1. **NEW PROGRAMMES/COURSES**

**School of GeoSciences**

**New Programme – MSc in Sustainable Energy & Society**

WM introduced the MSc in Sustainable Energy & Society programme proposal which aims to start in September 2017/18 academic year. WM acknowledged two concerns which had been raised by the School of Engineering:

- The proposed title of the MSc is too similar to the current MSc Sustainable Energy systems which is owned by the School of Engineering;

- Insufficient consultation with the School of Engineering regarding the use of Engineering courses in the proposed MSc.

- LH expressed concern regarding the entry requirements for the MSc as they seemed to include a catchment of students with widely varying backgrounds. It was suggested that WM consult with the recruitment officers on the wording of the marketing information.

- LH suggested that the bullets points should be reversed in section 11.
- GR advised when referring to Progression the programme specification the School need to be specific about credit volume, rather than numbers of courses.

The programme was approved subject to addressing the issues and suggestions listed above.

New courses

WW went through the new courses for approval. All of the courses were approved. WW will send LH the course code for the Palaeontology and Geobiology Dissertation (MScR).

School of Engineering

The BEng Engineering Technology (Electronics and Electrical) and BSc Engineering Technology (Civil and Environmental Engineering) programmes were approved subject to the title of the latter being changed to BSc Engineering Technology (Civil and Environmental).

School of Biological Sciences

LH summarised the status of the MScR Hosts, Pathogens and Global Health programme proposal:

- Courses need to go to School Board of Studies for approval (this may have to be done virtually)
- Once the courses have been approved by BoS they will be circulated by email to CLTC for approval
- Programme has been to CRTC for approval

Any other related business

**MSc in Computational Applied Mathematics**

LH informed the meeting that this programme specification had been received by College after the agenda had been sent out. To ensure that there will not be any negative impact on the marketing and recruitment of the programme by waiting until the next Programme Approval CLTC meeting for approval, the following procedure was agreed:

- Programme specification circulated by email and College to collate any comments;
- One of the weekly concession meetings will be extended and several members of CLTC will be invited to attend so that the programme can be formally approved.

**Action:** LH to circulate programme proposal and organise concessions meeting for approval.

New model of exchange at MSc Level
TB summarised the MSc in Operational Research exchange model which the School of Mathematics is proposing to run with Università della Svizzera Italiana’s Institute for Computational Science: the programme will use the Erasmus scheme to offer students the chance to study at the Università della Svizzera Italiana in Semester 2.

The Committee discussed the proposal and agreed that whilst there were no academic concerns with the proposal there were some logistical issues which need to be addressed:

- Progression to dissertation (Action LH to raise this with Academic Services)
- MoU / Student Exchange Agreement is required (Action TB to speak with Alan Henderson about this)
- Feasibility of students finding accommodation for one semester

**Programme Approval Procedure**

The Committee discussed the new draft programme approval procedure documents. AM noted that the definitions of Major and Minor changes in the guidance needed to match the definitions in PCIM; the guidance should state at what point approval takes place i.e. if a major change it should go to CLTC whereas minor changes stay in school for approval.

JC informed the meeting that Stephen Warrington was part of a Student Consumer working group and he will circulate feedback on the review of PCIM (including timeframes / feedback) to CLTC for comment.

The Programme Approval Procedure will be updated to incorporate the above and will then be circulated the Committee for final approval at the September CLTC meeting. Although the procedure is still at draft stage, LH confirmed that Schools should start using the procedure for the start of the 2016/17 session.

**UG work being submitted for assessment twice**

LH informed the meeting that it had come to the attention of College that some UG Informatics students on a collaboration with a Chinese university had been translating work which had been marked at UoE into Chinese and submitting it again at their Chinese university. LH highlighted that this is a direct contravention of the UoE Assessment Regulations.

GR suggested that the nature of the arrangement could be altered, for example to make it a dual award programme.

JC stated that Alan Henderson will be working with the School of Informatics to go through the original agreement.
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2. APOLOGIES
Apologies were received from Maurice Gallagher (School of Biological Sciences) and Stephen Warrington (School of Engineering)

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 5th April were approved as a correct record.

3.1 MATTERS ARISING

Global Select

A Task Group, headed by Bruce Nelson, has been set up to review this programme and the Convener would keep Committee informed of any developments.

Arrivals policy

Details of named contacts have now been received by the College Office. Schools who wish to put through a request for late arrival should use the current Concessions form.

New student survey

Members were asked to send a list of any measures they intended to take in response to the new student survey to the Convener.

Although it was noted that the response rate was quite low, there were some consistent themes throughout the feedback received.

4. CONVENERS REPORT

Science Studies Course

- The School of Social and Political Sciences intend to run a 10 point course at level 10, specifically aimed at Science and Engineering students.

- This course will run in block 2 of semester 1 and will be held Wednesday afternoon on the Kings Buildings campus.

- It was noted that while this seemed an interesting course, some Schools may have difficulty in matching this with another 10 point course.
Prof Williams would send the information he had on this course to Committee members for information.

**Higher Education Academy (HEA)**

- The Convener attended a forum meeting for Deans run by HEA in York recently, where the purpose and priorities of HEA were discussed.

- The STEM conference will continue in some form and, although this is constrained by budget, they wish to engage with institutions to develop ideas.

- Any ideas Committee members wish to share should be sent to the Convener.

**Review of Surveys**

- It was noted that this review revealed that students are asked to complete a very large number of surveys. These include both official University surveys and those from external organisations, related to their student experience.

- It was important that students are made aware of where priorities are in the completion of these, with precedence given to PTES or NSS surveys.

- It was also noted that the PTES survey was still experiencing low response rates. The model of this may be redesigned.

- A problem was highlighted with the NSS survey in that a mistake made in verification details does not show up in real time. Students who have made an error were still allowed to complete the entire survey, however, their submission was rejected later in analysis.

**Teaching Spaces**

A Working Group has been set up to look at projections for the number of students expected in the coming academic year to try to better understand the nature of the estate and the requirements at Kings Buildings.

The Review last year appointed an ‘owner’ of teaching spaces to allow a better structure for managing issues. The owner is Gavin McLachlan (CIO and Head of ISG) who will be the central route for all problems and issues to be directed.

5. **ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

Heather McQueen, the College Academic Misconduct Officer, led a discussion on the current situation of academic misconduct cases in the College.

Dr McQueen was coming to the end of her term, having served for 5 years in the role. Dr Richard Blythe, from the School of Physics and Astronomy, would be taking over the role from the next semester.
Discussed:

Some revisions to the University procedure had taken place recently, particularly clarifying the difference in processes between academic and non-academic misconduct.

A change had also been made in 2012 where penalties can only be applied by the CAMO, which in turn saw a slight increase in cases being processed through formal College procedures.

A discussion had taken place at the College Learning and Teaching Committee regarding the signing of Own Work Declaration Forms. While this was routine over other Colleges, the procedure varied at this College between Schools. It was felt that this form was not necessary for each individual piece of work, however, it was important that this be signed for any submission which was to be assessed for credit.

Over the past 5 years, the College has seen 200 formal cases. This year, College has processed twice as many cases from the previous year. While most Schools have had a consistent number of cases, there has been a notable increase in collusion cases in both the Schools of Engineering and the School of Informatics.

It was thought that this could stem from the way that tasks are set, with multiple cases often being reported in the same assessment. Some tasks which permit students to work together may provide the opportunity for collusion to occur and situations have arisen where students are not clear where the boundaries lie.

An HE Project had conducted a survey of students which included attitudes towards academic misconduct. 60% of students were aware that changing some words of copied material was plagiarism, with 1st year students and PGT students faring worst in this question.

It was felt that PGT students often do not have the time to go through induction processes or read material regarding good scholarship. Schools should consider formalising training and education for these students and teaching skills such as summarising and paraphrasing, while still avoiding plagiarism.

Heather McQueen attended a meeting earlier in the month regarding academic integrity, where mention was made of ‘essay mills’ or ‘ghost writers’. It appears that all kinds of assessments can be bought through these channels and the estimated figures suggest 15% submissions may be purchased in this manner.

This is not an expensive method, with ghost writers requiring roughly 30 days’ notice. This is something that the University should continue to be aware of.

The Director of Teaching for Informatics stated that in recent years the School had doubled their PGT cohort. Many of these students are from overseas and do not use English as their first language.
In addition, it was noted that in classes students are often encouraged to share code and work on projects together. For assessment, they can be allowed to discuss issues, but work on answers individually. This can be confusing and lead to a misunderstanding of the rules set. The School would assess where there are ‘weak points’ and consider whether these tasks can be redesigned or clarified.

The Committee thanked Dr McQueen for her update and for her work over the past 5 years.

6. **INDUSTRIAL ACTION**

It was not known at this stage what impact the proposed Industrial Action would have in areas such as Boards of Examiners. Guidance will be distributed from the College Office as soon as possible.

In the meantime, any queries should be addressed to the Academic Affairs Officer.

7. **ESTATES AND TEACHING SPACES**

A Master Plan is being developed, specifically for the north east corner of Kings Buildings. A major development will be ‘the Nucleus’ which hopes to bring together teaching spaces and additional feature such as retail outlets, cafes and display spaces. A Steering Group has been established to begin this design process.

The College will have to consider a clear steer on the requirements for teaching spaces. The development itself is expected to take at least 5 years, so thought must also be given to the needs of the College in the future.

It is proposed that Schools (other than Informatics) will have all first year students contained on the KB Campus and large rooms and lecture theatres are likely to be necessary.

The efficiency and flexibility of space is important and consideration given to the possible reconfiguration of rooms from year to year as the student population grows.

It is hoped that the first phase of development will be finished by December and it is the College’s intention to canvas students in September to gauge the types of facility they wish from the campus. It is also the intention to visit other Universities to gather ideas.

Thought should be given to whether the College requires very large classes and lecture theatres, or whether we have the capacity to provide more than one ‘sitting’. Will very large lecture theatres be used often enough to justify the building of these?

While teaching space can be shared between Schools, it would be extremely difficult to share or reconfigure laboratory spaces. Different Health and Safety regulations apply within Schools and experiments often have to be left out.
Opinions and requirements are being collated by Matthew Ball for the Architect firm and Schools were asked to provide comments to Duncan Herd in the College Office.

8. **REVIEW OF ACADEMIC YEAR**

Each School had given an individual response on this issue but feedback was also needed on behalf of the College as a whole. The Head of College had therefore asked for an opinion from a Learning and Teaching perspective.

It was noted:

- The proposal suggests exams after the Winter break

- A break is also proposed in the middle of each semester, each being 11 weeks long.

- The removal of the Spring break is likely to cause some impact and has had negative feedback. This may technically shorten the revision period in semester 2.

- The movement of exams to after Winter break will mean that this vacation period will be used by students for revision.

- It was thought that a move to exams after the Winter break will cause an increase in workload pressure during the first part of semester 2. This will mean that staff may have to mark, teach and administer at the same time.

- Having a compressed semester 2 could have implications for Schools who wish to carry out fieldwork, with most preferring to conduct these during more clement weather. This could also mean students having 2 weeks of fieldwork immediately followed by revision and examinations.

- If the University starts semester 1 week early, this is likely to have implications for visiting students in terms of receiving their results from the host University.

It was thought that in any event, some compromises would have to be made. The Convener would pass comments on to the Head of College and report any developments at the next meeting of College Learning and Teaching.

9. **COLLEGE POLICIES**

**Guidelines for Implementation for progression decision (Paper C)**

Noted
It was felt that these guidelines do not give any additional information, not already included in the University guidelines and may increase the risk of confusion.

Instead, a College flowchart would be useful, if all Schools are following the same route.

Lynda Henderson would look into this matter and get back to Committee Members at the next meeting

**Study Support Panel Guidance (Paper E)**

Noted

A University policy has been produced providing support for study panels were students are having serious issues. This guidance was to assist with the process of referral.

A pool of staff for Support for Study Panel has now been set up for the College of Science and Engineering, although no cases have yet been dealt with as yet.

Paper E includes a flowchart which sets out the stages of escalation process which was thought to be extremely helpful.

The document was approved by Committee.

**Support for students under 16 (Paper F)**

Noted:

- The University has no age limit on students and it has been noted that no guidance exists for Schools on how to deal with students under the age of 17

- While Senior Tutors would like to see discrete additional support, it was thought inappropriate to set these students apart

- It was important that student accommodation are aware of non-adult students within housing.

- Schools routinely run-off information for their own students which give their date of birth. However, it would be helpful if a list from college, highlighting these students, could be provided to the Senior Tutor or Student Support Officers.

Lynda Henderson agreed to talk to Recruitment and Admission regarding the provision of this list.

**Amended University Exam Hall Regulations (Paper G)**
The Committee noted these changes which were thought to be very sensible.

10. **OTHER BUSINESS**

**Meetings Schedule**

It was agreed that the Programme Approval Meeting, scheduled for early April, should be added to the Learning and Teaching Committee in March.

An additional Learning and Teaching Committee meeting should be scheduled in late April.

As the Convener was not available for the meeting scheduled in September, this would be held one week earlier.

A new meeting schedule would be sent to Committee members as soon as possible.  

**Panopto replacement**

While the College of Science and Engineering have not participated in this use of this equipment, both other Colleges have invested in its operation.

The School of Physics and Astronomy, and others, would like to make use of this product, but it is not clear under which conditions the Schools would be permitted to share.

Duncan Herd has been engaged to investigate this matter and has been in discussion with the Colleges regarding its longer term use.

It is now very urgent that some process be put in place and the Convener would raise this at Senate as a priority.

Judy Hardy would also raise this matter at the Learning and Teaching Advisory Group.

11. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

20th September 2016