

UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER

TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on 8 February 2006 at the Coleraine campus

PRESENT

Professor D A McAlister (Chair), Professor I Banat, Professor R R Barnett (Acting Vice-Chancellor), Professor N D Black, Mrs H Farley, Ms A Fearon, Mr P Fleming, Dr P Hanna, Dr D A Heenan, Professor D Hunter, Professor R Hutchinson, Professor E M Lillie, Mr D McGivern, Dr R J Millar, Professor A Moran, Dr M Murphy, Ms N O'Hagan

APOLOGIES

Professor J M Allen, Mr L McCurry, Mr T McLernon, Professor C W Mulholland, Professor R A Welch

IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs C G Avery, Dr C Curran (for mins 06.25 - 46), Mr A G Faulkner

UNRESERVED BUSINESS

06.1 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Committee noted that Mr N McKenna had resigned from the Committee as student representative and welcomed his replacement, Ms Aoibheann Fearon, to her first meeting of the Committee.

06.2 MINUTES

The Committee noted that in Appendix 2 to the minutes the Staff Development Unit and not the Quality Management and Audit Unit were to report on Faculty compliance with the University's policy on student transition: Teaching and Learning Strategy objective viii).

Subject to the amendment above, the confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2005 were signed by the Chair.

MATTERS ARISING

06.3 National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (Min 05.181 refers)

The Chair reported that DEL had confirmed that, for the 2006 competition, strand 1 Individual National Teaching Fellowship Awards would be supported in Northern Ireland, but strand 2 Group Projects would not. Higher Education institutions would be permitted to nominate up to three staff. Professor Hunter and the Staff Development Unit were currently considering the University's process and a call for nominations would be made in the near future. Faculties were encouraged to give initial consideration to nominations now, particularly in relation to the support of student learning.

06.4 Campus Co-ordinating Group Annual Report 2004/5 (Min 05.196 refers)

The Committee noted that the report from the Jordanstown Campus Co-ordinating Group on the operation and management of the arrangements for combined undergraduate subjects in 2004/5 together with the response to the Chief External Examiner's report would be received at the April meeting.

CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

06.5 QAA Consultation: Programme Specifications

The Chair reported that Faculties and other appropriate staff had been consulted about QAA proposals for published versions of programme specifications. The University's response had indicated that it was not supportive of the proposed 'Programme Plus' approach, which would be an unnecessary duplication of material already contained in online prospectus entries and would provide no enhancement to current published and public information.

06.6 HEFCE Review: Assessing Impact of TQI on HEIs

The Chair reported that the University had declined to participate in the QAA sector-wide review of institutions' published TQI reports, and would devote its resource to participating in a HEFCE study commissioned to assess the costs, benefits and other impacts of TQI upon institutions.

06.7 Collections and Information Access Policy

The Chair reported that consultation had taken place in relation to the Collections and Information Access Policy and an EQIA would not be necessary. The policy previously circulated in June 2005 therefore remained unchanged (min 05.114 refers).

06.8 Guidance on Safety in Fieldwork

The Chair reported that guidance on safety in fieldwork had been received from the Universities Health and Safety Association.

AGREED: that the Guidance be considered by appropriate Faculty Committees, eg Teaching and Learning and Health and Safety, to ensure compliance with best practice.

06.9 COURSE APPROVAL SUB-COMMITTEE

The Chair presented the report of the meeting held on 11 January 2006 (TLC/06/1).

06.10 Terms of Reference (Item 1)

The Committee noted the proposed addition of a new term of reference 2 'to keep under review the evaluation and revalidation schedule'.

AGREED: that the additional term of reference be approved.

06.11 Course Approval (Item 3)

The Committee noted the revisions approved by Faculties. The substantial number of courses withdrawn included nine HNC/D programmes in partner institutions. Two courses scheduled for January 2006 starts had deferred entry to September 2006: BSc Hons Applied Biosciences and Postgraduate Diploma/MSc Specialist Cognitive Therapy.

The Committee noted the following business in particular:

Postgraduate Diploma/MA Museum Practice and Management

A recommendation on approval of the programme had been deferred in view of concerns about sustainability until a supplementary document had been submitted and all conditions and recommendations had been addressed.

Professor Lillie reported that the document had now been submitted to the Academic Office and that agreement had been reached with the Heritage Council for co-operation with alternative partners.

BSc Hons Applied Biosciences

The original proposal had been for the top-up degree to be delivered by distance learning with limited use of resources at the Institute of Vocational Education in Hong Kong. Professor Black reported that the arrangement had not been concluded and that the Faculty was now considering a new partner. As this would be a change from the validated proposal, the particulars of the arrangement would have to be submitted for approval.

Postgraduate Diploma/MSc Specialist Cognitive Therapy

The Postgraduate Diploma/MSc Specialist Cognitive Therapy had been jointly validated by the University with the Northern Ireland Post Qualifying Educational Partnership (NIPQEP), the relevant PSRB. Professor Moran sought clarification regarding a Faculty of Life and Health Sciences' proposal to develop a programme in the same broad subject area. Mr Fleming confirmed that preliminary discussions with an accreditation body were planned and assured the Committee that the Faculty of Social Sciences would be invited to participate in these.

AGREED: that it be recommended to Senate that recommendations regarding course approval be endorsed as set out in Appendix 1.

06.12 Evaluation and Revalidation Schedule (Item 4)

The Committee noted that CA6 Revalidation Preparation Forms for the 2006/7 revalidation schedule had been sent to Deans in December for completion and return to the Academic Office by 20 February 2006.

The Committee noted that a decision regarding the request to merge the three Computing Sub-Units 16A, B and C to form a single Subject Unit had been deferred until the March Sub-Committee meeting, for further consideration in the light of experience of the revalidation of the large Built Environment Unit 4A in

January 2006. A decision regarding the request for a one year extension to the period of approval for Subject Unit 16E (BSc Hons Computing Science and BSc Hons Interactive Multimedia Design at Hong Kong College of Technology) would also be considered at the March meeting of the Sub-Committee in the light of concerns as reported by the Annual Course Monitoring Sub-Group (min 06.37 refers).

AGREED: that it be recommended to Senate that, one year extensions to the periods of approval for the following provision be granted and that the revalidation events be postponed:

<u>Re-validation Subject Unit</u>	<u>Approval to include</u>	<u>Re-validation to take place</u>
2A Art & Design	2006 intake	2006/7
25C PgD/MSc	2006 intake	2006/7
Careers Guidance		
17A Irish	2007 intake	2007/8
16A - C Computing	2007 intake	2007/8
24A Politics	2007 intake	2007/8

06.13 FACULTY HEADS OF COLLABORATIVE COURSE FORUM

Dr Hanna presented the report of the open meeting of the Forum held on 18 January 2006 (TLC/06/2) to which senior staff of partner institutions had been invited to discuss quality assurance matters. This was the first of what was planned to be an annual event. The Committee considered the report and the three recommendations in relation to Management and Governance Structures (Item 5), Staff Development (Item 11) and Work-Based Learning (Item 13).

06.14 Chairing of Examination Boards (Item 2)

The Committee noted the proposed provision of training for senior college staff in the chairing of examination boards.

06.15 Issues of Governance (Item 5)

The Committee noted the recommendation that partner institutions be required to include a copy of their Management and Governance structure with evaluation and revalidation documentation to clarify how important issues raised at course committee level were referred on and addressed at institutional level.

The Committee considered this to be a course management rather than an institutional governance issue and noted that, with the formation of the six new 'super' institutes, management and governance arrangements were likely to be reviewed.

AGREED: that the course management section of evaluation and revalidation documents should clarify arrangements in place for issues raised at course committee level to be reported and addressed at institutional level.

06.16 Library and ICT Provision (Item 10)

The Committee noted that the Forum would take forward with the Information Services and Human Resources Departments the issue of access rights for Recognised Teachers in partner institutions.

06.17 Staff Development (Item 11)

The Committee noted a recommendation that an online forum be set up to enable generic issues to be raised by partner institutions and answered by the University. This would also be used to disseminate good practice.

The Committee was supportive of the proposal but considered that further consideration needed to be given to a number of matters, including the nature of the forum, the use of FAQs, screening-out bad practice, maintenance of the forum, the monitoring of the University responses and the resources required.

AGREED: that the proposal be supported in principle and that the Forum be asked to bring forward a more detailed specification for consideration by the Committee.

06.18 College Co-ordinator Role (Item 12)

The Committee considered that the identification of a main co-ordinator in each partner college would facilitate greater efficiency in communication between the University and its partners.

The Committee noted that the Forum would forward a draft role specification for consideration by the Committee in due course.

06.19 Management of Work-Based Learning (Item 13)

The Committee noted that it was considered that the Sector Skills Councils (SSC) were not sufficiently developed in Northern Ireland to offer appropriate guidance on employment and work-based learning opportunities and that it was reported that, when fully operational, they may charge consultancy rates for course development.

The Forum had recommended that clarification be sought from DEL on the role of the Councils in future Foundation degree development.

AGREED: that the Chair and Professor Black should raise this matter at a forthcoming seminar with partner institutions, DEL and the SSCs and take the matter forward with DEL.

06.20 Issues from 2004/5 Annual Course Review (Item 14)

The Committee noted that there were many examples of good practice at partner institutions identified in external examiner reports. Opportunities for the dissemination of good practice was facilitated through University events for staff from both the partner institutions and the University.

06.21 SUB-COMMITTEE ON CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR ACADEMIC STAFF

Professor Banat presented a composite report from meetings of the Sub-Committee held on 10 and 31 October and 12 December 2005 (TLC/06/3).

06.22 Review of UU Peer Observation Scheme (Item 1)

The Committee noted the proposed methodology for conducting a review of the current University peer observation scheme during 2005/6 in line with TQEF and the former QAEC targets. The FDTL Project ELATE: Peer-Supported Review of LTA and Professional Development had provided information on an alternative approach to peer observation.

The Committee noted the timeframe for action for the review was being met and that the Chair of the Sub-Committee would report on the review to the Committee at its June meeting.

AGREED: that the proposed methodology for the review be endorsed.

06.23 TQEF Professional Strand Targets (Item 2)

The Committee noted that progress made on TQEF Professional Development Targets since July 2005 included the successful validation of the Postgraduate Certificate/Diploma/MSc Higher Education Practice and its accreditation by HEA. A conference entitled 'Challenge and Change in the HE Learning Environment: Process and Practice' was planned to be held on 4 – 6 September 2006 at the Magee campus.

06.24 Working Group: Online CPD System (Item 3)

The Committee noted progress of the Working Group established to develop an online system to support the continuing professional development of all staff within the University.

06.25 ACCREDITATION OF PRIOR LEARNING

The Committee at its October meeting had received a paper, which outlined Faculty and central department responses to a draft policy on APL. The Committee had been asked to reconvene to consider the comments and to revise as appropriate the draft policy and guiding principles (min 05.163 refers).

Dr C Curran presented the further report of the Working Group and its responses together with the revised draft policy and guiding principles (TLC/06/4). The Group considered that the further deliberation of the issues raised had strengthened the document and the policies and procedures defined therein.

06.26 Exemption Recording (Item 2.2)

The Committee noted that the Group agreed with the Academic Registry's recommendations to ensure that exemptions were recorded on the student's record through the new Student Record System.

06.27 Fees

The Committee noted that it was not clear from the response from Finance that there was appreciation of the need for Faculties/Schools to be adequately resourced to implement the proposed APL policy, and that all additional fee income received for the accreditation of prior learning needed to be returned to Faculties/Schools through their recurrent budget.

Clarification was sought whether the fee for a claim for the accreditation of prior experiential learning (APEL) would be payable in addition to the £3,000 fee. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Development and Student Services) advised that given the additional work undertaken to assess such claims it was anticipated that students would be expected to pay a fee for any APL claim.

The Group had recommended that for advanced standing and exemptions by APCL there should be a flat fee for programmes where standard rates of fees apply, consistent across the University (with exceptions for linked awards). The Finance Department would need to give consideration to the appropriate fees to be charged.

06.28 Limits to APL

The Committee noted that currently up to two-thirds of any course might be exempted but that the Working Group had recommended that postgraduate students should undertake a minimum of 50% of the prescribed programme of study. Although no change was proposed for undergraduate courses the Faculty of Business and Management had considered that, while two-thirds was appropriate for the accreditation of prior certificated learning (APCL), a limit of 50% should be set for APEL claims.

The Committee noted that the Working Group considered that certificated and experiential learning should be regarded as being of equal standing and that the process and systems implemented for APL should be sufficiently rigorous and robust to ensure confidence in the outcomes.

Faculties would be able to submit a case for departure from the principles and limits to APEL claims for consideration by the Committee.

In discussing the limits to APL the Committee re-emphasised current policy that it would be important that at postgraduate level the modules completed as part of studies be at the highest level and for Master's degrees include the dissertation. The Committee considered that for Intermediate level awards a 50% APL limit should also be set.

06.29 APL Board (Recommendations 1 and 2)

The Faculty of Arts had considered that the establishment of an APL Board at the level of the School/Faculty to approve claims would be a burdensome procedure and preferred a process involving the subject selector and Director of Admissions in the Faculty.

The Committee noted that the Group considered there needed to be a mechanism to ensure consistency, equity and transparency. The Committee now

proposed that the membership of the Board be determined by Faculties, with due regard to its status. The suggested membership had also been revised to include an APEL Adviser(s) and APL Co-ordinator.

06.30 Staff Development (Recommendation 3)

The Committee noted the need for centrally provided training and support of all associated staff. Although Staff Development had indicated a willingness to facilitate staff development it was noted that there should be involvement of experienced staff from the University in providing this.

The Committee noted that Staff Development would facilitate the dissemination of good practice.

The Committee recognised that, subject to Senate approval of the policy, the time-frame for implementation in the 2006/7 academic year was very tight and that training would need to be provided at the earliest opportunity.

The Chair advised that, until such time as the policy was endorsed by Senate, current claims for APL could continue to be processed under existing arrangements.

06.31 Outcome of Claims (Recommendation 6)

The Committee noted that it would be important that students were advised before embarking on an APEL claim that as with other forms of assessment there would be no right of appeal against academic judgement. APEL claims made as part of a course would however be subject to the same arrangements for resubmission as other modules.

AGREED:

- i) that it be recommended to Senate that the following be endorsed:
 - a) the Principles underpinning APC/EL Policy, the draft Policy for APL and the recommendations for implementations (Appendix 2);
 - b) the following maximum limits to APL be set:

Master's, Intermediate and Access Diploma Awards

Modules amounting to 50% of the credit value of the award.

Certificate and Honours Level Awards

Modules amounting to two-thirds of the credit value of the award;
 - c) that Regulations for the following awards be revised accordingly: AB, DipHE, Fd, HND/C, AdvCert, AdvDip, non-Honours degree, Postgraduate Certificate, Postgraduate Diploma, Master's, and that no change be made to the current two-thirds rule in Regulations for: Certificate, Diploma, CertHE, GradDip, GradCert, Honours degree;

- d) that the Regulations for Postgraduate Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates and Regulations for Postgraduate Programmes of Study leading to the Award of Master's Degrees be revised in accordance with Recommendation 21, as follows:

'Admission

2 Applicants for entry must normally:

- (a) have gained ...

[qualifications]

or ~~as an alternative to (a) and/or (b):~~

- (d) ~~provide evidence of their ability to undertake the programme through the accreditation of prior experiential learning.~~ in exceptional circumstances, where an individual has substantial and significant experiential learning, a portfolio of written evidence demonstrating the meeting of graduate qualities (including subject-specific outcomes, as determined by Course Committees) may be considered as an alternative entrance route. Evidence used to demonstrate graduate qualities may not be used for exemption against modules within the programme.'

and that the alternative in 2(a) iii of an 'equivalent standard in a preliminary examination for admission' [to Master's programmes] and the associated Guidelines be revoked.

- ii) that, subject to Senate approval of i) above, Finance and Staff Development be asked to progress financial arrangements and staff training respectively;
- iii) that Dr Curran and the Working Group be thanked for the work involved in preparing the report and that, subject to Senate approval of i) above, the Group be asked to reconvene in Autumn 2007 to review the extent to which the policy had been effective in supporting the accreditation of prior learning, compliance with the policy and to consider possible modifications in the light of experience.

06.32 QAA AUDIT 2005

In October 2005, the Committee had received the QAA Institutional Audit Report (2005) together with an action plan to address the 'desirable' recommendations which lay within the remit of the Committee (mins 05.144 – 05.149 refers).

The Committee considered two papers, Internal Moderation (TLC/06/5a) and External Examiner's Authority (TLC/06/5b) which included extracts from the QAA Audit Report, the previous paper considered by the Committee and Faculty responses.

06.33 Internal Moderation (Recommendation 1)

The Committee noted the University's current policy in relation to internal moderation as outlined in the University's Assessment Handbook and was asked to consider the extent to which the University should be more prescriptive in relation to internal moderation and the minimum expectations for a University policy.

The Committee noted some difference in the approach taken by Faculties. The Committee noted that practices varied, with full or sample double marking of examination scripts being common in arts-based disciplines, whereas in more technical based courses which have a reasonably precise specification of the required answers and marking schemes, a system of monitoring was more appropriate. There did however appear to be a similar approach across the Faculties in relation to the moderation of projects/dissertations, fails and firsts.

The Committee noted that the University's definition of double marking was a process whereby two markers mark all the scripts (which was the same as 100% monitoring) with the final mark being calculated as the average of two marks.

Although external examiner reports and the QAA Audit had not identified any problems in relation to the University internal moderation arrangements, the general view appeared to be that additional guidance on the University's expectations for internal moderation would be helpful to Faculties.

AGREED: that the Academic Office bring forward proposals on a minimum University policy for consideration by the Committee at its April meeting.

06.34 External Examiners Authority: Viva Voce Examinations (Recommendation 3)

The Committee at its October meeting had understood that the issue related to viva voce examinations and the potential impact on marks for candidates who had not attended a viva. If required, explicit advice might be drawn up in regard to the size and range of any sample selected for vivas, the format of the examinations, and the consequences for the whole cohort.

The Committee was asked to consider a paper summarising Faculty responses. It was noted that the use of viva examinations varied across Faculties, as did the approach taken in terms of the sample selected and the consequences for the whole cohort. The Committee noted the two possible functions of vivas:

- i) to reach decisions on specific candidates (especially with borderline classifications); and
- ii) to confirm the general judgement, appropriateness and consistency of marking standards (including the internal and external moderation process which has already taken place).

It was suggested that there did not appear to be a problem with the possible functions of vivas as outlined above but that it would be important for Boards of Examiners to be aware of their responsibility to ensure the equitable treatment of students in considering consequences for a whole cohort.

AGREED: that the University's guidance (in the Assessment Handbook and External Examiner's Handbook) be revised to make explicit that Boards of Examiners when using vivas should give consideration to the implications for the whole cohort of students to ensure equitable treatment of students.

06.35 QAA AUDIT 2006

The Committee considered the draft Self Evaluation Document for the Collaborative Audit (TLC/06/6).

The Committee noted that the draft SED would be further revised to reflect current progress in terms of the provision of transcripts, the costing of collaborative activity, the University's management of strategic leadership including the Change Academy proposal and the overall success of the University's collaborative arrangements.

AGREED: that comments on the draft Self Evaluation Document be submitted to Ms C Browning, QMAU.

ANNUAL MONITORING

06.36 Annual Subject Monitoring 2003/4

The Committee noted that Planning had advised that there were alternative codes for occasional students not intending to take examinations and that students coded as occasional were not included in the records provided for ASM (min 05.201 refers).

06.37 Annual Course Review 2004/5

The Committee considered paper TLC/06/07, the report of the Teaching and Learning Committee Sub-Group which met to consider submissions from partner institutions for the 2004/5 Annual Course Review exercise.

The paper also outlined action taken to address outstanding matters from the 2003/4 annual review including the three missing course reports (mins 05.155 and 05.202 refers). The Committee confirmed that it was satisfied with the action taken to address matters arising from the 2003/4 exercise (pp9-19) and subsequent progress.

Section C of the report (pp67-78) identified general issues arising from the 2004/5 review. Summary recommendations for University consideration together with the lead agent responsible for action and the timescale for action were outlined in pages 4-6 of the report; recommendations for Faculties and partner institutions were outlined in pp78-83.

It was noted that the majority of the recommendations were the responsibility of the FHCC Forum. The Committee considered the following recommendations for which it had been identified as lead agent:

Low Demand/Enrolments (Recommendation 6)
Review of Provision (Recommendation 7)

The Committee noted that this issue had been raised in previous years and that actions taken to address low demand and enrolment included Faculty assessment of CA2 proposals and scrutiny by the Academic Planning Sub-Committee and its predecessor and at validation. DEL/DARD approval of proposals was also required for FE and CAFRE. It was noted that the current charging of the Licence fee and in future the new pricing model which would arise from the current VFM Review would ensure that institutions were more realistic about proposals and the recruitment of viable numbers. It was also expected that the forthcoming mergers of Colleges would offer opportunities for rationalisation.

The Committee noted the recommendation that partner institutions be asked to review their suite of University approved programmes and to submit CA5 forms in respect of those courses not offered. It was noted that this was already happening as 41 CA5 forms had been submitted in the last academic year and 18 more had been submitted so far this year. FHCCs had been active in asking Colleges to submit these for courses not recruiting and the re-validation process obliged colleges to review their provision. Approval lapsed for any course which was not revalidated.

Quality Assurance Concerns: Specific Colleges (Recommendations 14)

The Sub-Group had identified quality assurance concerns in relation to four Colleges (Castlereagh, Fermanagh, HKCT and NEIFHE) and recommended that a University delegation should visit the institutions to discuss quality assurance processes at institutional level with senior managers.

The Committee noted that the annual report from Westcare Business Services had not been received in time for the second year in succession.

Clarification of policy regarding the future of HNC/D provision was sought by Professor Hutchinson. Professor Black reported that although DEL's and the University's preference was for Foundation degree programmes, as yet no formal decision regarding withdrawal of support for HNC/D programmes had been made by DEL.

AGREED: that the recommendations of the Sub-Group be endorsed with the exception of recommendations 6 and 7 which required no further action at this stage but should continue to be monitored.

06.38 Revised Arrangements for the Quality Assurance Reporting Process on Edexcel Programmes

The Committee noted the changes made to the quality assurance reporting process for Edexcel programmes from 2005/6 (Section E of Sub-Group Report).

AGREED: that the proposed approach be endorsed.

06.39 QMAU MONITORING VISIT: HTMi

The Committee received for information purposes the report of the monitoring visit to the School of Hotel and Tourism Management (HTMi), Switzerland on 24 and 25 November 2005 (TLC/06/8). The visit was undertaken as part of the University's procedures for the approval of new partner organisations, which involved a review visit to the collaborative partner after the second intake of students onto its first programme.

The Committee noted that HTMi had made progress to date in addressing concerns previously raised by the external examiner and the Faculty Head of Collaborative Courses and thanked the Head of School and the FHCC for their work with the institution. The re-validation scheduled for May 2006 would proceed provided that the external examiner and FHCC reports due in March confirmed that concerns had been adequately addressed.

The Committee asked that the minor statistical discrepancies (cohort size, gender and home country) between the monitoring visit report and the 2004/5 annual course review report be checked. It was noted that HTMi was now offering an MBA in conjunction with Queen Margaret University College.

06.40 REVIEW OF ANNUAL SUBJECT MONITORING AND REVALIDATION

The Committee received paper TLC/06/9 which addressed issues in relation to the current annual monitoring process taking account of views expressed by Faculties at the consultation seminar facilitated by Prof Raban in October 2005 and set out possible modifications to the process. The paper also outlined some proposed enhancements to the re-validation process.

06.41 Annual Subject Monitoring

In relation to ASM it was proposed to develop the risk-based approach, with flexibility allowed to Faculties to determine how evidence was obtained to address areas of risk identified by the University, and in course-level reporting, and the process of review. Faculties would also be expected to identify good practice and how it is disseminated. It was proposed that course reports would relate to evidence from June Examination Board data, views of students, external examiners and PSRBs, and changes in the external environment. They should be available for Faculty review not later than early September. A Sub-Group of the Committee would meet in November and December to consider Faculty-level reports and triangulate with their own analysis of the key centrally available performance data.

Mr McGivern reported that the basis for the collection of graduate destination data now meant that a student undertaking part-time postgraduate study might be recorded as being in a non-graduate job, if he/she was also working part-time.

The Chair confirmed that the former Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee had agreed that courses undergoing re-validation in a particular year should not be exempted from annual monitoring since the objectives of both processes were different. It was acknowledged however that under the proposed risk-based approach to ASM, a Faculty might decide not to require completion of an annual report for course(s) scheduled for re-validation in a particular year.

06.42 Re-validation

The Committee noted that the effectiveness of the re-validation process had been reviewed in 2002/3 and that it was generally considered to be fit for purpose. A report reviewing evaluation and re-validation activity was submitted to the Committee at the end of each academic year and a small number of changes were usually agreed. A review of guidance on evaluation and re-validation had been undertaken in 2004/5.

The Committee noted that a particular problem identified was the very large size of some units, which raised some concern about the feasibility of panels confirming the validity of all courses and modules. There was also a need in such units for Faculties to ensure that the external subject experts nominated to panels were sufficient in number to cover the full range of provision. Some practical difficulties had been encountered with the re-validation of subject unit 4A: Built Environment which had been held as a three-day event. The Committee was generally supportive of reducing the size of the larger subject units and for evaluation events to be held for new proposals unless an appropriate case was made to CASC justifying consideration of a new proposal as part of a revalidation unit eg substantial commonality with other provision in the unit.

The Committee noted that the Academic Office could provide Panels with a digest of statistical information publicly available from the TQI website relating to entry, continuation and destination data and NSS results.

The Committee noted a suggestion from the Faculty of Arts that the Academic Office should have a greater input in scrutinising submissions prior to re-validation events so that documentation and regulatory matters were addressed prior to submissions being circulated to Panels. The Academic Office confirmed its willingness to assist Faculties in this regard but that it would inevitably have implications for the timescale for submission. It was not thought that Panels were impeded in their consideration of key issues by the Academic Office's report on these matters. It was noted that the Academic Office currently reviewed draft final documents before they were signed off by Panel Chairs.

AGREED: that relevant Faculty Committees give consideration to the proposals outlined in the paper with a view to providing a response to the Academic Office by 24 March 2006 for further consideration by the Committee at its April meeting.

DEPARTURES FROM UNIVERSITY REGULATORY/MODULAR FRAMEWORK

06.43 PGCE (PRIMARY AND POST-PRIMARY)

The Committee, at its December meeting, had not been convinced by the case made by the Faculty of Social Sciences for a departure from the University's normal modular structure and had asked the Faculty to give further consideration to presenting the programme as two 20-point modules at level M and two 10-point modules at level 3 (min 05.22 refers). The Committee considered paper TLC/06/10 from the Faculty, which confirmed that the PGCE course committee had accepted the Committee's recommendation and would be restructuring the programme accordingly.

06.44 NURSING PRE-REGISTRATION PROGRAMMES

The Committee, at its October meeting, had received a paper from the Faculty of Life and Health Sciences seeking broad endorsement of a number of proposed departures from general arrangements for its Nursing pre-registration programmes (BSc/BSc Hons Nursing). The Committee had asked the Faculty to review its proposals in the light of discussion and that the revalidation panel give particular attention to the grounds for the proposals and their appropriateness (mins 05.166 – 05.168 refer).

The Committee received paper TLC/06/11, which included an extract from the report of the revalidation panel and a supplementary statement received from the Faculty. It was noted that the revalidation panel had not made any specific recommendations in relation to the proposed departures from current University regulations.

06.45 Progression

The Committee noted that the first proposal was for entry into a common BSc/BSc Hons Nursing programme and that progression to either Honours or non-Honours would be determined at the end of Semester 1, Year 2 on the basis of performance. Honours progression would require a mark of 55% or above; students with a mark between 40 and 54% would be required to complete a non-Honours degree. The Committee noted that, although a new admission offer standard of 260 UCAS points for both Honours and non-Honours had been agreed, such programmes were normally differentiated in both content and entry standard. The progression standard required within all other Honours degrees and undergraduate programmes in the University was 40%.

While noting that the DHSSPS would prefer the University to offer a non-Honours entry route, the Faculty reported that its proposal, which incorporated a Foundation degree exit route, reflected the high calibre of applicants. The Committee considered that it would not be acceptable for Nursing students, once admitted, to be required to achieve a higher standard than other students to progress within an Honours programme.

AGREED:

- i) that the proposal be not approved;
- ii) that the University should discuss with the DHSSPS ways to meet the Department's expectations;
- iii) that any implications for NMC approval be discussed with NIPEC.

06.46 Examination Boards

The second proposal related to the holding of examination boards three times per year, at the end of each semester when results would be finalised. It was proposed that the external examiner would only attend in person, in September, but would be fully involved in decisions during the year. It was noted that regulations currently required attendance at all Boards where results contribute to the calculation of the final award.

It was also proposed that Boards might permit students to carry 30 credits of failure (with the exception of placement modules) into the next semester in a year because of the standard size of modules used, and that students failing 60 points in a semester or 30 credits at the second attempt should not proceed but be required to resit in the next academic year. University regulations allowed automatic progression between Semester 1 and 2 and a maximum of 20 credits carried into the next year.

The Committee noted that the University has standard regulations to ensure equity and that automatic progression between semesters had been introduced because of the difficulties in ensuring full moderation within semester 1.

The Committee was assured by the Faculty that there would be full moderation to allow final confirmation of results within each semester.

AGREED that it be recommended to Senate that:

- i) the proposal to hold examination boards at the end of each semester be approved, subject to the attendance of at least one external examiner at each Board of Examiners' meeting;
- ii) that the proposed arrangements for the consequences of failure arrangements be approved for the programme, ie students be permitted to carry 30 credits of failure in taught modules into the next semester in a year and that students failing 60 credit points in a semester or 30 credit points at the second attempt, should not proceed, but be required to resit in the next academic year;
- iii) that Regulations for Honours degrees and non-Honours degrees be revised as follows:

Consequences of Failure

25 and 26 ADD 'The consequences of failure in BSc/BSc Hons Nursing shall be as specified in the programme regulations.'

- iv) that the University's Code of Practice for External Examining be revised as follows:

10 e) External Examiners are entitled to attend all meetings of Boards of Examiners of which they are members. ADD *With the exception of the BSc/BSc Hons Nursing, they shall be present at all meetings where the performance of candidates which contributes to the final result is being considered. ADD In the BSc/BSc Hons Nursing, at least one external examiner shall be present at each Board of Examiners which considers final results.* In the case of linked postgraduate diplomas and master's degrees, the Faculty may determine in accordance with approved procedures whether the External Examiners attend for one or both award stages.

06.47 BSc HONS BUSINESS, (SINGLE HONOURS AND MAJOR), BSc HONS BUSINESS FINANCE AND INVESTMENT (COLERAINE), BSc HONS BUSINESS STUDIES (JORDANSTOWN)

The Committee considered requests from the Faculty of Business and Management following the recent revalidations that the final year honours dissertation module be optional in the BSc Hons Business (Single Honours and Major) (Coleraine) and BSc Hons Business Studies (Jordanstown) and for no dissertation to be available in the BSc Hons Business Finance and Investment programme (Coleraine) (TLC/06/12 and 13).

It was noted that University regulations state that in the final year of an Honours degree one or more modules shall normally be assessed by a dissertation.

The Committee noted that, although a substantial piece of independent research-based study was not a programme-level learning outcome, the achievement of independent research-based study would be demonstrated in other compulsory final year modules.

AGREED: that the proposed departures be approved.

06.48 BA HONS ARCHITECTURE

The Committee considered a case from the Faculty of Arts for proposed departures from the University regulatory and modular framework in respect of the recently revalidated BA Hons Architecture programme (TLC/06/14).

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 being assessed by either coursework or examination.

In the programme it was proposed that only two 10-point modules would be assessed by a combination of coursework and examination. The Committee noted that, as an aim of the course was to respond creatively and responsibly to the demands of a complex and changing profession, it was necessary for students to reassess their functions and responses through a wide range of assignments. Many of the prescribed criteria of the Architecture Registration Board (ARB) also involved continuous assessment.

AGREED: that the proposed departure be approved.

Modular Structure

Under the University's modular framework, taught modules are normally 10, 15, 20 and 30 credit points in size and up to two 10-point modules may be studied in a semester.

The Committee considered the requests for three 10-point modules per semester in each year and for a long-thin 60-point design module in Year 1.

It was noted that the course had been designed to reflect the requirements of the professional bodies (ARB and RIBA) and the QAA benchmarks which expected Architecture Design to constitute 50% of all credits. Thirty credits per semester would therefore cover Design (in 30 point modules in each semester in Years 2 and 3) with the remaining 30 credit points being split into three 10-point modules to cover the three other themes studied. The 60-point Design module in Year 1 was considered to be the most appropriate means to provide students with the skills and knowledge necessary to challenge and widen their perception of architecture in the first year.

AGREED: that the proposed departures be approved.

06.49 MSc HIGHER EDUCATION PRACTICE

The Committee considered a case from the Faculty of Social Sciences that the MSc award in the Higher Education Practice programme be based on the 60-credit point dissertation only (TLC/06/15).

The Committee noted that the University's regulations for Master's awards state that for a Pass with Distinction to be awarded a candidate must achieve an overall average of 70% or more, with a mark of at least 70% being achieved in half the course, in modules amounting to at least 90 credit points, including the dissertation. Although the Postgraduate Certificate/Diploma stages of the Higher Education Practice programme were assessed on a Pass/Fail basis, the course committee intended to award marks for the MSc dissertation.

The Committee noted the Faculty's view that the awarding of marks was contrary to a reflective practice approach to continuing professional development and was not conducive to encouraging staff to participate in such a programme.

Members expressed concern about the proposal to award the Distinction solely on the dissertation. An alternative suggestion was for the pass/distinction bandings to be used at the Postgraduate Diploma stage so that the calculation of the overall grading of the MSc might be based on the achievement of distinction level in modules amounting to at least 90 credit points including the dissertation.

AGREED:

- i) that the Faculty's proposal be not approved;
- ii) that the Faculty give further consideration to the MSc being graded on a Pass/Fail basis only or for pass/distinction bandings to be used at Postgraduate Diploma level;
- iii) that the Faculty report its conclusion to the Committee at its April meeting.

06.50 BSc HONS PSYCHOLOGY (WITH DIS) (COLERAINE), BSc HONS SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY (WITH DIS) (COLERAINE), BSc HONS PSYCHOLOGY (MAGEE)

The Committee considered a paper from the School of Psychology, Faculty of Life and Health Sciences for departures from University regulations following the recent revalidation (TLC/06/16).

06.51 BSc Hons Psychology (with DIS) (CE), BSc Hons Social Psychology (with DIS) (CE), BSc Hons Psychology (ME)

The Committee noted that the University's regulations state that the assessment results for the final level of an honours degree shall normally contribute 100% to the final result. Exceptions to include level 2 may be permitted by the Teaching and Learning Committee where professional bodies require pre-final level study to contribute to classification for recognition purposes.

It was noted that the British Psychological Society continued to require a contribution from level 2, and the Faculty proposed that Year 2 should contribute 30% of the weighting towards the final result in the above programmes.

AGREED: that the request be approved.

06.52 BSc Hons Psychology with DIS (CE), BSc Hons Social Psychology with DIS (CE)

The Committee was asked to consider a proposal that normally only those students who achieve an average mark of 60% or better in Year 1 be permitted to participate in the optional placement leading to the award of Diploma in Industrial Studies in these programmes.

The Committee noted that, because of the large number of Psychology students and the relatively small number of agencies willing to fund a paid placement, it was not possible for the School to provide placements for all students. Several employers had stated that they did not wish to interview large numbers of applicants and had asked the School to short-list for interview.

It was noted that the University's regulations allow students to progress to the next stage of a programme with a mark of 40% and some concern was expressed that a progression threshold of 60% at the end of Year 1 might set an unwelcome precedent for other subject areas which had difficulty in securing placements. As the placement year was integral to the degree, it did not seem appropriate for the University to set a higher progression requirement.

AGREED:

- i) that the proposal be not approved;
- ii) that employers might identify within their own criteria for interview and selection a specific performance threshold.

06.53 ENGLISH IN BRITAIN ACCREDITATION SCHEME (EIBAS) ACCREDITATION VISIT

The Committee noted the inspection report of the British Council visit held on 5 - 7 September 2005 and the response to the report from the International Office (TLC/06/17).

The Committee noted that the Centre for English Language Teaching met the standards of the scheme and that continued accreditation had been recommended. The actions taken or to be taken in relation to specific points were noted. No substantive teaching and learning issues had been identified.

The Committee noted that CELT was considering whether British Council accreditation was worthwhile and that alternative forms of accreditation would be investigated.

AGREED: that the International Office/CELT take forward the action identified and report to the Teaching and Learning Committee and Academic Development and Student Support Committee as appropriate.

06.54 REPORT FROM THE PROGRESS FILES/INDUCTION/RETENTION AND PROGRESSION WORKING GROUP

Dr Millar presented a report of a meeting of the Progress Files/Induction/Retention and Progression Working Party held on 18 January 2006 (TLC/06/18).

The Committee noted that three new Faculty PDP co-ordinators had been appointed and that the Group had agreed that hard copies of the Faculty Strategies for PDP be circulated to all full-time members of academic staff. All Faculties were now piloting PDP in postgraduate courses.

The Committee noted a tabled updated paper 'Legal Issues – Personal Development System' which had recently been revised. Dr Millar confirmed that the Head of Governance Services had already commented on the paper. It was considered that this paper, relating to legal safeguards in access, data protection, copyright and licensing did not fall within the remit of the Committee.

The Committee noted that, while the PDP process came within the remit of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), responsibility for the PDP System lay within the portfolio of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Development and Student Support).

With regard to Retention and Progression matters, the Working Group had asked the Committee to provide feedback on the usefulness of the cohort tracking exercise and whether short-term measures should be provided, pending the introduction of the new Student Record System. The Committee discussed whether it would be useful for Course/Subject Directors to know those students who have transferred or withdrawn from another course at the University, so that appropriate support might be offered. To safeguard confidentiality information would be limited to the fact that a particular student had been enrolled on a different course of study at the University in the previous year.

AGREED:

- i) that Governance Services be asked to identify the Committee or University officer with authority to approve the legal issues document;
- ii) that identification of transferred and previously withdrawn students would be useful to Course/Subject Directors.

Duration 3 hours 15 mins

15 February 2006
AGF/CA/lh

REPORT FROM THE COURSE APPROVAL SUB-COMMITTEE (11.1.06)

COURSE APPROVAL

The Sub-Committee considered business from each Faculty and noted revisions approved by the Faculties as detailed in the Appendix.

FACULTY OF ARTS

PgDip/MA Museum Practice and Management (PT) (DL)

RECEIVED: the report of the Evaluation Panel.

- NOTED:
- (a) that the Faculty was investigating alternative arrangements following the withdrawal of Dundalk Institute of Technology as a partner in delivery;
 - (b) that a recommendation on approval of the programme had been deferred in view of concerns about sustainability until a supplementary document was submitted (by 31 January 2006) and all conditions and recommendations had been addressed; an update would be provided to the March meeting.

Subject Unit 21A: Music

RECEIVED: the report of the Re-validation Panel.

NOTED: that the Teaching and Learning Committee at its meeting in December 2005 had not approved a departure from the standard approach in relation to Level 1 assessment (coursework/written examination) and progression in Composition and Performance (condition (i)).

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the panel being met, the following provision be approved for a further period of five years (intakes 2006 to 2010):

Certificate in Foundation Studies in Music (PT) (ME)
Undergraduate Hons Subject: Music
(Single Hons/Major/Main/Minor) (FT/PT) (ME)
Master of Music (MMus) (FT/PT) (ME).

Proposed FdA Design for Visual Communication at BIFHE

NOTED: that the Institute had withdrawn the above proposal.

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT

Subject Unit 15E: Leisure (Colleges)

RECEIVED: the report of the Re-validation panel.

NOTED: (a) that the Panel had considered a new proposal from Omagh College to replace an existing HND;

(b) that, with regard to APEL, the University was developing its own policy and that Colleges would be expected to align their arrangements with it.

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the panel being met;

(i) the following provision be approved for a period of five years (intakes 2006 to 2010), with maximum cohort sizes of 18 FT and 20 PT (Lisburn) and 15 PT (Omagh):

FdSc Event Management (FT/PT) at Lisburn Institute of Further and Higher Education

FdSc Leisure, Sport and Event Management (PT) at Omagh College of Further Education;

(ii) that Omagh College of Further and Higher Education be recognised under Ordinance 1984/8.

Subject Unit 1C: Accounting (Colleges)

RECEIVED: the report of the Re-validation Panel.

NOTED: that only Newry and Kilkeel Institute of Further and Higher Education was now involved in this unit, offering Levels 1 and 2 with progression to the final year of the degree at Jordanstown.

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the panel being met, the following provision be approved for a further period of five years (intakes 2006 to 2010), with a maximum cohort size of 25:

BSc Hons Accounting (Levels 1 and 2 with AB exit award) (PT) at NKIFHE.

Programme Withdrawals

NOTED: that the following programmes had been withdrawn:

HND Retail and Customer Services Management at BIFHE

HND Business and Marketing (with CIS) at BIFHE

HNC Business and Marketing at Limavady College of FHE

HNC Retail and Customer Services Management at Limavady College of FHE

BSc (Hons) Business Studies at Lisburn Institute of FHE (outcentre)
BSc (Hons) Business Studies at Limavady College of FHE (outcentre).

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

BSc Civil Engineering and BSc Construction Engineering

- NOTED:
- (a) that Chair's action had been taken to approve an extension to the period of approval for one year to include the 2006 intake for the above programmes;
 - (b) that the programmes would then be withdrawn in recognition of the transfer of Intermediate level qualifications to the FE sector.

Programme Withdrawals

NOTED: that the following programmes had been withdrawn:

HNC Computing (Business Information Technology) at EDIFHE
HND Computing (Business Information Technology) (PT) at EDIFHE
HND Computing (Software Engineering) with CIS at EDIFHE
HND Computing (Software Engineering) (PT) at EDIFHE
HNC Computing (Software Engineering) at EDIFHE.

FACULTY OF LIFE AND HEALTH SCIENCES

BSc (Hons) Applied Biosciences (PT) (DL)

RECEIVED: the report of the Evaluation Panel.

- NOTED:
- (a) that the programme provided a top-up degree consisting of the final year level 3 modules;
 - (b) that, although delivered via distance learning, limited resources would be used at the Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) in Hong Kong (e.g. study space and organisation of written examinations);
 - (c) that Hong Kong would be the target market in the first instance and in particular IVE students with subsequent extension to the UK market;
 - (d) that e-tutors would be recruited from IVE but would be employees of the University;
 - (e) that the Panel had expressed concern about the risk of personation and plagiarism by students; and that the Course Team had given assurances that rigorous safeguards would be employed to discourage and detect cheating, including the use

of telephone vivas as suggested by the University's Framework for e-Learning Standards;

- (f) that the Agreement with IVE was receiving particular attention from Governance Services and specialist lawyers, so that the obligations of the University and IVE were clearly addressed.

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the Panel being met, the programme be approved for a period of four years (intakes January 2006 to January 2009), in line with the University's revalidation schedule for Subject Unit 3A: Biosciences (UG);

AGREED: that the Faculty be advised to monitor closely the operation of the programme.

[NOTE: the Faculty has now deferred entry to September 2006 and a new Hong Kong partner is being sought.]

Subject Unit 28D: Optometry

RECEIVED: the report of the Re-validation Panel.

NOTED: that the question of the appropriate entry standard to be required of graduate for admission to high demand courses had been referred to the Academic Development and Student Services Committee in December 2005 to ensure that parity was achieved across Faculties.

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the panel being met, the following provision be approved for a period of five years (intakes 2006 – 2010):

BSc Hons Optometry (FT) (CE).

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

PgDip/MSc Specialist Cognitive Therapy (PT) (ME) (Joint evaluation with Northern Ireland Post Qualifying Education and Training Partnership)

RECEIVED: the report of the Evaluation Panel.

- NOTED:
- (a) that the proposal involved collaboration with the NI Centre for Trauma and Transformation;
 - (b) that a Memorandum of Understanding had not yet been received;
 - (c) that the Course Team had indicated that the programme would now start in September 2006, rather than January;
 - (d) that, in response to a Panel recommendation, the title of the course had been revised from PgDip/MSc Cognitive Therapy.

RECOMMENDED: to the Teaching and Learning Committee and the NIPQETP's Quality Assurance Board that, subject to the conditions of the panel being met, the programme be approved for a period of one year (intake September 2006) in line with the revalidation schedule for Subject Unit 26G.

PgDip Restorative Practices (PT) (JN)

RECEIVED: the report of the Evaluation Panel.

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the panel being met, the programme be approved for a period of five years (intakes January 2006 – January 2010).

PgCert School Library Management (PT) (JN, with CE and ME by videoconference)

RECEIVED: the report of the Evaluation Panel.

- NOTED:
- (a) that the programme title had been revised from School Library Work;
 - (b) that the Panel had a number of concerns including the need for staff appointments and had only recommended a two-year period of approval;
 - (c) that one of the Panel's conditions was that a full-time member of staff was to be recruited and that one of the new posts assigned to the School had been allocated and that an existing member of staff with an ICT background would contribute, as suggested in paragraph 7.1 of the evaluation report;
 - (d) that assessment was based on pass/fail only, which was a common approach within the School of Education for programmes involving CPD.

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the panel being met, the programme be approved for a period of two years (intakes January 2006 and 2007);

- AGREED:
- (i) that the Curriculum Vitae of the member of staff appointed to the Course Team be included in the revised course document;
 - (ii) that the Faculty keep under review the appropriateness of the programme title, given that it may evolve to embrace a broader sector.

PgCert/PgD/MSc Higher Education Practice (PT) (JN, CE, ME) (Joint evaluation with Higher Education Academy)

RECEIVED: the report of the Evaluation Panel.

- NOTED:
- (a) that the proposed programme replaced the former PgCHET (Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Teaching), brought in the PgDip/MSc and was part of the University's broader CPD framework for academic staff;
 - (b) that the previous programme (PgCHET) had been delivered at Letterkenny Institute of Technology (LIT) as an outcentre and that Dundalk Institute of Technology (DKIT) has expressed an interest in the new programme but that the evaluation document had not included such provision;
 - (c) that any outcentre arrangements would involve delivery by University staff and operate on the same basis as the course at the University with appropriate quality assurance arrangements being put in place;
 - (d) that the proposed delivery of the new PgCert at LIT from January 2006 and DKIT from March 2006 would require approval by the Academic Planning Sub-Committee through the CA3 procedure;
 - (e) that it was proposed that modules within the Postgraduate Certificate and Diploma be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis only, but that the Master's research paper be given a mark which would lead to an overall grading of Pass or Pass with Distinction. The award of Pass with Distinction at Master's degree level would then be based on the final 60 credit points rather than on the standard 90 credit points;
 - (f) that the rationale for the assessment approach had not been outlined in the evaluation submission and a special case would need to be made to the Teaching and Learning Committee as it represented a departure from University regulations.

RECOMMENDED: to the Teaching and Learning Committee and the Higher Education Academy that, subject to the conditions of the panel being met, the programme be approved for a period of five years (intakes January 2006 – January 2010).

Subject Units 30B1 and 30B3: Diploma in Foundation Studies for Mature Students (FT/PT) at NWIFHE and EAFHE

RECEIVED: the report of the Revalidation Panel.

- NOTED: (a) that the report had been approved by Chair's action;

- (b) that approval of the Diploma in Foundation Studies at EAI FHE had been deferred until all conditions and recommendations had been addressed, but that 2005 entry had been permitted;
- (c) that the programmes had been re-titled 'Diploma in Foundation Studies' but that these titles would require further change in light of a decision by the Teaching and Learning Committee at its meeting in December 2005 to endorse, from 2006, a new award of 'Access Diploma' and to remove 'Foundation Studies' from the subject component of Access course titles;
- (d) that there was a misunderstanding by EAI FHE staff that their students had access to University resources (Note: this common and persisting misunderstanding was discussed again at the Teaching and Learning Committee at its meeting in December 2005 when it was agreed that the Quality Management and Audit Unit would write to partner institutions to clarify the position);
- (e) that the University requirement for the final 60 credit points of Access programmes to be at the equivalent of NICATS level 3 had not been met by EAI FHE since the second Mathematics module at NICATS level 2 would be delivered in semester 2. This matter had been discussed by the Teaching and Learning Committee at its meeting in December 2005 when it was agreed to amend the requirement to 'a minimum of 60 credit points at the equivalent of NICATS level 3 *in the final year*' from 2005/06.

- RECOMMENDED:
- (i) that, subject to the conditions of the Panel being met, the Diploma in Foundation Studies (FT/PT) at NWIFHE be approved for a further period of five years (intakes 2005-2009) at the Strand Road and Northside campuses for a maximum cohort size of 96 FT and 51 PT students;
 - (ii) that the Colleges revisit the titles of the programmes for 2006 intakes.

Subject Unit 8A: Economics

RECEIVED: the report of the Revalidation Panel.

- NOTED:
- (a) that the revalidation included a proposal for a new programme: PgDip/MSc Applied Economics and Management (FT) which had not been approved and that a new submission was to be made;
 - (b) that students who failed to complete the compulsory placement in the undergraduate degree appeared to be allowed to proceed to their final year of study and that this was not in line with University regulations.

RECOMMENDED: that, subject to the conditions of the panel being met, the following provision be approved for a period of five years (intakes 2006 - 2010):

Undergraduate Honours subject: Economics (Single Honours)
BSc with DIS (Major/Minor) (FT) (JN)

PgD/MSc Applied Economics (FT/PT) (JN)

AGREED: that the Faculty be asked to clarify the position regarding the consequences of failure of placement for the BSc Hons Economics with DIS at the next meeting.

COURSE APPROVAL SUB-COMMITTEE

11 January 2006

FACULTY OF ARTS

Undergraduate Hons Subjects: English, American Studies

To create a level 2 version of module ENG511C1, for 2005/6 only, and a level 3 version of AMS316C1 for 2006/7 in respect of two students following the transfer of American Studies from Jordanstown to Coleraine.

BA Hons History

To introduce a new second year optional module, Medicine and Modernity in Ireland and Britain 1700-1920.

BA Hons Irish History and Politics

To revise the title, content and level of module HIS304M1 for 2005/6.

BA Hons Modern Studies in the Humanities at NKIFHE (outcentre)

To replace module HIS533J1 with HIS531J1 following the departure of a member of staff.

PgDip/MA Culture and Identity

To introduce a new compulsory 15 point module 'Methods and Sources' for Ethnological Research'.

FACULTY OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

BA/BSc Hons Consumer Studies

To revise the assessment strategy in module CST505P2, and to replace Enterprise Studies module HTM414P2 with 2 x 10 point modules: Entrepreneurship Awareness and Entrepreneurship Applied.

FdSc Culinary Arts

To replace module HTM414P2 with 2 x 10 point modules: Enterprise Awareness and Entrepreneurship Applied

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

HNC/D Building and Estate Management at Causeway Institute of FHE

To revise the level of two modules BLD111X1 and LAW105X1 from 1 to 2 to accord with the University's Qualifications and Credit Framework.

HNC Engineering Design & Manufacture (Electrical); HNC Engineering Design & Manufacture (Mechanical) at Causeway Institute of FHE

To introduce new compulsory level 2 modules in Microprocessors EEE120X1 (for Electrical) and Applied Mechanics MEC103X2 (for Mechanical).

FdSc Computing and Network Systems at NKIFHE

To revise the assessment required in Programming 2 module.

BSc Hons Biomedical Engineering

To replace module RAD303J2 with EEE306J2.

BSc Civil Engineering

To modify module CIV101J1 to incorporate an element of PDP.

BSc Hons Architectural Technology and Management

To modify module ARC106J1 to incorporate an element of PDP.

BSc Hons Building Surveying

To modify module SUR110J1 to incorporate an element of PDP.

BEng Hons Civil Engineering

To modify module CIV120J1 to incorporate an element of PDP.

BSc Hons Housing Studies

To modify module SUR106J1 to incorporate an element of PDP.

BSc Hons Property Investment and Development

To modify module SUR106J1 to incorporate an element of PDP.

BSc Hons Quantity Surveying

To modify module SUR110J1 to incorporate an element of PDP.

BSc Hons Transport and Supply Chain Management

To modify module TRA102J1 to incorporate an element of PDP.

BSc Hons Urban Planning and Property Development

To modify module SUR106J1 to incorporate an element of PDP.

PgDip/MSc Renewable Energy by Distance Learning

To specify two modules which may not be condoned and to change the semester of two modules.

PgDip/MSc Web Information Systems

To revise modules COM614J1 and COM615J2

MSc Web Information Systems

To revise the module description for 'Research Methods and Research Study' module.

FACULTY OF LIFE AND HEALTH SCIENCES**BSc/BSc Hons Geography/Geography with DIS/DAS**

To introduce two new optional modules: 'Modern Europe: Politics and Society' and 'A Geography of Heritage' and to remove GEO316C2.

BSc Hons Environmental Science with DIS/DAS; BSc Hons Geography with DIS/DAS

To revise the assessment regime for module ENS104C1 to 100% coursework.

BSc Hons Marine Science

To revise module MAR506C2; to retitle MAR503C2; to change the status and semester of modules MAR503C2 and MAR501C2.

BSc Hons Radiography

To revise the assessment regime in module RAD506J2.

BSc Hons Sports Studies; BSc Hons Sport and Exercise Science

To introduce two new optional modules 'Advanced Sports Development' and 'Sport and Empire' (the latter within Sport Studies only).

MSc Health Science

To revise the module description for PTH811J4.

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

PgCert/PgDip/MSc Counselling and Therapeutic Communication

To introduce a new module 'Health and Therapeutic Communication' to replace CMM710J2.

HNC Care Practice

To revise the level of module 'Quality in Health & Social Services' to level 2 from 2005/6.

BSc Criminology and Criminal Justice; Undergraduate Honours Subject: Criminology (Minor)

To introduce a revised module at level 2, Economics of Law, Crime and Punishment.

LLM Human Rights Law

To change the coursework requirements in module LAW828M2 to one piece.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND POLICY FOR THE
ACCREDITATION OF PRIOR LEARNING

2006

GUIDING PRINCIPLES UNDERPINNING APC/EL POLICY

The following principles are fundamental to the achievement of awards that meet nationally recognised standards of achievement.

- 1 Learning should be recognised irrespective of the context in which it is achieved.
- 2 It is the achievement of learning, or the outcomes of that learning, and not just the experience of the activities alone that should be accredited.
- 3 Learning must be evidenced in writing and authenticated at the appropriate level.
- 4 Claims for APC/EL should be open to the same rigour and be comparable in terms of evidence and effort.
- 5 Decisions regarding the accreditation of prior learning are a matter of academic judgement, informed by professional bodies and other stakeholders.
- 6 The entire APC/EL process should be transparent to all stakeholders and demonstrably rigorous and fair.
- 7 All staff associated with the accreditation of prior learning should have their roles clearly and explicitly defined, and underpinned by appropriate staff development.
- 8 Policy and procedures for the accreditation of prior learning should be subject to regular monitoring and review.
- 9 Limitations to APC/EL shall be clearly defined.

POLICY FOR APL

1 General Policy

- i) Duly constituted APL Boards at the level of the School or Faculty shall take decisions regarding claims for APC/EL.
- ii) Faculties/Schools shall have due regard for core elements of the programme to ensure that applicants have met the requisite learning outcomes within APC/EL claims.
- iii) For Certificate and Honours level programmes, students must register for modules amounting to at least the final third of the credit value of the award at the highest level. For Master's, Intermediate and Access Diploma Awards, students must register for modules amounting to at least the final half of the credit value of the award at the highest level. Exemptions shall not be permitted for these modules.
- iv) Subject/Course Teams shall make explicit any modules where an APL claim cannot be considered and also make explicit the rationale and justification.
- v) The duly constituted APL Board shall have due regard for the authenticity, currency, validity, reliability and sufficiency of the evidence provided (see Glossary of Terms).
- vi) Schools/Faculties should appoint an APEL Adviser(s) to provide advice and guidance to applicants on claims for APEL (see Glossary of Terms).
- vii) APC/EL claims should be transparent to all stakeholders and demonstrably rigorous and fair.
- viii) Claims must be evidenced by certification or in writing (for experiential claims).
- ix) Exemptions shall be granted for whole modules only, save in the exception where a module is clearly defined into theoretical and practical elements. In this case, claims may be considered for either the theoretical or practical components.

2 APCL for Advanced Standing

- i) Regard shall be taken in relation to the currency of the certificated evidence.
- ii) It shall be the responsibility of the student to furnish the APL Board with the requisite information of the learning achieved within a certified claim.

3 APCL for Exemptions

- i) Regard shall be taken in relation to the currency of the certificated evidence.
- ii) The APL Board shall determine whether the certificated evidence is commensurate with the learning outcomes within the module(s) for which exemption is sought.

- iii) It shall be the responsibility of the student to furnish the APL Board with the requisite information of the learning achieved within a certified claim.

4 APEL for Admission

- i) Undergraduate Admissions

Admission to undergraduate programmes is based upon prospective students, with considerable life and work experience, demonstrating evidence of their ability to undertake the programme. Subject/Course Committees shall specify the minimum outcomes to be demonstrated for admission to the programme.

- ii) Postgraduate Admissions

The principle of admission to postgraduate programmes is based on the premise that students shall hold a degree or equivalent qualification. In exceptional circumstances, where an individual has substantial and significant experiential learning, a portfolio of written evidence demonstrating the meeting of graduate qualities (including subject specific outcomes, specified by Subject/Course Committees) may be considered as an alternative entrance route. Evidence used to demonstrate graduate qualities may not be used for exemption against modules within the programme.

- iii) Recording of APEL Admissions

The recording of Admission via an APEL route shall be reported at Course Committees and subsequently noted at Faculty Boards.

5 APEL for Advanced Standing

- i) The APEL Adviser shall, in consultation with the applicant, determine whether the proposed evidence is likely to meet the criteria of being authentic, current, valid, reliable and sufficient. Notwithstanding the responsibility for advice, the responsibility for the claim lies with the applicant.
- ii) The portfolio to demonstrate the meeting of learning outcomes in an experiential learning claim for advanced standing shall be available to the external examiner(s). The level and nature of involvement of the external examiner(s) shall be agreed between the Subject/Course Committee and the examiner(s).

6 APEL for Exemptions/Part of a Course

- i) The APEL Adviser shall advise applicants on whether an APEL claim is appropriate and against which module(s) exemption is sought.
- ii) The APEL Adviser shall, in consultation with the applicant, determine whether the evidence presented is likely to meet the criteria of being authentic, current, valid, reliable and sufficient.
- iii) Students shall enrol on the APEL version of the module for which exemption is sought. Students will take each learning outcome and provide written authenticated evidence of experiential learning in relation to its achievement.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

1 Faculties/Schools should have in place a duly constituted APL Board to take decisions. Subject/Course Directors representing Subject/Course Committees should attend to ensure consistency across courses. The Board would receive recommendations from the relevant Subject/Course Director on behalf of the Subject/Course Committee. Operationally, there needs to be a formal mechanism to ensure that decisions are notified to Academic Registry for amendments to be made to individual student records.

2 Constitution of the Board:

The membership of the Board should be determined by Faculties, with due regard to its status. It is suggested that membership should be drawn from:

FHCC
Co-ordinator for Teaching and Learning
Associate/Head of School
APEL Adviser(s)
APL Co-ordinator (see Glossary of Terms)
Subject/Course Directors
PSRB – invited members, where appropriate.

3 Appropriate arrangements should be developed for the training and support of all staff associated with the guidance and assessment of claims for the accreditation of prior learning.

4 Faculties need to ensure that procedures are in place to ensure equitable and consistent treatment of claims.

5 Faculties/Schools should determine a process to record activity for the individual and to assimilate a dataset to ensure fairness and consistency of decisions.

6 Outcomes of claims:

Approved
Insufficient evidence
Not approved

Where the decision is of insufficient evidence, there should be one opportunity for the student to provide additional evidence to the Board if this is considered necessary and appropriate, within a timeframe determined by the Board.

The decision of the Board should be final (no right of appeal).

7 Students should be informed of the outcome following the Board's decision on a timely basis. In the case of decisions on admission, the outcome should be passed to the Head of Faculty Administration for communication to the applicant.

- 8 Where opportunity to undertake a module is limited, decisions on advanced standing and exemption must be taken before the student is required to commence the module so that the student is not disadvantaged.
- 9 Faculties/Schools should have prepared materials to inform students how to make a claim for APC/EL.
- 10 Consideration should be given to having an APEL version of each module, denoted by a suffix to the module code, and that the module template is revised to include the alternative portfolio assessment for APEL where students take each learning outcome and provide written evidence of experiential learning in relation to the achievement of each outcome. The module template should be amended only for those modules where a claim for experiential learning is deemed appropriate by the Subject/Course Committee.
- 11 Faculties/Schools should determine the minimum and maximum levels of support that should be provided to students to enable students to complete their APEL claim.
- 12 Faculties/Schools should consider appointing an APL co-ordinator.
- 13 There should be no fee for APC/EL claims for undergraduate admissions in keeping with the University's commitment to Widening Access.
- 14 A fee should be charged for admission to postgraduate programmes by APEL in recognition of the resources required to assess the claim.
- 15 For advanced standing and exemptions by APCL there should be a flat fee for programmes where standard rates of fees apply, consistent across the University (with exceptions for linked awards).
- 16 For advanced standing by APEL there should be a flat fee for programmes where standard rates of fees apply, consistent across the University.
- 17 For exemptions by APEL, students shall register for the APEL version of the module(s) and the standard/or modified module fee applied.
- 18 Consideration should be given to the amount to be charged for the module fee for APEL and to the flat fee for APCL for advanced standing and exemption.
- 19 Monies generated should be deployed back to Faculties to help enable them to resource administering the process.
- 20 Subject/Course Committees should give consideration to the currency of the evidence submitted in relation to subject specific requirements.
- 21 The wording of the programme regulation for admission to postgraduate courses should be changed to 'in exceptional circumstances, where an individual has substantial and significant experiential learning, a portfolio of written evidence demonstrating the meeting of graduate qualities (including subject-specific outcomes, as determined by Course Committees) may be considered as an alternative entrance route. Evidence used to demonstrate

graduate qualities may not be used for exemption against modules within the programme'.

- 22 Individual applications to programmes via the APEL route should be noted at Faculty Boards (standing item).
- 23 The programme regulation templates should be reviewed to make the admissions requirements clearer as the Working Group noted some ambiguity in interpreting APEL requirements.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Accreditation: the process of identification, assessment and formal acknowledgement of prior learning and achievement.

Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL): a process for assessing and, as appropriate, recognising prior experiential learning or prior certificated learning for academic purposes. This recognition may give the learning a credit value in a credit-based structure and allow it to be counted towards the completion of a programme of study and the award of qualifications associated with it.

The term 'accreditation of prior learning' is used here to encapsulate the range of activity and approaches used formally to acknowledge and establish publicly that some reasonably substantial and significant element of learning has taken place. Such learning may have been recognised previously by an education provider; described as 'prior certificated learning' or it may have been achieved by reflecting upon experiences outside the formal education and training systems, described as 'prior experiential learning'.

Accreditation of Prior Certificated Learning (APCL): a process through which previously assessed and certificated learning is considered and, as appropriate, recognised for academic purposes.

Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL): a process, through which learning achieved outside education or training systems is assessed and, as appropriate, recognised for academic purposes.

Advanced Standing: is a broad term associated with admission where applicants are deemed to have met the requisite outcomes to enable them to commence the programme at an advanced stage.

APEL Adviser: person with subject expertise to provide advice and guidance to applicants.

APL Co-ordinator: person appointed with responsibility for the overview of APL activity in the School/Faculty and who may chair the APL Board.

Authenticity: the evidence should clearly relate to the applicant's own effort and achievements.

Credit: is an educational currency which provides a measure of learning achieved at a given level.

Currency: the evidence should relate to current learning. Where the course/subject and/or professional, statutory or regulatory bodies have specific requirements and/or time limits for the currency of evidence, certification or demonstration of learning, these should be made clear and transparent.

Exemptions: is the awarding of academic credit against specific outcomes on a modular basis.

Level: the standard of achievement reached on completion of the specified outcomes for which accreditation is being claimed.

Reliability: the extent to which there is inter-assessor agreement or consistency in the assessment of claims.

Sufficiency: there should be sufficient written evidence to demonstrate fully the achievement of the learning being claimed.

Validity: there should be a clear and transparent link between the learning being evidenced and the outcomes against which recognition is being sought.