College of Science and Engineering  
College Learning & Teaching Committee  
Minutes of meeting held on 11 January 2011 at 2.00 p.m..

Present  
Prof S Bates    Convener  
Dr S Anderson   School of Informatics  
Dr T Bailey     School of Mathematics  
Dr T Bruce      School of Engineering  
Dr W Hossack    School of Physics & Astronomy  
Ms L M Henderson Academic Affairs Officer  
Prof C Pulham   School of Chemistry  
Dr G McDougall  Dean of Quality Assurance  
Prof G Reid     School of Biological Sciences  
Prof M Summerfield School of GeoSciences  
Dr D Williams    Head of Academic Affairs

In attendance:  
Mrs L Archibald Minutes Secretary

1.1 **APOLOGIES**  

Apologies were received from Mr K Kantor (Student Representative) and Mr W Kerr (IS User Services Division)

2. **MINUTES**  

The minutes of the meeting held on 16th November were approved.

2.1 Matters arising

2.1 Special circumstances  
The new guidance had been distributed to students ahead of the exam diet.

It was too early to gauge whether this new guidance had a substantial effect on the number of special circumstances received but indications were that numbers had decreased from previous years.

It was agreed that this guidance should be distributed again before the main exam diet in April in conjunction with on-line guidance published by Registry.

7.1 Senate Learning & Teaching Committee  
It was agreed that an online ‘knowledge base’ would be set up for academic staff, providing readily accessible material on innovations within teaching and learning within the College. This was in the process of being constructed and a report given to committee as soon as possible.
It was noted that the ‘Peer Feedback Workshop’ had taken place on 17th December and was thought to have been a very useful meeting. Another of these Workshops was proposed for around June.

The Convenor asked for any suggestions on themes that the Committee would like to be considered should be e-mailed to him.

3. CONVENER'S REPORT

Learning & Teaching Strategy

The meeting that had been arranged had been cancelled due to the severe weather conditions and it was hoped that a full report would be presented to the Committee in February.

4. INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION PROGRAMME

An amended version of the final proposal for this programme was tabled. Once approved at college level, it would be passed to the Curriculum Student and Progression Committee for University Approval.

It was noted:

The decision had been made that the English related courses were now compulsory and there would be no opt-out opportunity.

Re scientific vocabulary – the expectation was that student taking that strand would work in school specific sub-groups with all taking the course at the same time.

It was suggested that Schools may like to consider having their own diagnostic tests to evaluate applications.

It was felt that a list of targeted countries would be helpful. It was agreed that an appendix of these countries should be attached to the original document.

5. ENGINEERING REPORTS

5.1 PDP “Managing my Learning”

Noted:

This paper was a result of a perceived gap in PDP from a student’s school and professional life.

The School believed that only one meeting with a Director of Studies
was not enough of an induction for students into University study.

These forms were intended to give the student an opportunity to reflect on and take charge of their learning experience and provide the framework for communication through normal pathways.

It was thought that the inclusion of ‘senior students’ in group talks with Directors of Studies may be helpful.

The scheme had been fairly well received by both staff and students so far. Similar activities had been partially adopted and introduced by other schools.

It was strongly recommended that Engineering continue to refine and pursue this system.

It was agreed that the Engineering DOT would distribute the original documents to the Committee for their use.

5.2 **Resits in honours for professional purposes:**

Noted:

The necessity for this paper had arisen out of two drivers

i) the IET had altered the amount of compensation allowed in a student’s later years

ii) Joint Board of Moderators was keen that students should not progress without passing certain elements of the programme (not through compensation).

The proposal attempts to resolve both of these issues allowing additional attempts to achieve required passes.

It was emphasised that the proposed type of resit would not adjust the recorded mark for classification, only the student’s ability to proceed.

This Proposal was agreed at College level.

The School of Engineering would consider this at their Board of Studies and return to the Committee at its meeting in May with detailed procedures.

6. **STUDENT LED WORKSHOPS**

This report was in response to a number of discussions during the last
semester with EUSA and Institute for Academic Development.

The report outlined the possibilities and logistics for student led workshops or seminars. The intention is to have a range of these activities as one of a variety that Schools may wish to offer for Innovative Learning Week.

It was felt that there should be active student rep involvement in arranging activities for ILW and some meetings were already arranged to engage with them in terms of planning.

It was noted that none of the Schools within Science and Engineering were intending to opt-out of the ILW.

It was agreed that Schools should produce a one-page document of their proposals for Innovative Learning Week to be considered at the March meeting. This would give the opportunity to focus on their proposals and serve as a chance to pick up interesting ideas from other schools.

The Convenor agreed to talk to Sue Rigby to gather some clarity on what the centralised plan was for ILW and whether there had been any progress on creating a Wiki for this purpose.

**DISTANCE EDUCATION INITIATIVE**

7.

**Received:** Presentation from Judy Hardy on the up-to-date situation with the Distance Education Initiative. A copy of this presentation is attached to these Minutes.

**Noted:**

Planning and consultation phase of the initiative had been completed with the first pilots being offered from 2012.

The funding profile will be a 80/20 % split between Colleges and support services

Documents would be released shortly giving Indicative funding levels

This Initiative was for postgraduate programmes only

Proposals which do not demonstrate a net income generation will not be funded.

The finances provided from the initiative are for the development of a programme, rather than delivery

Support and information in terms of technology and marketing of
programmes was key to the development of any programme.

It was hoped that an Away Day would be organised in order to provide this information.

It was noted that a Quality Assurance process which was consistent with current regulations would have to be provided for this initiative.

It was thought that some competitor analysis would be beneficial

Concern was expressed over the capabilities of the current WebCT system and its ability to manage such programmes. This question would be raised at the next DEI Technology Working Group meeting.

Questions were raised regarding the matriculation and assessment process for these programmes. Judy would check with Registry to ensure that this was taken into account in the Steering Group.

It was agreed that

- Any development should be carried out with the aim to provide a strong College-wide infrastructure which Schools could then use as a platform for programmes.

- It would be valuable to use the College Learning and Teaching Committee as a pool for ideas and support

- Schools with programme ideas should first discuss their options with Simon Bates and Judy Hardy

- Any proposals will be discussed within the College Learning and Teaching Committee and an infrastructure put in place.

8. **TPR School of Mathematics**

It was noted that the TPR Report had identified many areas of good practice and the School was congratulated by the Committee.

The School had responded to all the recommendations and the Committee noted that some actions had already been implemented and others were in progress if planned.

The Report was accepted by the Committee as standard College procedures. The School would be required to report back on progress in 12 months time.

9 **REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEE**
Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)

Received: An oral report from Dr Williams on the CSPC meeting held on 2 December 2010.

- Shared Timetabling at the University of Edinburgh
  The Committee welcomed the project.

- HSS: International Foundation Programme
  The Committee approved the proposal as a pilot, with the recommendations that:
  a) the programme be reviewed at the end of its first year of operation to re-examine the issue of increasing the number of credits to 120 and to award a Cert HE; and
  b) the policy on which courses students can resit be clarified.

- CSE collaboration
  The College proposal for new collaborative arrangement with the University of KwaZuluNatal was approved.

10 AOCB

There was no other business arising.

11. Date of Next Meeting

Programme Approval Meeting 25th January

Planning Meeting – 3rd February

CL&TC – 15th February

It was agreed that the Convenor would talk to the Head of College to gather more information on the purpose of the Planning Meeting on 3rd February and report back to Committee

It was proposed that the CL&TC Meeting on March 22nd should be re-scheduled. The College would contact Committee members as soon as possible with an alternative date.