme PDP processes. In implementing PDP within the University the following guiding principles have been established:

1. PDP will feature in all award-bearing programmes and will achieve the general objectives as identified in section 2.
2. The ultimate responsibility for engaging with the PDP process will reside with the student and they will own the personal records arising from PDP.
3. All designated students will have equal opportunity to access support for their PDP.
4. Customised PDP processes will be developed at Faculty, School or Programme level to reflect the particular needs of their students and they will be embedded within the distinctive learning experiences offered by individual programmes of study.
5. Models of PDP will build on and link to existing good practice e.g. aligning work-based learning, entrepreneurship, employability, retention and widening participation activities to the PDP process.
6. Students will have the opportunity to meet a designated member of staff to plan their learning programme and review performance.
7. The University of Ulster Personal Development System (PDSystem) will support the recording of the outcomes of the PDP process. ***Additional appropriate mechanisms for recording outcomes may be used where there is a rationale to support this.***

### **4. RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### **4.1 Student**

In order to derive maximum benefit from PDP students have the responsibility:

- To participate fully in the PDP process and the opportunities for PDP offered by the University in a range of learning contexts both inside and outside the formal curriculum;

- To ensure that they know how to effectively access and use the University of Ulster PDSystem to reflect upon their learning and achievements and to plan their own personal, educational and career development; and
- To create, with support, their own learning records, within the University of Ulster PDSystem, **or other suitable systems**, containing information about the qualities and skills they can evidence which can be drawn upon **to enhance employability** or further study.

## 4.2 Faculty

Faculty/School/**Graduate School**/Programme has the responsibility:

### 4.2.1 Implementation

- To develop at appropriate levels, in line with University policy, teaching and learning strategies which design and implement a PDP process appropriate to their subjects and their students, influenced by professional and statutory bodies where appropriate.

### 4.2.2 Information

- To include information about PDP within their student/module handbooks, with clear indication of how a student can expect to encounter PDP within the programme; and
- To provide students with information on any ways in which their own evidence of learning might be eligible for accreditation.

### 4.2.3 Opportunities and Support

- To introduce students **during** the programme, to PDP;
- To provide students with opportunities for PDP at each stage of their programme and to explain its rationale;
- To encourage and support students to engage in the PDP process;
- To integrate PDP into the student support mechanisms to allow both staff and students to engage actively in the reviewing of student development; and
- To provide clear guidance and support on the use of the University of Ulster PDSystem, **or alternative systems**, and about the records that students are expected to maintain within the system.

### 4.2.4 Development and Monitoring

- To undertake regular reviews and evaluation of the model(s) adopted for the implementation of PDP.

## 4.3 University

The University has the responsibility:

- To articulate its policy on PDP through the University prospectus, student handbook and any other means deemed appropriate;
- To ensure that the monitoring, review and development of PDP will be a feature of all university quality assurance processes. (e.g. discussed explicitly as part of the (re) validation process, themed audit etc.);
- To continue the provision, development and support for the University of Ulster PDSystem as an interactive online tool for use by students and staff; and
- To provide staff development opportunities for all relevant categories of staff to enable them to provide effective support to students in the process of PDP.

FACULTY OF ARTS

Dr Gerard O'Hare Student Scholarship Scheme for International Travel				
Eligibility	Criteria for Award	Selecting Body	Value of Award	Origin
All Year One students on programmes in the Schools of Art and Design and Built Environment	Successful completion of Year One by June of the current academic year; quality of project proposal including budget and practicability of proposal as assessed by selection panel.	Panel comprising Dr Gerard O'Hare, Heads of School of Art and Design and Built Environment, and other staff associated to the scheme in each school	£5,000 per student partnership - travel to be completed before return to University for commencement of Year Two	Dr Gerard O'Hare Parker Green International Newry

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT

Capita Achievement Award				
Eligibility	Criteria for Award	Selecting Body	Value of Award	Origin
Final year BSc Hons Human Resource Management (with DIS) students	Best overall student	Board of Examiners	£1000	Capita Belfast

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

Latens Systems Ltd Award				
Eligibility	Criteria for Award	Selecting Body	Value of Award	Origin
First year BEng Hons Software Engineering students	Best overall student	Board of Examiners	£250	Latens Systems Ltd
Latens Systems Ltd Award				
Eligibility	Criteria for Award	Selecting Body	Value of Award	Origin
Second Year BSc Hons Computing Science students	Best overall student	Board of Examiners	£250	Latens Systems Limited
The NWIPP-Design Multimedia Award				
Eligibility	Criteria for Award	Selecting Body	Value of Award	Origin
Final year BSc Hons Multimedia Computing and Design students	Best performing student	Board of Examiners	£300	North West of Ireland Printing and Publishing (NWIPP) Design

## FACULTY OF LIFE AND HEALTH SCIENCES

The Maura Hamill-McKenna Award				
Eligibility	Criteria for Award	Selecting Body	Value of Award	Origin
All health visitor students on BSc Hons Community and Public Health Nursing and PgD Community and Public Health Nursing at the time of nomination	Overall top average mark in 3 specialist modules of the programme and positive report from Teacher Practitioner	CPHVA and University Lecturer Panel  Agreed by September Board of Examiners	Perpetual cup donated by family  CPHVA will provide a place at their annual conference in Harrowgate (held in October every year) + flights and accommodation	Community Practitioner and Health Visitor Association (CPHVA)
The Sarstedt Prize				
Eligibility	Criteria for Award	Selecting Body	Value of Award	Origin
All graduates of the MSc Biomedical Science (Distance Learning)	Highest scoring graduate	Course Committee recommending to Board of Examiners for final decision	£200	SARSTEDT Ltd Belfast

## FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission/Transitional Justice Dissertation Prize				
Eligibility	Criteria for Award	Selecting Body	Value of Award	Origin
LLM in Human Rights Law students (who complete their dissertation within the deadline)	Highest mark in the Dissertation (and in the cases of two or more with the same mark, originality). With External Examiner approval.	LLM Course Committee, verified by the Board of Examiners	£500	Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission