

UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER

TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on 7 December 2005 at the Jordanstown campus

PRESENT

Professor D A McAlister (Chair), Professor I Banat, Professor N D Black, Professor K Greenan, Dr P Hanna, Dr D A Heenan, Professor D Hunter, Professor R Hutchinson, Ms A Kemplay, Professor E M Lillie, Mr D McGivern, Mr N McKenna, Mr T McLernon, Professor A Moran, Professor C W Mulholland

APOLOGIES

Professor J M Allen, Professor R R Barnett, Mr P Fleming, Professor B M Hannigan, Mr L McCurry, Dr R J Millar, Ms N O'Hagan, Professor R A Welch

IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs C G Avery, Mr A G Faulkner, Mrs R Fee (for mins 05.210 – 05.219)

UNRESERVED BUSINESS

05.175 MINUTES

The confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2005 were signed by the Chair.

MATTERS ARISING

05.176 Assessing Work-Based Learning (Min 05.142)

The Committee noted that revisions to the guidance to clarify its status and scope were nearing completion and that the final version would be issued to Committee members, be placed on the Academic Office website and incorporated into the next edition of the Assessment Handbook.

05.177 APL (Min 05.163)

The Chair reported that the Working Group would reconvene on 12 December 2005 to consider Faculty comments and to revise the draft policy and guiding principles. A report would be received by the Committee at its February meeting.

05.178 Group Dissertation – MSc Business Improvement (Min 05.169)

At its October meeting, the Committee had considered the response from the course team, which outlined the assessment and monitoring arrangements for the programme and had asked the Faculty to provide confirmation that all learning outcomes were expected to be achieved by each individual student and

that each student's workload was commensurate with the award of 60 credit points.

The Faculty had since provided a further response confirming that the above requirements would be met.

AGREED: that the proposal for a group dissertation in the above programme be approved.

05.179 Access to Electronic Journals by Students of Partner Institutions (Min 05.170)

Professor Black had discussed with Information Services the costs associated with providing access to electronic journals to selected partners. The Assistant Director (Library) had confirmed that generally partner institutions were expected to make adequate provision for their own students, and the Library worked closely with Faculties and colleges to assist in identification of requirements. Licence agreements for electronic journals did not provide for open access but the University could, at an additional cost, extend access by students of partner institutions. Such arrangements would need to be costed and paid for on an individual institution basis.

AGREED:

- i) that the Quality Management and Audit Unit write to partner institutions to clarify the position and to ask them to ensure that students on validated programmes were fully aware that they had no special privileges at the University (including access to electronic resources);
- ii) that Faculties ensure that partner institutions are advised of the core journals which should be available either in hard copy or electronically, and the adequacy of the resource be considered by evaluation and re-validation panels.

CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

05.180 Distinguished Teaching Awards

The Chair reported that individual awards for excellence in teaching had been made to Professor K Houston, School of Computing and Mathematics and Dr T Maguire, School of Media and Performing Arts. Dr M Eaton, School of Environmental Studies, had been highly commended in this category. No award had been made in the team category but the School of Biomedical Sciences team, led by Dr J O'Connor, had also been highly commended. The Committee noted that, disappointedly, no applications had been received for excellence for the support of teaching and learning.

05.181 National Teaching Fellowship Scheme

The Chair reported that the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme had been re-launched for 2006 and that it would comprise two strands, Individual National Teaching Fellowship Awards and Project Grants. Higher Education institutions would be able to nominate up to three staff in the individual award strand, which

would be open to staff engaged in supporting and promoting excellence in student learning. A call for nominations would be made in early January. In the project strand, teams will be able to bid for funds of up to £200,000 and the invitation to bid for project funding would open in September 2006.

AGREED: that Faculties be encouraged to make nominations, particularly in relation to the support of student learning.

#### 05.182 FACULTY HEADS OF COLLABORATIVE COURSES FORUM

Dr Hanna presented a composite report from meetings of the Forum held on 21 September and 9 November 2005 (TLC/05/88).

#### 05.183 Education and Training Inspectorate (ETI) (Item 2)

The Committee noted the on-going work with ETI and that the need for the University and colleges to engage pro-actively with Sector Skills Councils in the development of Foundation degrees had been emphasised at a recent ETI Staff Development event. The Chair of the Forum and the Head of the Quality Management and Audit Unit would be taking this forward with representatives of the Sector Skills Councils, as they became established in Northern Ireland.

The Forum was also seeking to harmonise the University's and the Department's outline proposal (CA2) requirements.

#### 05.184 Intermediate Qualifications (Item 3)

The Committee noted that Mr P Morrison, Policy Officer for Foundation Degrees at DEL, had attended a meeting of the Forum and had confirmed the 2+2 model in Northern Ireland. A national Fd marketing campaign was planned for December 2005 and it was hoped that a campaign targeted within Northern Ireland would dovetail with this.

The Committee discussed the future of HNDs, their funding and the work-based learning requirements which would have to be fulfilled in re-designing certain subjects such as business studies as Fd degrees.

The Committee had previously noted that DEL had extended the permitted range of Foundation degrees and had advised Colleges that it was prepared to consider proposals in any vocational area for 2006/7, provided that they met the criteria for a Foundation degree. Although the University's preference was to cease HND/C provision and the University and DEL encouraged the conversion of HNDs to Foundation degrees at re-validation, DEL had no policy regarding their discontinuation. With the roll-out of Intermediate level qualifications to the FE sector, the University would shortly cease to have direct experience of delivery of Edexcel courses, which would call into question its continuing involvement with the courses of another awarding body.

It was noted that the possibility of colleges delivering the first year of the '+2' element had also been raised by the Forum. Professor Black reported that issues relating to Intermediate level qualifications would be discussed at a forthcoming meeting with ANIC and DEL in January.

AGREED: that the University's support for HND/Cs should be re-visited following the January meeting.

05.185 Low Student Enrolment (Item 4)

Dr Hanna reported that a paper on the impact of low student enrolments and progression onto UU courses had been forwarded to the Academic Development and Student Services (ADSS) Committee.

05.186 Admissions Criteria (Item 5)

The Committee noted that at its October meeting the ADSS Committee had considered the anomaly with regard to the required number of GCE/GCSE passes for admission to Foundation and Honours Degrees (four and five passes respectively).

It was noted that if the ADSS Committee had decided to change the number of GCE/GCSEs required a recommendation would need to be forwarded to Senate to revise the University's regulations.

05.187 Discrepancies between UU and College Data in the 2003/4 Annual Course Review (Item 6)

The Committee noted that, as an outcome from the 2003/4 Annual Course Review of collaborative programmes, the Forum had been asked to consider the discrepancies between UU and College data. The Committee noted the Forum's conclusions outlined in the appendix to the report.

It was noted that many of the issues could be resolved by the University taking ownership of student transcripts for all students enrolled on validated programmes at partner institutions. One of the recommendations was for Colleges to be reminded that the University's validation fees should not be charged separately to students; all capitation fees should be paid in a single instalment. The Committee's view was that this should be a requirement.

AGREED: that the Value for Money Study Group on Collaborative Courses be asked to consider the arrangements for payment of capitation fees and how these might be paid in a single instalment.

05.188 Aide-Memoire for Foundation Degree Validations (Item 7)

The Committee noted that the Forum had agreed the contents of a supplement to the University's aide-memoire to be used by course teams and validation panels in considering Foundation degrees.

05.189 Staff Development for Staff in Partner Institutions (Item 8 and 9)

The Committee noted that a Staff Development day for Course Directors in partner institutions had been held in October and that the Forum was planning a meeting in January with College quality representatives.

05.190 Reporting Arrangements for Faculty Head of Collaborative Courses Forum

Dr Hanna reported that the Forum proposed to submit reports to the Committee once per semester highlighting matters of interest and recommendations. In addition, occasional papers might be submitted on more pressing issues.

The reporting timeframe and operating arrangements for the Sub-Committee were discussed. It was noted that sub-committees were not independent, freestanding bodies and should report on a regular basis so that the parent committee was kept up-to-date, and could offer timely guidance.

AGREED: that the Forum report following each of its meetings to the next meeting of the Committee.

05.191 REVIEW OF THE ROLE OF FACULTY HEAD OF COLLABORATIVE COURSES

The Committee received a paper reviewing the role of Faculty Heads of Collaborative Courses (TLC/05/89).

In December 2004, the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee set up a Working Group to review the effectiveness of the role of the FHCC after 18 months of managing Faculty collaborative activity. The Committee noted that the new arrangements for the management of the University's collaborative partnerships were working well and was asked to consider the 18 recommendations made by the Group.

Recommendation 1: Role of FHCC

The Group recommended that the role of the FHCC be maintained as a core element of the University's structures for the management of its collaborative structure. Professor McAlister reported that a decision on this need not be taken at this stage, given that the report was an interim review.

Recommendation 2: FHCC Job Description

The Committee noted that it was proposed that the FHCC Job Description be revised to add six responsibilities to reflect fully the breadth of the work undertaken. It was noted that there appeared to be some overlap between the duties and responsibilities, for example duty 5 and responsibility 8, and that the duties should be re-visited to make a clear distinction between duties and responsibilities.

Dr Hanna reported that the proposed amendment to the requirement to attend 'one course committee' to 'any course committee' (2v) should be further amended to read 'at least one course committee annually'.

Recommendation 4: Cultural Awareness Training

The Chair reported that the cultural awareness training to be provided for all staff engaged in overseas collaborative activity would be undertaken by the International Office, supported by Staff Development.

### Recommendations 6 and 10: Staff Appraisal

The expectation for Deans to appraise the performance of FHCCs, including their attendance at Forum meetings and participation in staff development, was noted. The Deans would need to take account of any changes in the appraisal scheme in light of the current review.

### Recommendation 7: Recognition for Staff

The Committee noted that support from subject experts had been an issue in certain areas but that this was now less of a concern. It was noted that, while Deans should ensure that proper recognition was given to all staff, subject experts who support the work undertaken by Faculty Heads, were considered to be particularly deserving.

### Recommendation 8: Succession Planning

The Committee noted that it was recommended that Faculties should give consideration to succession planning to ensure a high level of continuing support to partner institutions.

The Committee discussed the recommendation and noted that the fixed-term nature of the post would require the appointments procedure to be completed in good time to ensure adequate handover and briefing if a change of post-holder were made. It was also noted that Deans and Heads of School were required to plan for succession in all areas of work.

### Recommendation 14: Costing

The Committee noted the recommendation that FHCCs be consulted about the costing of collaborative activity. Responsibility for this would continue to lie with the Finance Department and Faculty management.

AGREED:

- i) that the Quality Management and Audit Unit be asked to re-draft paragraph iv, page 12 as it might allow an individual to be identified;
- ii) that, subject to the comments above, recommendations 2 -18 be endorsed and be referred to Faculties and departments as set out in Appendix 1.

## TEACHING AND LEARNING STRATEGY

### 05.192 University Objectives for 2005/6

Professor McAlister presented proposals for specific objectives for 2005/6 within the University's Teaching and Learning Strategy (TLC/05/90) (min 05.143 refers). It was noted that the achievement of some of the objectives would be reported directly through the Teaching and Learning Committee or other Committees/Working Groups as appropriate. Faculties could set other teaching and learning objectives, for example in relation to e-learning, in relation to their own priorities.

Professor Banat sought clarification of the University's criteria for the extension of the appointments of external examiners and the maximum period permitted. It was noted that the University's Code of Practice for External Examining stated that appointments were made for a period of not more than four years in the first instance but might be extended for a period of not more than one year for a new course or in order to provide continuity between successive groups of external examiners. Exceptionally, a two-year extension may be allowed in the case of a discontinued course.

The Chair reminded Faculties that, in order to ensure that external examiners were in place by the start of the academic year for which they have moderation responsibilities, they should plan ahead and start to consider possible new or replacement external examiners at an early date.

AGREED:

- i) that the Academic Office re-present the objectives in a table to indicate the lead responsible agent and the timeframe for reporting;
- ii) that the objectives for 2005/6 be endorsed and forwarded to Senate for approval (Appendix 2).

#### 05.193 Draft Template for Faculty Reports on Achievement of Objectives

The Committee, at its October meeting, had agreed that a common template be developed to assist Faculties in providing reports on the achievement of the University's teaching and learning objectives (min 05.143 refers).

The Chair presented the draft template for Faculty reports (TLC/05/91) which was based on that used by the Faculty of Business and Management.

AGREED: that the template be endorsed.

#### UNDERGRADUATE MODULAR PROVISION 2004/5

#### 05.194 Chief External Examiner Reports and Responses

The Committee received the annual reports from the Chief External Examiners for the Coleraine and Magee campuses and the responses from the Campus Co-ordinating Groups (TLC/05/92). The Committee noted that the reports for the Jordanstown campus would be considered at the February meeting of the Committee.

Both reports were very positive and confirmed that standards were appropriate and that the processes for the determination of awards were sound and had been fairly conducted. The Chief Examiner for the Coleraine campus had made reference to the high number of resits in Year 1, relative to Single Honours degrees. The Campus Co-ordinating Group would investigate this and in addition the Committee noted that the University would be considering this matter in the proposed thematic audit of the experience of students following modular programmes (min 05.200 refers).

The Committee noted that the Magee Chief Examiner had noted a disproportionately higher failure rate in the Law subject. The Committee noted that the response to the suggestion that some discretion be given to the Progress and Award Board for the further moderation of marks had confirmed that this would be inappropriate and would not be taken further.

05.195 Campus Co-ordinating Groups Annual Report 2004/5

A report from the Coleraine and Magee Campus Co-ordinating Groups on the operation and management of the arrangements for combined undergraduate subjects in 2004/5 was received (TLC/05/93).

The Committee noted that the report was generally positive and that developments had included a Modular Student Handbook and enhancement to the Studies Advice system. A corporate promotional leaflet had been developed for use at Open Week 2005. A number of initiatives had been identified for 2005/6 in the areas of timetabling, class sizes, student support, promotional material and internal communications.

Jordanstown provision was not included in the report owing to the illness of the Jordanstown Director of Combined Studies. Professor Moran reported that, as the majority of the provision at Jordanstown was based in the Faculty of Social Sciences, she had ensured that the Campus Co-ordinating Group had met. Representatives from the Faculty of Business and Management were present. The Committee noted that the issues and trends reported for Coleraine and Magee were similar at Jordanstown. The Jordanstown Group would continue to meet and targets and actions had been agreed for the next meeting. The management of induction and the scale of activity had been raised as issues.

AGREED: that the Directors of Combined Studies and Subject Directors be commended for their management of the scheme, working with others to make it successful.

05.196 QAA INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT – UNIVERSITY RESPONSE TO STUDENT SUBMISSION

The Committee at its May meeting had considered the teaching and learning issues which had been identified in the University response to the Student Written Submission for the recent QAA Institutional Audit (min 05.65 refers). The Committee received the reports from Faculties on the communication of module outlines and anonymous marking for coursework.

05.197 Module Outlines

The former Planning Committee had asked the Committee to ask Faculties to review and report back on current practice in the communication of module outlines to students. The Committee received paper TLC/05/94.

The Committee noted that all students received information either in hard copy and/or electronically and that the general view was that the University should not be prescriptive in terms of the means of communication of information to students. Students would necessarily observe some differences between

subjects but that this should not cause any difficulty, provided that the University's minimum requirements for the core information (supplied to students through a Module Teaching Plan or a Module Handbook) were met and that the information was current and issued by the start of the module.

#### 05.198 Anonymous Marking of Coursework

The Committee, at its meeting in May 2001, had agreed that the anonymous marking of coursework should be encouraged where practicable and feasible. Faculties reported to the Committee in October 2002 that this practice was not widespread and they were asked to keep their processes under review. In May 2005 the Committee asked Faculties to review current practice and to provide an updated report to the Committee, in light of comments in the Student Written Submission.

The Committee received paper TLC/05/95 which set out the current position within Faculties and noted that, while practised in some areas, the predominant view was that anonymous marking of coursework was neither practical, feasible nor desirable. The Committee noted that it was inherent that anonymous marking was not feasible for some assessment methods and that it would create an additional administrative load.

The Committee considered that, with the use of clear assessment criteria and with robust moderation arrangements in place, there appeared to be no overriding tangible benefits for students or staff in requiring anonymous marking of coursework.

AGREED:

- i) that anonymous marking of coursework should continue to be encouraged by Faculties where it was appropriate, feasible and practical;
- ii) that Faculties devise their own methods for safeguarding student anonymity during the process, but that it should be lifted when internal marking was complete for the purposes of student feedback.

THEMED AUDITS

#### 05.199 Themed Audit: Operation of Board of Examiners

The Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee, at its meeting in October 2004, had agreed an audit of the operation of Boards of Examiners. The Committee received the report of the audit of the Boards of Examiners (TLC/05/96) and was asked to consider the 11 recommendations made.

The Chair expressed some concern that a number of the recommendations would lead to a greater level of bureaucracy required from Faculties, particularly at Board of Examiners meetings, which was a very busy period of the academic year. Whilst there needed to be robustness and accuracy in the process, the University had to be realistic about what could be achieved given the time constraints involved.

A recommendation (8) was made that Faculty Extenuating Circumstances Panels be established, based on the model in the Faculty of Engineering, as a means of ensuring consistent and fair treatment. Such Panels would consider all documented extenuating circumstances and make recommendations to the Board of Examiners.

AGREED:

- i) that the report be not adopted but that Faculties and Academic Registry might review their arrangements in the light of its proposals;
- ii) that Faculties be invited to consider the establishment of Extenuating Circumstances Panels; this would not be a requirement provided Faculties were satisfied that their own arrangements ensured that there was fairness and consistency in the treatment of claims;
- iii) that the proposed establishment of cross-subject Panels to consider extenuating circumstance claims for modular provision be considered in more detail as part of the proposed themed audit (min 05.200 refers).

#### 05.200 Themed Audits 2005/6 – 2006/7

The Committee noted the schedule of themed audits for 2005/6 – 2006/7 (TLC/05/97) which included a proposal for the audit of modular programmes in 2006/7 with a focus on the nature of the student experience of this type of provision. This had been proposed in the light of evidence of significant student failure across modular programmes. Given the forthcoming wider review of academic governance arrangements, it was considered sensible to defer the previously proposed audit of the operation of Faculty and School Boards.

It was noted that the Committee would receive reports on current audits as follows:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Operation of Staff/Student Consultative Committees within partner institutions | June 2006  |
| Operation of student complaints and appeals procedures in partner institutions | April 2006 |
| Dissemination of good practice – collaborative provision                       | April 2006 |

AGREED:

- i) that the proposed audit of the experience of students following modular programmes be approved for 2006/7;
- ii) that members be invited to forward other possible areas for audit to Mrs J Alleyne, Head of Quality Management and Audit Unit.

## ANNUAL MONITORING

### 05.201 Annual Subject Monitoring 2003/4

The Committee, at its October meeting, received the responses from Faculties and central departments to the report of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee Sub-Group and had noted that a number of responses had still to be received (min 05.152 refers).

The Committee noted the additional responses received (TLC/05/98) together with a detailed response from Information Services Department in relation to the Course Experience Questionnaire. A response from Corporate Planning and Governance Services was still outstanding in relation to Recommendation 9 regarding the recording of occasional students not taking final examinations.

### 05.202 Annual Review of Courses 2003/4

The Committee noted that a report on the three missing reports from the Annual Review 2003/4 would be received as part of the report on the 2004/5 Annual Review at the February 2006 meeting (min 05.155 refers).

### 05.203 Edexcel

The Committee noted that, as part of the Edexcel Foundation's revised quality monitoring arrangements from 2004/5, a report would be made to Edexcel on HND/Cs, based on the material gathered for Annual Subject Monitoring and Annual Course Review.

### 05.204 STUDENT REPRESENTATION AND FEEDBACK: SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY TO DATE AND PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

The Committee received a paper on Student Representation and Feedback (TLC/05/99) which outlined the agreed TQEF targets in the area of student representation, the activities to date and planned developments. The project aimed to achieve effective student representation, to consider the use of incentives to encourage student representation and the use of PDP to give student representation a higher profile.

The Committee noted that 205 students had completed a training course and that it would be useful to obtain feedback from Faculties through ASM on whether the training had been effective. Training events would be offered to partner institutions. Good practice at other institutions was also being investigated. A set of resources, including a student representative handbook and election guidance, had been developed and the initiative would be extended to postgraduate level.

Mr McKenna reported to the Committee that the Students' Union was engaging closely with the project, and was undertaking its own strategic review of this area. Following feedback from the University project the Students' Union would be considering whether a post for student representation should be established. The Committee commended the Students' Union and encouraged any further development to help make student representation more effective.

## 05.205 ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE 2004/5

Ms Kemplay presented the report on the assessment of teaching student questionnaire for 2004/5 (TLC/05/100).

The Committee noted that, although participation was mandatory, the number of lecturers involved in the 2004/5 survey (675) had decreased from the previous year. This was a matter of concern and also that the percentage of participating teaching staff by school varied greatly from 96% to 21%. The Committee was informed that a 95% participation rate was likely to be proposed as a 'corporate metric' to the VCAG as a Faculty target, together with a possible target of 65 – 70% of teaching to be achieved in the 'very good' and 'outstanding' categories.

The pattern of findings was similar to that in previous years with the majority of students satisfied with all aspects of teaching. Given the substantial resources invested by the Staff Development Unit, Ms Kemplay expressed some disappointment that there had not been an improvement in the results. It was suggested that the results might reflect a higher student benchmark and the work of the Unit had helped at least to ensure that standards were being maintained.

The Committee noted a recommendation to encourage each member of teaching staff to select modules and associated student groups which from year to year would cover the range of modules taught and to reflect the different teaching methods, eg lectures, seminars.

Some members expressed misgivings about the value of the tool, in particular because that the lecturer chose the class and the timing of its administration. It was noted that the questionnaire had been reviewed recently and was deemed valid. A reflective, informed approach to its use, in accordance with the guidelines, would contribute to staff's continuing professional development.

The Dean of the Faculty of Business and Management reported that the Faculty found the survey to be a useful assessment tool and considered there to be a correlation with the national student survey. A participation rate of 85% had been set by the Faculty for 2005/6 and the modules to be selected would this year be those involving large group teaching.

Members reported that the provision of qualitative feedback was helpful.

AGREED:

- i) that Ms Devine be thanked for her work in preparing the report;
- ii) that Faculties consider the summary Faculty/School results and reflect on these in both Faculty committees and as part of Annual Subject Monitoring;
- iii) that further analysis of the data be undertaken, if possible, together with a comparative analysis with the findings of the National Student Survey.

05.206 IMPLICATIONS FOR TAUGHT PROGRAMMES OF GUIDELINES ON THE DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF RESEARCH ON HUMAN SUBJECTS

The Committee received a paper on the implications for taught programmes of legal and ethical requirements for the design and conduct of research on human subjects (TLC/05/101).

It was noted that the Research Governance Unit had drawn up a University-wide policy for research on human subjects, through a set of procedures based around five categories of research and referral of proposals for scrutiny by Faculty/School Research Governance Filter Committees or the University Research Ethics Committee.

In relation to taught provision the Policy covered projects involving human subjects in the following cases:

- research projects undertaken by Master's students which were subject to the same processes as other research proposals;
- research conducted by undergraduate or taught postgraduate students involving NHS/HPSS patients, staff, records etc which might be referred to a Student Projects Ethics Committee in future but were presently covered by Health Trust procedures.

The Research Governance Steering Committee, at its September meeting, had identified potential areas of concern in the distinction between research projects at postgraduate and undergraduate level, and those projects which involve human subjects but which might be practice or training rather than research based.

The Committee noted suggestions in the paper which might assist fulfilment of the research objectives of modules or dissertations without direct engagement with human subjects.

It was noted that Dr D O'Kane had advised that the Science Shop might potentially be affected by the Policy and had asked the Committee to consider a possible exemption for such initiatives, which provided training for students.

The Committee noted that there were significant implications for some online programmes where approximately 3 – 400 students were undertaking projects on human subjects.

AGREED:

- i) that the University policy and procedures relating to research on human subjects be confirmed as covering all forms of such investigation, including those undertaken by undergraduate and postgraduate taught students;
- ii) that, in respect of Science Shop or other projects, the Research Governance Unit/Research Ethical Committee be asked to consider whether evidence of ethical approval of projects by other agencies or organisations would obviate the need for consideration by Faculty or

University committees, and to consider compiling a list of such bodies for the information of staff;

- iii) that Course Directors and other staff should be mindful of the time required to obtain approval from the appropriate University ethical committee or external body and to consider the merits of other forms of research in meeting the learning objectives of the course.

05.207 REPORT ON THE CORE PROGRAMME PROVISION OF THE CENTRE FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING (CELT) 2004/5

The Committee received the report on the Centre's core programme provision 2004/5 (TLC/05/102).

The Committee commended CELT in its work in encouraging students whose first language was not English to attend in-session workshops.

05.208 POSTGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN FURTHER AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The Committee considered the response (TLC/05/103) to the ETI report which was received at the October meeting (min 05.165 refers).

It was noted that the programme was scheduled for re-validation (unit 9I) in April 2006 together with the MSc in Lifelong Learning and that the draft covering letter should be revised to reflect this.

AGREED: that the comprehensive response be endorsed and forwarded to ETI.

05.209 ACCESS COURSES

At the October meeting the Committee had noted a report on outstanding business of the former Access Courses Sub-Committee to be taken forward through either the Academic Development and Student Services Committee or the Teaching and Learning Committee as appropriate (min 05.139 refers).

The Committee received paper TLC/05/104 on business falling within its remit.

05.210 University Requirements for the Award of Diploma (Access to Higher Education (Item 1)

The Committee noted that within the University's framework for Access programmes the final 60 credits should be at the equivalent of NICATS Level 3.

It was noted that this cannot be achieved in full-time one year Access courses using generic NICATS Mathematics modules, as the second Mathematics module at NICATS Level 2 would be delivered in semester 2.

It was noted that Chairman's action had been taken on behalf of the Access Courses Sub-Committee and the Teaching and Learning Committee to amend the requirement to 'a minimum of 60 credit points at the equivalent of NICATS

Level 3 *in the final year* for the 2005/06 academic year to enable programmes re-validated in 2004/05 to proceed on this basis.

The Committee was asked to consider the adoption of this revision for subsequent years. This amendment would have no implications for part-time programmes, and students undertaking one year full-time courses would still achieve a minimum of 60 credit points at NICATS Level 3.

AGREED: that the proposed revision be endorsed so that a minimum of 60 credit points at the equivalent of NICATS Level 3 be required to be achieved 'in the final year' from 2005/6.

05.211 Working Group on the Future Development of Access Provision (Item 2)

Ms R Fee presented the report of the Working Group (Appendix 1 to TLC/05/104) and asked the Committee to consider the recommendations under sections 1 – 7. The recommendations under section 9 had been referred to the Academic Development and Student Services Committee for consideration.

05.212 Academic Standards and Descriptors for Access Programmes

The Committee welcomed the development of a draft generic programme specification which provided a generic descriptor in terms of shared learning outcomes to create a common basis for, and consistency in, the description of student achievement.

AGREED:

- i) that the draft specification be adopted;
- ii) that the specification be commended to Colleges for use for all new proposals and for the description of existing courses at re-validation.

05.213 APL and Exemptions for Previous Study

The Committee noted that the Working Group had discussed the issue of exemptions for Access programmes and that the candidates seeking exemptions fell broadly into two categories:

- applicants holding at least five GCSEs including Mathematics and English;
- applicants holding a higher award.

a) Applicants holding five GCSEs

The Committee noted that a number of Access programmes made provision for exemptions from the first 60 credits on the basis of five GCSEs at Grade C or above, including Mathematics and English GCSE (equates to NICATS Level 2).

The Group considered that applicants who have attained some qualifications at GCSE level only would not have demonstrated that they were capable of undertaking study at Higher Education level and should

not be offered exemption from the first 60 credit points as no mapping of outcomes had been undertaken. They could however be considered for individual exemptions from those modules that offer the equivalencies.

b) Students Holding a Higher Award

The Committee noted that some applicants to University courses who already held A levels or degrees, but without high enough grades or specific subjects, faced increasing difficulties in finding suitable subject-specific A level providers and that Access courses by default were the only option available for such students wishing to change careers and gain access to University programmes.

The Committee considered that Access programmes, with their ethos of widening participation in Higher Education for under-represented groups by providing for mature students without conventional entry requirements, were not designed to meet the specific needs of students holding higher level qualifications. There was an issue of how specific 'shortfalls' in qualifications presented by such applicants could be met.

It was noted that with regard to exemptions, as such students had already demonstrated that they were fully capable of undertaking study at Higher Education level and therefore would not be disadvantaged by not taking the first 60 credit points of the programme in terms of building confidence and learning skills, could be granted exemptions for the first 60 credit points (the maximum permitted).

AGREED:

- i) that automatic exemption for 60 credit points on the basis of five or more GCSE qualifications at Grade C or above (including Mathematics and English) be withdrawn with effect from 2006/07 for new and existing programmes;
- ii) that exemptions might be considered through APL arrangements for modules providing for equivalence to GCSE Mathematics and English for applicants holding these qualifications;
- iii) that University staff responsible for admission decisions be encouraged to identify from their experience the specific 'shortfalls' in higher qualifications presented by applicants, and whether an appropriate programme could be developed for students who already met the University's general entry requirements; and that an increased awareness of the purpose and nature of Access programmes be promoted within Faculties;
- iv) that the impact of the admission of well qualified students to Access courses be monitored by FHCCs through the annual course review process.

#### 05.214 Use of Commendation in Access Programmes

The Working Group had noted that the majority of Access students achieved a Commendation (60% standard) and that, consequently, the award appeared to have become devalued. It was recommended to the Committee that the award of Commendation be replaced with Distinction (70%) from 2006/7.

The Committee noted that all undergraduate courses, except Honours degrees, had the Commendation award and that no change had been made when this matter had been discussed by the Committee in October 2004.

AGREED: that the appropriate classification bands in undergraduate programmes be considered following the outcome of the Burgess review of the classified Honours degree.

#### 05.215 Assessment of Programmes as Providing an Alternative to GCSE English and Mathematics for Entry to Higher Education

The Committee noted that the Working Group considered that the School of Education should be asked to identify a new subject expert, following the recent retirement of the member of staff who had undertaken assessments of Access programmes as providing an alternative to GCSE English for entry to Higher Education (HE).

Although recognising that there would be resource implications to this approach, the Group was of the view that consideration should be given to drawing on expertise within the Further Education sector.

AGREED:

- i) that the School of Education be asked to nominate a replacement subject expert for English in the short term;
- ii) that, if necessary, the School of Education should also give consideration to drawing on expertise within the Further Education sector or elsewhere for the assessment of individual Access programmes as providing an alternative to GCSE English and Mathematics, for the purposes of admission to HE.

#### 05.216 Programme/Award Titles

The Committee noted that with the recent reduction of the minimum age for admission from 21 to 19 years, the Access Courses Sub-Committee had invited course teams to consider whether the term 'for Mature Students' remained appropriate in programme titles.

The Working Group considered that the programme award titles should be sufficiently distinctive so as to be readily recognisable as an Access qualification and had recommended that the award should be changed from 'Diploma' to 'Access Diploma' and that the term 'Foundation Studies' should be included in all Access programme titles before the subject was identified (eg 'Access Diploma in Foundation Studies in Computing').

Consideration had also been given to an appropriate title for Certificate exit awards and the Group had recommended that these should be named 'Certificates in Adult Learning'.

AGREED:

- i) that it be recommended to Senate the new award title of 'Access Diploma' be added to the Schedule to Ordinance 2001/1 from 2006/7;
- ii) that, the term 'Foundation Studies' be **not** included in the titles of Access Diploma programmes;
- iii) that the title for all exit awards be 'Certificate in Adult Learning';
- iv) that all providers be asked to submit CA3 forms to change awards and titles from 2006/7 intake.

#### 05.217 Pathways Approach and their Support

The Working Group had noted that the 'pathways' approach within some programmes provided for a number of optional routes to complete the qualification but was concerned that this approach had the potential to heighten student expectation unjustifiably in relation to progression to specific undergraduate programmes.

AGREED: that new proposals should not use the term 'pathway' to describe student exposure to a particular subject and that the term 'option' should be used instead.

#### 05.218 Sharing of Modules Between Colleges

The Committee noted that the Working Group wished to encourage the sharing of modules between Colleges and considered that the Inter-Centre Access Forum presented an ideal mechanism for Colleges to share modules and good practice.

AGREED: that the Inter-Centre Access Forum be asked to consider including the sharing of good practice between Colleges, including module content and assessment, as a standard item on the agenda for meetings.

#### 05.219 Pilot on the Use of APEL in Access Provision (Item 3)

The Committee noted that in October 2004 the Access Courses Sub-Committee had approved the introduction of four new modules in the second year of the Diploma in Foundation Studies (Science & Technology) at BIFHE and the Diploma in Foundation Studies (Science) at NWIFHE to provide a route into Nursing degrees for holders of a relevant NVQ 3 who were exempted some first year modules. The proposal was approved, subject to the inclusion of an additional APEL module to meet the shortfall in credit points at NICATS Level 3.

The Faculty was asked to provide a review of the operation of the strand to the Access Courses Sub-Committee at its first meeting of the 2005/6 academic year.

The Committee noted the report from the Faculty of Life and Health Sciences, reviewing the operation of the pilot year of the APEL strand introduced at BIFHE in 2004/05 and also that the programmes were being re-validated on 7 December 2005.

05.220 Programme Regulations (Item 4)

The Committee noted that, when the template of regulations for Access programmes was produced, the University's principles on the extent of condonement and consequences of failure were translated into a specific number of modules (with related credit points). The template regulations now required revision as programmes which used the NICATS Mathematics modules now contained a mix of module sizes, including 10, 15 and 20 point modules.

The Committee noted that the change would bring the regulations into line with other undergraduate courses but that they would be less generous in terms of condonement than the current regulations.

AGREED: that the proposed amendments to the template of Access regulations be approved from 2006/7.

PROPOSED DEPARTURES FROM REGULATORY OR MODULAR FRAMEWORK

05.221 PGCE (Primary and Post Primary)

The Committee received paper TLC/05/105 from the Faculty of Social Sciences regarding a proposed departure from the University's normal modular structure in relation to the PGCE programme which had been re-validated in February 2005.

The Re-validation Panel had welcomed the move to modularisation of the PGCE programme and, while recognising that the nature of the PGCE programme made it difficult to fit it within a modular structure, it was noted that, although the programme was structured on the basis of two modules, one in each semester, there were elements of the modules relating to the ICT portfolio and the Post Primary pathway subsidiary subjects that crossed the modules. The Panel also noted that each module comprised 30 credit points with a mix of levels: 20 at level M and 10 at level 3, and that the level M learning outcomes for the programme were repeated as the outcomes for each module.

The Panel had set as a condition of approval that the modular structure be revisited in light of the Panel's discussions to reconsider progression, credit points and level in terms of the outcomes being achieved and demonstrated. It was noted that in its resubmitted documentation, the course team advised that the structure proposed at the re-validation meeting was considered to be the most appropriate and had been retained.

The Committee noted that the University's modular structure allowed modules to be delivered across the academic year on a 'long-thin' basis. There was no provision for a mix of levels within modules and only one level could be recorded for each module within the module database.

The Committee was not convinced by the case for a departure from the University's normal modular structure.

AGREED: that the proposal be **not** approved and the Faculty be asked to give further consideration to presenting the programme as 2 x 20 point modules at Level M and 2 x 10 point modules at Level 3.

## 05.222 BMus

Professor Hunter presented a case from the Faculty of Arts for three proposed departures from University regulations in respect of the recently re-validated BMus programme (TLC/05/106).

### a) Optional Final Year Project Module

University regulations state in the final level of an Honours degree one or more modules shall normally be assessed by a dissertation/project.

The Committee noted that research methodology would be addressed throughout the BMus programme and that all modules in the final year would have a research dimension. Professor Hunter confirmed that the learning outcomes of the project would be achieved in other core/optional modules.

AGREED: that the project be approved as an optional module.

### b) Level 1 Assessment

University regulations state that at level 1 at least 50% of the modules shall normally be assessed by a combination of coursework and written examination with the remainder assessed by either coursework or examination.

The Committee noted that it was proposed that all Level 1 modules be assessed by coursework only. The subject team considered that the wide range of tasks set, including class tests, were the most appropriate means of assessing the learning outcomes. Written examinations were taken in Years 2 and 3.

The Committee considered that it was important that students undertook some written examinations to help prepare them for such examinations in later years and to provide an additional means of verifying individual achievement of learning outcomes.

AGREED: that the proposal be **not** approved.

### c) Progression Arrangements

The Committee noted that University regulations set the pass mark in undergraduate courses at 40% for each assessment element and for the module overall. The Team proposed that students who wished to pursue

performance or composition in final year be required to meet a 60% threshold in relevant second-year modules; and subsequently 65% in the associated first-semester modules for further study in semester 2. The Team considered that, unless a student had demonstrated the potential to achieve the learning outcomes associated with the final year modules in performance and composition, by achieving the thresholds stated, he/she would probably experience considerable difficulty with their demands.

Although these were the current operating arrangements, the Committee considered that regulations should observe the principle that students who had achieved the learning outcomes of pre-requisite modules should be permitted to proceed to the related module in the next year/semester. It was however suggested that students who were not demonstrating a high level of achievement might be strongly advised against selecting the final year modules.

It was also suggested that the Team could give consideration to the specification of the pre-requisite level 2 module as non-condonable for final year performance and composition options.

AGREED: that the proposal be **not** approved.

#### 05.223 NEW PRIZES

The Committee considered a paper setting out proposals for the establishment of 16 new prizes in the Faculty of Arts and Business and Management (TLC/05/107).

The Committee welcomed the establishment of the new prizes, but asked that the Faculty of Arts clarify the selection criteria and process which did not appear to be based on assessment results.

AGREED: that it be recommended to Senate that the 16 new prizes be established as at Appendix 3.

#### NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE

#### 05.224 Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area

The Committee noted extracts from the Network for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ENQA) publication on the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European higher education area (TLC/05/108). Mr Peter Williams, Chief Executive of the QAA had been elected President of the ENQA.

The Committee noted that the status of the guidelines for internal HEI standards had still to be clarified in terms of their relationship with the QAA Academic Infrastructure, and whether HEIs would need to use them as explicit reference points in addition to national ones.

05.225 Consultation on QAA's New Institutional Audit Method

The Committee noted that Faculties and Departments had been invited to comment on the QAA's proposed revised methodology.

05.226 Consultation on European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning

The Committee noted that the European Commission was consulting on a proposed European Qualifications Framework, based on eight levels. Countries had been invited to comment and to organise their own national consultations. UUK had made a response and the DfES had organised an e-consultation. The deadline for response was 31 December.

Duration: 3 hours 40 mins

16 December 2005

AGF/CA/lh

## REVIEW OF ROLE OF FACULTY HEAD OF COLLABORATIVE COURSES

### TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS 7.12.05

The Working Group recommends:

1. That the role of the FHCC be maintained as a core element of the University's structures for the management of its collaborative partnerships.

**To be considered at the time of the final review.**

2. That the FHCC Job Description be revised to include:
  - i) to liaise with internal Course Directors who have responsibility for out-centre provision;
  - ii) ensure that mechanisms are in place at Faculty level to approve publicity/promotional/marketing material emanating from partner institutions;
  - iii) to provide support for staff in partner organisations through participation in staff development events as appropriate;
  - iv) with regard to teaching and learning, to provide advice and guidance on policy and regulations;
  - v) to amend the requirement to attend 'one course committee' to read 'any course committee';
  - vi) to liaise with library personnel to agree library resources as appropriate.

**Approved, subject to revision to v) and further review for consistency and clarity: refer to Quality Management and Audit Unit.**

3. That the University's Value for Money Steering Group include within its Terms of Reference out-centre provision and report its findings to the Teaching and Learning Committee by June 2006.

**Refer to VFM Study Group on Collaborative Provision.**

4. That cultural awareness training be provided for all staff engaged in overseas collaborative activity.

**Approved: refer to International Office, supported by Staff Development.**

5. That the University take action to ensure that the promotions criteria adequately reflects, and gives appropriate weighting to, excellence in collaborative activities, locally and internationally.

**Approved: refer to Human Resources.**

6. That Deans, through the appraisal system, ensure that Faculty Heads are fulfilling their duties and responsibilities as detailed in the job description and are performing to a level appropriate to senior lecturer designation.

**Approved: refer to Deans.**

7. That Deans/Associate Deans ensure that proper recognition be given to all staff, but in particular, subject experts who support the work undertaken by the Faculty Heads.

**Approved as normal expectation: refer to Deans.**

8. That, due to the fixed-term nature of the posts, Faculties give consideration to succession planning to ensure a high level of continuing support to partner organisations.

**Approved as normal expectation: refer to Deans.**

9. That Faculties give consideration to the number of Faculty Heads taking account of the nature, scale and geographical dispersion of collaborative activity.

**Approved: refer to Deans.**

10. That Faculties ensure (via appraisal) that the performance of Faculty Heads is monitored to ensure, *inter alia*, regular attendance at Forum meetings and participation in staff development events.

**Approved: refer to Deans.**

11. That appropriate reporting channels be established at Faculty Executive level to ensure effective and timely communication and resolution of collaborative-related matters.

**Approved: refer to Deans.**

12. That, in fulfilling their duties and responsibilities as detailed in the job description, Faculty Heads report any concerns regarding the appropriateness of staff teaching on approved courses to the appropriate Head of School.

**Approved: refer to FHCCs.**

13. That, other than in exceptional circumstances, the first point of contact within the University for college staff should be the appropriate FHCC.

**Approved: refer to FHCCs.**

14. That FHCCs are consulted, as appropriate by representatives from the Finance Department and Faculty management, periodically to discuss matters relating to the costing of collaborative activity and the collection of income generated from this work.

**Approved subject to confirmation of ultimate responsibility with Faculty and Finance: refer to Finance Department and Deans.**

15. That, to enable them to report on the adequacy of library resources and in relation to library resources in general, Faculty Heads engage fully with their Faculty librarian.

**Approved: refer to FHCCs.**

16. That, following on from the University's Themed Audit on the operation of Boards of Examiners, the findings from the audit be shared with partner organisations.

**Limited action: see min 05.199: FHCCs and Academic Registry to advise as appropriate.**

17. That the Forum look at how best to set up a central database for collaborative activity, the information to be stored and the mechanisms for updating it.

**Approved: refer to FHCC Forum.**

18. That the Forum seek to appoint a Vice-Chair and give consideration to the selection process for the next Chair.

**Approved: refer to FHCC Forum.**

## UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVES FOR 2005/6

| <u>Objective</u>  | <u>Responsibility</u>                            | <u>Report To</u> | <u>Target Date</u>  | <u>Progress and Further Action Planned</u> |
|---|--|------------------|---|--|
| <u>Admissions and Access</u>  |  |                  |   |  |
| i) To complete the EQIA on Student Recruitment and Admissions and to formulate an Admissions Policy.  | Working Group under Professor Allen              | TLC and [ADSSC?] | June 2006   |  |
| ii) Faculties, as part of the academic planning process, are to demonstrate how they will attain their MASN and non-MASN target student numbers for the period up to 2008/09 having due regard to the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• engage in widening participation and outreach, and</li> <li>• extending international and local collaboration.</li> </ul> | Faculties  | ADSSC            | February 2006   |  |
| iii) Following the publication of the HEFCE guidelines on the provision of information on quality and standards in higher education (TQI), the University will provide information on a timely basis in line with the guidelines.   | Academic Office (in co-operation with Faculties) | TLC              | Ongoing:<br>Summary reports June 2006 (re-validation)<br>October 2006 (External Examiner) |  |
| iv) To extend the Step-Up programme to other geographical locations and into other academic disciplines. (An economic appraisal to be submitted to DEL (January 2006) with a view to extending the programme to Belfast in Science and Engineering in September 2006.)  | Dr D O'Kane                                      | ADSSC            | February 2006   |  |
| v) To initiate implementation of the University's Access Agreement, including, inter alia, the promotion of bursaries and scholarships, the development of innovative outreach activities and the further development of internal and external collaborative partnerships for the delivery of the Agreement.  | PVC (ADSS)                                       | ADSSC            | October 2006  |  |

| <u>Objective</u>  | <u>Responsibility</u>                                      | <u>Report To</u> | <u>Target Date</u> | <u>Progress and Further Action Planned</u> |
|---|--|------------------|--------------------|--|
| <u>Programmes of Study</u>  |  |                  |                    |  |
| i) In line with DEL policy to progress the further roll-out of Foundation Degrees and the smooth transfer of UU intermediate level qualifications to the further and higher education sector.   | PVC (ADSS)/Faculties                                       | ADSSC            | October 2006       |  |
| ii) In light of DEL recommendations following of the consultation process in relation to Further Education Means Business, the provision of a position paper on the future development of the partnerships with the sector and the University.                      | PVC (ADSS)   | ADSSC            | October 2006       |  |
| iii) The University will continue to give high priority to the effective development of e-learning programmes, in particular the extension of the range of programmes to include top-up degrees.  | Professor C Mulholland/<br>Faculties                       | ADSSC            | June 2006          |  |
| iv) An evaluation of employer contributions to subject development to be undertaken by faculties.   | Faculties/QMAU   | TLC              | April 2006         |  |
| <u>Teaching and Learning</u>  |  |                  |                    |  |
| i) In line with the University's e-learning Strategy, priority will be given to the embedding of e-learning in the teaching and learning pedagogy for land-based programmes, supported as appropriate by Staff Development and the Institute for Lifelong Learning. | Faculties/<br>Professor C Mulholland/<br>Staff Development | TLC<br>ADSSC     | October 2006       |  |
| ii) The PDP programme to be implemented for all first-year undergraduate students in 2005/06 and subsequently to be rolled-out to all undergraduates as this cohort of students progresses through the University.  | Mr D McGivern/Faculties                                    | ADSSC/TLC        | October 2006       |  |
| iii) PDP programmes to be developed for postgraduate students, part-time students and research students.  | Mr D McGivern/<br>Faculties/Research<br>Office             | ADSSC/TLC        | October 2006       |  |

| <u>Objective</u>   | <u>Responsibility</u>              | <u>Report To</u> | <u>Target Date</u> | <u>Progress and Further Action Planned</u> |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|
| iv) The findings of the TQEF/FDTL projects to be monitored periodically throughout the 2005/06 academic session with a view to disseminating best practice and improving overall University performance with respect to student retention. | Staff Development/<br>Faculty TLCs | TLC              | June 2006          |  |
| v) The review of student representation to be completed during the 2005/06 academic session.   | QMAU                               | TLC              | October 2006       |  |
| vi) To develop and disseminate innovations and good practice in teaching and learning.   | Faculties/Staff<br>Development     | TLC              | October 2006       |  |
| vii) To agree a policy and guiding principles for APL.   | Working Group                      | TLC              | February 2006      |  |
| viii) To report on Faculty compliance with the University's policy on Student Transition.  | Staff Development                  | TLC              | April 2006         |  |
| <u>Assessment</u>  |                                    |                  |                    |  |
| i) To incorporate the finalised Assessment of Work-Based Learning/Placement Guidance into the Assessment Handbook.   | Academic Office                    | TLC              | June 2006          |  |
| ii) Faculties to review current policy on internal moderation for written examinations and coursework assignments and more detailed University Guidance to faculties to be developed.  | Faculties                          | TLC              | February 2006      |  |
| iii) Following consultation with faculties, guidance to be provided on viva voce examinations and included in the 2006 editions of the External Examiner's and Assessment Handbooks.   | Faculties/Academic<br>Office       | TLC              | February 2006      |  |
| iv) To undertake a faculty review of current practice in the anonymous marking of coursework.  | Faculties/Academic<br>Office       | TLC              | December 2005      |  |
| <u>Standards and Quality</u>   |                                    |                  |                    |  |
| i) To undertake a review of the ASM and validation/re-validation processes.  | QMAU                               | TLC              | April 2006         |  |

| <u>Objective</u>   | <u>Responsibility</u>              | <u>Report To</u> | <u>Target Date</u>                                    | <u>Progress and Further Action Planned</u> |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| ii) To undertake thematic audits in the areas of student complaints and SSCC arrangements in collaborative partner institutions.   | QMAU                               | TLC              | April 2006 (SSCC)                                     |  |
| iii) To receive the report from the Working Group on Plagiarism and to agree recommendations arising therefrom for implementation in the academic session 2006/7.                            | Working Group                      | TLC              | June 2006 (Complaints)<br>April/June 2006             |  |
| iv) To review the Peer Observation scheme and agree a protocol for the revised scheme for implementation in the 2006/7 academic session.   | Staff Development                  | TLC              | June 2006   |  |
| v) In collaboration with the Faculty CPD co-ordinators to progress the implementation of the newly developed and institutionally approved Staff Development Policy and Supporting Framework. | CPD SC/Staff Development           | TLC              | October 2006  |  |
| <u>Rights and Responsibilities</u>   |                                    |                  |   |  |
| i) The review and launch of the revised overall students' charter to be approved by Senate and Council by May 2006.  | QMAU                               | Senate/Council   | June 2006   |  |
| ii) The development of a support charter for e-learning students to be approved by Senate and Council by May 2006.   | Director of Lifelong Learning/QMAU | Senate/Council   | June 2006   |  |
| <u>Reward and Recognition</u>  |                                    |                  |   |  |
| i) To disseminate and seek quality University nominations both individual and project to the revised 2006 National Teaching Fellowship Scheme.   | Staff Development/<br>FITLS        | TLC              | January 2006 (individual)<br>September 2006 (project) |  |
| ii) As part of the University's response to the 2006 Institutional Audit Report, to review and revise the Staff Appraisal Scheme in collaboration with Human Resources.                      | Staff Development/HR               | Council          | June 2006   |  |

Faculty of Arts

| Digital Residency Award: MFA   |  |   |   |                      |
|--|--|---|---|----------------------|
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award   | Selecting Body  | Value of Award  | Origin               |
| MFA  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Graduating MFA student from the University of Ulster working with digital media.</li> <li>- Outstanding artistic achievement in artistic quality, innovation, challenging nature and extent of the artist's work.</li> <li>- Relevance and benefit of the award to advance the artist's skills and expertise.</li> <li>- Relevance and benefit of the award to furtherance of the artist's career.</li> <li>- Candidate is available to participate in the residency within 12 months of receiving the award.</li> <li>- Benefit to the candidate, at this time in his/her career, from the interaction with digital project space artists in QSS.</li> </ul> | Representatives from the sponsoring body along with UU Course Director. | A four month residency in the Digital Project Space along with the sum of £200 for use on materials.                    | Queen Street Studios |
| Northern Ireland Visual Arts Forum Graduate Award:<br>BA Hons Fine and Applied Arts  |  |   |   |                      |
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award   | Selecting Body  | Value of Award  | Origin               |
| Final Year students  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Award for visual excellence and innovation in visual arts practice demonstrating cutting edge, quality work.</li> <li>- Appropriateness to the corporate environment.</li> </ul>  | Representatives from the sponsoring body along with UU Course Director  | £200  | NI Visual Arts Forum |
| Yard Gallery Prize: BA Hons Fine and Applied Arts                                    |  |   |   |                      |
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award   | Selecting Body  | Value of Award  | Origin               |
| Awarded to a student producing high quality work which embraces a commercial appeal. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Original and innovative approach.</li> <li>- Accessible but not compromised work.</li> <li>- Of public appeal.</li> </ul>   | Representatives from the sponsoring body along with UU Course Director  | £250 plus the opportunity to take prominence in a mixed show at the new gallery due to open in Holywood in October 2005 | Yard Gallery         |

| Diageo Northern Ireland Emerging Artist Award: BA Hons Fine and Applied Arts |   |  |   |                               |
|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award  | Selecting Body   | Value of Award  | Origin                        |
| Final year students  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cutting edge, quality work.</li> <li>- Appropriateness to the corporate environment.</li> </ul>  | Representatives from the sponsoring body along with UU Course Director | £1000 (to include the purchase of the chosen piece(s))                    | Diageo Northern Ireland       |
| Daler Rowney Painting Prize: BA Hons Fine and Applied Arts                   |   |  |   |                               |
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award  | Selecting Body   | Value of Award  | Origin                        |
| Final year students  | Expressive and intuitive use of colour, either in a figurative or abstract style of painting.   | Representatives from the sponsoring body along with UU Course Director | Georgian oil paints to the value of £100                                  | Daler Rowney                  |
| The Carson McDowell Award: BA Hons Fine and Applied Arts                     |   |  |   |                               |
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award  | Selecting Body   | Value of Award  | Origin                        |
| Final Year Students  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Excellence in standard of work.</li> <li>- Ability to translate creative ideas into visual depiction(s).</li> <li>- Investment potential for corporate collection.</li> </ul>    | Representatives from the sponsoring body along with UU Course Director | £500 to the student + the purchase of the work                            | Carson McDowell Solicitors    |
| Spectrum Oil Colours Award: BA Hons Fine and Applied Arts                    |   |  |   |                               |
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award  | Selecting Body   | Value of Award  | Origin                        |
| Final year students  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experimentation with methods and materials.</li> <li>- Exploration of painting techniques.</li> </ul>  | Representatives from the sponsoring body along with UU Course Director | £100 worth of Spectrum Art materials                                      | Spectrum Oil Colours          |
| Walker Communications Limited Prize: BA Hons Visual Communications           |   |  |   |                               |
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award  | Selecting Body   | Value of Award  | Origin                        |
| Final Year Students  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All aspects of the work produced are original.</li> <li>- Work shows imagination and creativity.</li> <li>- The work will translate will into a 48-sheet poster site.</li> </ul> | Representatives from the sponsoring body along with UU Course Director | £500, plus a poster site for their artwork and one week's work experience | Walker Communications Limited |

| The Connor Keightly Annual Photography Award                                      |   |  |                |                |
|---|---|--|----------------|----------------|
| All courses in School of Art and Design with a photography component (lens based) |   |  |                |                |
| Eligibility   | Criteria for Award  | Selecting Body   | Value of Award | Origin         |
| Final Year Students   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality of the work on exhibition.</li> <li>- Consistency and commitment to practice.</li> <li>- Benefit to professional practice after graduation.</li> </ul> | Representatives from the sponsoring body along with UU Course Director | £300           | Speech Matters |

Faculty of Business and Management

| Hewlett-Packard (Ireland) Prize: For best overall Business Studies student at Magee Campus   |  |                     |                |  |
|--|--|---------------------|----------------|--|
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award                             | Selecting Body      | Value of Award | Origin                                   |
| Final year graduating students at undergraduate level  | Best overall average of marks.                 | Board of Examiners  | Trophy + £250  | Hewlett-Packard (Ireland)                |
| Invest NI Award: PGD/MSc in International Business   |  |                     |                |  |
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award                             | Selecting Body      | Value of Award | Origin                                   |
| MSc International Business Students  | Best field consulting.                         | Board of Examiners  | Trophy + £500  | Invest NI (North Western Office)         |
| McDaid, Moore and McCullough Prize – Final Year Accounting:<br>BSc Hons Business Studies with Options (full-time and part-time) (ME) |  |                     |                |  |
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award                             | Selecting Body      | Value of Award | Origin                                   |
| Business Studies with Accounting Final Year  | Best average in Final Year Accounting modules. | Boards of Examiners | Trophy + £250  | McDaid, Moore and McCullough Accountants |
| Rutledge Joblink Prize for Best HRM student:<br>BSc Hons Business Studies with Options (full-time and part-time) (ME)                |  |                     |                |  |
| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award                             | Selecting Body      | Value of Award | Origin                                   |
| Business Studies with HRM Final Year   | Best average in HRM Specialism modules.        | Board or Examiners  | Trophy + £250  | Rutledge Joblink                         |

Institute of Directors' Prize: MBA

| Eligibility  | Criteria for Award   | Selecting Body     | Value of Award                           | Origin                 |
|--------------|--|--------------------|--|------------------------|
| All students | Best team presentation in the Strategy and Marketing Module. | Board of Examiners | Tyrone Crystal Engraved Cup + Book Token | Institute of Directors |

Mivan International Strategy Prize: MBA/MBS

| Eligibility                      | Criteria for Award  | Selecting Body     | Value of Award                 | Origin        |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| Full-time and part-time students | Best overall performance on the Capstone International Strategy Module. | Board of Examiners | Perpetual Prize and Book Token | Mivan Limited |

HD Mooney Memorial Trophy: BSc Hons Accounting Year 2

| Eligibility                   | Criteria for Award  | Selecting Body     | Value of Award   | Origin                             |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|
| All full time year 2 students | Student with the best score in the year 2 Financial Accounting module as determined by final module mark to take account of both coursework and exam. | Board of Examiners | Trophy plus £150 | Baker Tilly Mooney Moore (Belfast) |