

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

Minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2003

Present: Dr JG Roberts (Convener), Dr A Clarke, Mr D Cockburn, Miss A Harper, Dr WF Long, Ms L Clark (*vice* Ms C Macaslan), Professor BD MacGregor, Mrs D McKenzie-Skene, Professor M Player, Mrs L Stephen and Professor DW Urwin with Dr D Comber, Professor MA Cotter, Ms J Duncan, Mr JLA Madden, Dr W Naphy, Professor C Secombes, Dr N Spedding and Dr G Mackintosh (Clerk) in attendance

Apologies for absence were received from Professor Bruce, Professor JH Farrington, Dr S Kunin, Professor SD Logan, Professor PA Racey, Professor AA Rodger, Mrs K Fowler, Mr G Pryor and Dr T Webb

Professor T Ingold was in attendance for the discussion in regard to Class Certificates and Tutorial Attendance.

Mr D Jones was in attendance for the discussion in regard to the Academic Institutional Profile.

Mr Cockburn declared interests as a member of the QAA Scotland Board, the Enhancement-led Institution Review Steering Group, the SHEFC Teaching and Learning Committee, the Scottish Advisory Committee on Credit and Access, the SHEFC Enhancement Theme Planning Group for Assessment and the SCQF Joint Advisory Committee.

MINUTES

595. The Committee approved the Minutes of 28 March 2003. *(copy filed as UCTL/230503/426)*

MATTERS ARISING

596. In regard to Minute 580.3, the Committee noted that the Operational Manual for Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) had been published following discussion at a joint meeting of the Learning & Teaching Committee and Teaching Quality Forum of Universities Scotland on 22 May 2003. The Committee further noted that the University was scheduled to undergo review in 2004/05.

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT ENGAGEMENTS

- 597.1 The Convener drew the Committee's attention to the tabled paper concerning the SHEFC Quality Enhancement Engagements. *(copy filed as UCTL/230503/444)*
- 597.2 Members were invited to pass any comments on this paper to the Clerk to QUEST by 3 June 2003.

CLASS CERTIFICATES AND TUTORIAL ATTENDANCE

- 598.1 The Committee received a paper setting out a proposal that the School of Social Science be allowed to implement a Tutorial/Seminar Assessment Mark (TAM/SAM) for Level 1 and 2

courses which would represent 10% of the overall assessment. A pass in the TAM element would be essential for achievement of an overall pass mark in the course. The Committee was invited to consider approval of this proposal for a two-year trial period, to run in parallel with, and to be reviewed at the same time as, the trial abolition of Class Certificate refusal.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/427)

- 598.2 Professor MacGregor outlined the background to the proposal. He stated that the main reason for abolishing Class Certificate refusal had been to address student retention and progression. However, abolishing Class Certificate refusal was not the only way of achieving this. The proposal from the School of Social Science brought forward an alternative way to address this problem and he sought the Committee's approval for this proposal which would run alongside and be evaluated with the final abolition of Class Certificate refusal.
- 598.3 Professor Ingold informed members that the proposals had been developed following long and extensive discussions in the School of Social Science Executive Committee. The Committee had been unanimous in its concern in regard to the trial abolition of Class Certificate refusal. He informed members that tutorials are a key aspect of the School's teaching and student attendance at lectures is increasingly poor. Therefore, without a means of securing tutorial attendance, it will be difficult to effectively monitor students. The School had agreed the proposed system would hopefully enhance student retention and allow problems to be dealt with as they emerge.
- 598.4 Dr Roberts also drew attention to the central aspect of the proposals which encouraged development of certain generic skills. Evaluation of the development of these key skills would be required to be assessed. The proposals brought forward by the School of Social Science would mean that a student could not achieve a pass mark in the TAM simply through attendance alone.
- 598.5 There following a wide-ranging discussion, the main points of which are summarised below:-
- If these generic skills can only be achieved through attendance and are essential for achievement of the learning outcomes of the course, then the School of Social Science should be applying to retain the sanction of Class Certificate refusal.
 - The system proposed is not new. It was used at the University of Reading twenty years ago.
 - There is no problem with assessing generic skills but achievement of these seems to dictate whether or not a student achieves an overall pass in the course. The subject-specific skills seem to have less importance. It would be more reasonable to say you must achieve a pass in each element of the course in order to achieve an overall pass mark. As the proposal is written, a student must achieve a pass in a specific component with 10% to be able to achieve an overall pass.
 - It is difficult to differentiate between generic and subject-specific skills as in many cases they are inter-related.
 - The proposal, if approved, will be evaluated to allow comparison with the effectiveness of the trial abolition of Class Certificate refusal.
- 598.6 Following lengthy discussion of the proposal, a vote was taken and the proposal was approved (7 votes for, 3 against). It was noted that to allow effective operation of this system students failing to achieve a pass TAM mark would have their Class Certificate refused thereby preventing them from unnecessarily taking the end-of-course assessment.
- 598.7 It was agreed that the School of Social Science would be invited to come forward with proposals for evaluation of the system to the October meeting of the UCTL.

Action: Clerk

598.8 It was agreed that the School of Social Science would also be asked to ensure that students are made fully aware of the requirements for the award of a pass TAM mark.

Action: Clerk

598.9 It was further agreed that the Registry would give consideration to the appeal route for students failing to achieve a pass TAM mark.

Action: Clerk

ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

599.1 The Committee received a paper setting out proposals for an Academic Institutional Profile which would be compiled annually and made available in support of the process of Internal Teaching Review, for external quality assurance purposes and Freedom of Information requirements. The Committee noted that the proposals had been developed and approved by the Retention and Progression Team and by its statistical sub-group.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/428)

599.2 In considering the proposals, it was noted that in regard to the first destination statistics, it may be useful to drill down further to discipline level for internal purposes. Members were invited to forward any detailed comments to Mr Jones.

599.3 The Committee approved the proposals and agreed to forward recommendations to the University Management Group and Senate.

Action: Clerk

CODE OF PRACTICE ON STUDENT DISCIPLINE

600.1 Following consideration of the revised Code of Practice on Student Discipline by the UCTL on 28 March, the Senate gave consideration to the revised Code on 7 May 2003. At that meeting, a number of issues were raised and it was agreed that these should be referred back to the UCTL for further consideration. The Committee therefore received a paper setting out the issues raised by the Senate together with a proposed response.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/429)

600.2 The Committee approved the proposed response to points (i) to (xi).

600.3 The Committee gave consideration to the proposed response to points (a) to (g) as outlined below:-

(a) – approved.

(b) – approved.

(c) – approved.

(d) – approved.

(e) – The Committee noted that it had been proposed that, in paragraph 7.2.6 of the Code, the award of a mark of zero was anomalously high. However, following discussion, it was agreed that no change should be made to the Code as it was felt a clear penalty was more appropriate as it may be hard to determine the extent of independent work.

(f) – approved.

(g) – The Committee was asked to consider the situation when two or more students submit identical practical reports and neither admits collusion. Following discussion, it was agreed that there should be no collective guilt and that if there is no 'clear and convincing proof' that

one or other of the students concerned was guilty of cheating, both should be cleared of the allegation of cheating.

- 600.4 In discussion of the paper, concern was raised that care should be taken to ensure that those from different cultures or whose native language is not English are not too harshly treated by the penalties of the Code. It was agreed that the Code should allow Schools to provide clear guidance to all students at the start of each course.

FINAL REPORT FROM THE WORKING GROUP ON ACADEMIC APPEALS AND STUDENT COMPLAINTS

- 601.1 The Committee reviewed the final report from the Working Group on Academic Appeals and Student Complaints.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/430)

- 601.2 The Convener reminded members that the work of this Working Group had been ongoing for some time. Initially, the Group had come forward with revised (8 page) Guidance Notes. However, following consultation with the University solicitors, it had been felt these revised Guidance Notes were not student friendly. The University solicitors brought forward revised versions which, following consideration by the Working Group, were also felt to be confusing to students. It was decided that a separate short Policy document together with a more detailed Guidance Note would be more appropriate. Accordingly these had been drafted and the Committee was invited to consider the finalised version.

- 601.3 It was also noted that the Students' Association had agreed to draft leaflets for students giving advice on how to make an appeal or submit a complaint

Action: DC/JD

- 601.4 The Committee approved all Policy documents and Guidance Notes.

- 601.5 In regard to the Guidance Note on 'Payment of Expenses Incurred by a Successful Applicant or Complainant' it was agreed that consideration should be given to the status of distance learning students.

Action: Clerk

- 601.6 The Committee further approved the proposal that the documents should be passed to the AAUT for comment before being considered by Senate. The comments raised by the AAUT would be discussed at a joint meeting between a sub-group of the Working Group and members of the AAUT. Any revisions would be then considered by the UCTL in October before submission to the Senate in November.

Action: Clerk

REVISED PROCEDURES FOR INTERNAL TEACHING REVIEW

- 602.1 The Committee received revised copies of Appendices 3.8 and 3.11 of the Academic Quality Handbook setting out the revised procedures for Internal Teaching Review together with a copy of the proposed Self-Evaluation Document (and the appended Postgraduate Research Student Training and Supervision Report Form).

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/431)

- 602.2 The Committee noted that the proposals had taken account of SHEFC guidance. The revised procedures had been trialed during 2002/03 in the reviews of the School of Modern Languages and the Department of Biomedical Sciences and further revisions had been made to the procedures in the light of the feedback from these reviews. The main features of the revised procedures were highlighted as summarised below:-

- The revised procedures should only require the School/Department to produce the Self-Evaluation Document. Information in the Appendices should be already on file.
- All credit-rated provision (including PG) must be reviewed. A separate Panel would be appointed by the ASC(Pg) to review postgraduate research provision with the outcome from this review being reported in the single ITR Report.
- A number of additional Appendices had been proposed following the trial: these were the addition of Programme Specifications and Curriculum Maps, minutes from the last two years' Staff-Student Liaison Committee and Teaching Committee, details of research students and relevant documentation from any recent accreditation visits.
- The trial had shown that students were enthusiastic and appreciated the notion of ITR. They would have liked more time to express their views. However, they did not request any greater involvement in the preparatory stages for review.
- A questionnaire may be introduced (to be co-ordinated by the Registry) to allow all students in the School undergoing review the opportunity to comment.
- There will be no summative assessment. Exemplary features will, however, be flagged.
- Reports will be put on the University website with the School being invited to also put their SED on the web.
- There would be three reviews per year.

602.3 In discussion, it was noted that the Unit of Review would required to be re-visited following the establishment of Colleges. The matter would be discussed with Heads of College.

Action: JGR/NS

602.4 The issue of the addition of a separate review of postgraduate research was discussed. It was felt that Schools may not welcome a second review. It was further noted that the main ITR Panel may well see research students in their capacity as demonstrators. Furthermore, the main Panel would also be addressing taught postgraduate provision. It was therefore noted that it may be more efficient to combine the reviews with the main ITR Panel addressing postgraduate research provision in addition to undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision.

602.5 Following discussion, it was agreed that, subject to approval from the ASC(Pg), the two reviews should be combined. The ASC(Pg) would be given the opportunity to comment on the SED.

Action: NS

602.6 It was agreed that in regard to publication of the Report that the Report should be published together with the agreed response from the School. Following discussion, it was agreed that both the Report and agreed response should be published on the web simultaneously.

602.7 The Committee approved the revised documents as outlined above and agreed to forward recommendations to Senate.

602.8 The Committee recorded its thanks to Dr Spedding and the ITR Panels for their work in developing the revised procedures.

APPOINTMENT OF ADVISERS FOR 2003/04

603.1 The Committee received a tabled paper setting out the Registry Implications in regard to the Appointment of Advisers for 2003/04.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/445)

- 603.2 The Convener informed members that the issue of appointment of Advisers for 2003/04 was under discussion with the AAUT. All members of staff had been sent a survey in regard to advising and the outcome of this survey was currently being analysed.
- 603.3 It was noted that the main problems were associated with the MA. A Working Group was to be established to address the matter during 2003/04. Interim provision would be put in place for 2003/04.

DRAFT PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF PLAGIARISM AGAINST GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY

- 604.1 The Committee received a paper setting out draft procedures for dealing with allegations of plagiarism against graduates of the University. The paper had been prepared in consultation with Deans, the ASC(Pg) and senior staff in the School of Law.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/432)

- 604.2 In approving the proposed procedures, the Committee proposed the following revisions:-
- To paragraph 1.1, insertion after 'plagiarism' of "as defined in the Code of Practice on Student Discipline".
 - To paragraph 3.1, deletion of 'the Disciplinary Committee made decide, on behalf of the Senate'.
 - That consideration be given to whether a further penalty (as detailed in 3.1) would be for the award of a lesser award.

Action: Clerk

ROLE OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS IN APPROVING FIRST HALF-SESSION COURSE CAS MARKS

- 605.1 The Committee received a paper summarising a request from the School of Engineering & Physical Sciences, on behalf of the Engineering External Examiners, that the University's procedures for approving first half-session CAS marks and results be changed.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/433)

- 605.2 Following discussion, the Committee agreed that the current policies for (a) the approval/moderation of marks and results and (b) the selection of scripts and other work to be sent/made available to the External Examiner should be re-affirmed, with the proviso that Schools/Departments may apply to the UCTL for "non-Honours" CAS marks to be provisional until June: the results of these courses, however, should be confirmed by the External Examiner in January/February. The Committee further agreed that Heads of School/Department should ensure that, in consulting prospective External Examiners as to their willingness to act prior to submitting a formal notification to the University, they should specify the University's requirements for External Examiners in regard to the timing of scripts and other work that they would be asked to review, and of the marks/results that they would be asked to approve, which should be in accord with the University's policies as defined in Section 7 of the Academic Quality Handbook.
- 605.3 The Committee was also invited to consider a request from Heads of Department in the Faculty of Education who wished a change in the policy whereby overall course CAS marks are only released to students by the Registry for undergraduate and postgraduate CPD credit-bearing provision and PGCE provision. In the case of CPD, the request was made because students are able to embark on courses at any time of the year and often require a pass in one course before they are permitted to register for another course. Assessments are usually

in-course assignments rather than examinations. Current practice in the Faculty is that they release provisional marks to these students and that the External Examiner usually only confirms these annually in June: thus these marks can remain provision for many months. Students who have provisionally failed are permitted to resit and the resit is usually undertaken and marked before the Examiners have confirmed the first attempt provisional mark.

- 605.4 In the case of PGCE, students have a guaranteed induction year that commences in the August immediately following the completion of their studies. In order that there is no delay in the commencement of their induction year, the Faculty has requested that these students also be permitted to resit any failed assessments before the External Examiner confirms the mark.
- 605.5 Following discussion, the Committee agreed that, exceptionally, the Faculty of Education could continue to release overall provisional course CAS marks together with feedback to students, with these marks being confirmed by the External Examiner(s) three times each year. This was approved on the proviso that, in the case of marks in the range CAS 7-10, candidates' scripts should be sent to the External Examiner(s) on a monthly basis for confirmation of the CAS marks before the marks were released to the students. This would enable those students who had failed a course to be offered a resit opportunity as soon as possible.

INTERIM REPORT FROM THE QUALIFICATIONS AND LEVELS DESCRIPTORS WORKING GROUP

- 606.1 The Committee received an interim report from the Qualifications and Levels Descriptors Working Group.
(copy filed as UCTL/230503/434)
- 606.2 In regard to compliance of Designated and non-Honours degrees with the SCQF, the Committee approved the following:-
- that each area of study adopt a non-Honours degree which meets the minimum requirements for the award of the Scottish Bachelors degree;
 - that the degree of MA (Combined Studies) be no longer offered with effect from entry in September 2004;
 - that the requirements for the award of the Designated degree be retained at 360 credit points including 90 credit points at Level 3.
- 606.3 It was agreed that in the light of the decision in regard to the Designated degree, consideration should be given to the case of Joint Honours students wishing to exit with a Designated degree.
Action: Clerk
- 606.4 The Committee noted that the majority of Honours programmes were now compliant with the SCQF. Those still not compliant would be addressed during 2003/04 by the relevant ASC. The Committee further noted that the Working Group would be addressing the issue of levels descriptors with recommendations being brought forward early in 2003/04.
- 606.5 The Committee noted the proposals in regard to the review of the *Grade Spectrum*. The Committee agreed the proposed timescale.
- 606.6 In discussion of the proposed revisions, it was noted that the Aegrotat degree should be retained, that the term 'element' should be defined and that the differences in length of Honours programmes should be recognised.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON TEACHING

607. The Committee approved the proposals in regard to Wednesday Afternoon Teaching.
(copy filed as UCTL/230503/435)

THE PROVISION OF SPECIAL EXAM CONDITIONS

- 608.1 The Committee received a copy of a memorandum from Professor J Hunter in regard to the provision of special exam arrangements.
(copy filed as UCTL/230503/436)
- 608.2 The Committee agreed to defer the matter to the next meeting.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR TEACHING

609. Following the recent identification of an omission in the Code of Practice for Undergraduate Teaching and the Code of Practice: Postgraduate Taught Student, the Committee approved addition of the following at the end of each Code as detailed below:

To the Code of Practice for Undergraduate Teaching

'Problems and Difficulties

The University aims to provide a welcoming and supportive environment for its undergraduate students. However, from time to time students will encounter problems and difficulties. Complaints should be addressed in the first instance to the person who is in charge of the particular area of the University's activity concerned, e.g. a Head of School/Department about academic matters, a Warden about residential matters. You Adviser or the Students' Association will assist you if you are unsure as to how to pursue a complaint.'

To the Code of Practice: Postgraduate Taught Students

'Problems and Difficulties

The University aims to provide a welcoming and supportive environment for its postgraduate students. However, from time to time students will encounter academic problems and difficulties. In the first instance, they should raise them with their taught Postgraduate Co-ordinator, but if this is not possible they should see their Head of Department. If problems continue, they may wish to contact the relevant University Postgraduate Officer (via the University Postgraduate Registry).'

REMIT AND COMPOSITION OF STUDENTS' PROGRESS COMMITTEES

- 610.1 At its meeting on 13 December 2002, the UCTL had agreed a number of revisions to the remit and composition of the Students' Progress Committee (SPC). These revisions were proposed (i) to reflect the revised composition of the SPCs following the formation of a composite SPC for the areas of Arts & Social Sciences, Divinity, Education, Law and Science and (ii) to reflect the revisions made to the General Regulations governing Students' Progress.
- 610.2 Following this meeting, further consideration was given to the remit of the SPC. It was proposed that consideration of applications from UK and EU undergraduate full-time students seeking support from the University for their application for payment of tuition fees from public funds for a repeat period of study should be a duty carried out by the UPC Convener (a revision to the job description of the UPC Convener is included as item 15.3). It was felt that, subject to supporting documentation being provided, that such applications should normally

be supported. Where a UPC Convener did not feel able to support an application, the student would have the right to submit a complaint in accordance with the procedures set out in the Guidance Note on Student Complaints.

- 610.3 The Committee approved the revised remit and composition of the Students' Progress Committee and agreed to invite the Senate to give agreement to empowering the SPC to hear and determine all cases on behalf of the Senate. Hence, appeals against all decisions of the SPC would be made directly to the University Court and not to the Senate Undergraduate Academic Appeals Committee in the first instance.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/437)

REVISIONS TO THE JOB DESCRIPTION FOR UPC CONVENER

- 611.1 The Committee approved the addition to the Job Description of the UPC Convener as detailed below:

'To consider applications from UK and EU undergraduate full-time students seeking support from the University for their application for payment of tuition fees from public funds for a repeat period of study'

- 611.2 This revision was proposed in the light of the revisions to the remit and composition of the Students' Progress Committee as outlined above.

CERTIFICATION OF ABSENCE FOR MEDICAL REASONS OR OTHER GOOD CAUSE

- 612.1 The Committee approved the revisions to the Guidance Note on Certification of Absence for Medical Reasons or other Good Cause (Academic Quality Handbook Appendix 7.5). These revisions had been made to bring the document in line with the revised Guidance Notes on Academic Appeals and Student Complaints.

- 612.2 Additionally, revisions had been made to address guidance from the Scottish Executive Health Department guidance regarding the provision of medical certificates. The Scottish Executive had advised HEIs that GP's NHS duties do not cover provision of medical certificates to cover, for example, late submission of academic assignments due to illness and that GPs may charge for such medical certificates. The Scottish Executive had further advised that HEIs should make it clear to students whether or not the Institution would reimburse any fee.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/438)

RACE EQUALITY POLICY ACTION PLAN

613. The Committee approved sections 4, 5 and 6 of the revised version of the Race Equality Action Plan.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/439)

POLICY ON PERMITTING STUDENTS TO TAPE RECORD LECTURES

614. The Committee on Disabilities, at its meeting on 19 May 2003, had approved the policy on permitting students to tape record lectures. The UCTL approved the policy, which would form an additional appendix to the Academic Quality Handbook.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/440)

REPORT FROM QUEST MEETING OF 12 MAY 2003

615. The Committee noted the report from the meeting of QUEST held on 12 May 2003.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/441)

REPORT FROM THE RETENTION AND PROGRESSION TEAM (RAPT)

616. The Committee noted the annual report for 2002/03 from the Academic Learning and Study Unit that had been considered by the Retention and Progression Team at their meeting on 9 May 2003.

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/442)

REPORT ON THE STUDENT MONITORING SYSTEM FOR THE FIRST HALF-SESSION 2002/03

- 617.1 The Committee noted that a report on the outcome of the 'At Risk' (C6) reports entered by Schools/Departments in the first half-session 2002/03 had shown that:

- Overall, out of the 1386 'at risk' reports, 30% of students went on to successfully pass the course for which they were reported.
- Only 17% of those students reported as 'at risk' (C6) went on to subsequently lose a class certificate.
- Of the 600 'at risk' (C6) reports were amended by Advisers to indicate that the student was intending to continue of the course (C4), 61% of these students went on to successfully pass the course.
- Of the 140 students referred by their Adviser to see the Convener of the Students' Progress Committee, 29% of these students went on to successfully pass the course.

- 617.2 A copy of the full report was available from the Senate Office.

REVIEW OF SENAS FORMS AND PROCEDURES FOR COURSE AND PROGRAMME APPROVAL (Minute 552 refers)

618. The Committee noted that a review of SENAS forms and the procedures for course and programme approval would be undertaken over the summer, in consultation with UPC and ASC Conveners and Heads of School/Department. If possible, proposals would be circulated to UCTL members for approval in order that the revised documentation and procedures could be considered by the Senate at its meeting on 9 October 2003 with a view to the revised procedures being adopted for the 2003/04 Planning Cycle.

COMMUNICATION WITH STUDENTS (Minute 574 refers)

- 619.1 The Committee noted that the Academic Registrar and members of staff from the Registry had met with the Director of Information Systems and Services and DISS staff to discuss the technical aspects of the proposals to move to greater electronic communication with students.

- 619.2 At this meeting, it was noted that while delivery of e-mails could not be guaranteed to be 100% reliable, it was no less reliable than the delivery of post to students. It was noted that delivery of e-mails to non-University accounts was the main problem in regard to reliability of delivery and it was agreed that students would be advised that the delivery of e-mails forwarded to non-University accounts could not be guaranteed. This would be done via the prominent display of noticed on the web site where students can set up automatic forwarding to non-University e-mail accounts. Furthermore, it was noted that non-delivery of internal e-mails can occur when student's mailboxes go over-quota. It was agreed that students would be strongly encouraged to be responsible for ensuring that their mailboxes do not go over-quota. It was further agreed that DISS would give consideration to introducing a mail-clean service for student e-mail accounts (similar to that used for staff e-mail accounts) thereby removing this problem.

- 619.3 In order to ensure that students were made fully aware that the University might communicate with them electronically (by e-mail or via Portals), the sheet would be included with their Joining Instructions sent over the summer. This would be sent to all students (both new entrants and returning students).

(copy filed as UCTL/230503/443)

**REVISIONS TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR
AND CATALOGUE OF COURSES
(Minute 579 refers)**

- 620.1 The Committee noted that, following the last meeting, the Registry had consulted Advisers of Studies in regard to the recommendation that the production of the Abridged Catalogue of Courses be ceased or reduced to only level 1 courses (as opposed to currently including both level 1 and 2 courses). The majority view from those Advisers who responded was that the Abridged Catalogue should be retained for this coming Academic Year but reduced to only level 1 courses and that through the Advising Questionnaire distributed to students at Advising, their views on the usefulness of the document should be sought.
- 620.2 Heads of School/Department were also consulted in regard to the proposed distribution of hard copies of the Catalogue of Courses and University Calendar to their School/Department. It had been agreed that all Heads of School and Heads of Department/Discipline will receive hard copies of the Catalogue of Courses and the relevant section(s) of the University Calendar.
- 620.3 The web version of the Full Catalogue of Courses would be available by the end of May with hard copies being printed in late July to incorporate additional course changes made over the summer to replace the Supplement. The web version would be updated over the summer to incorporate these additional changes.

SURVEY OF HONOURS ENTRY CRITERIA

621. The Committee noted that responses had been received from all Schools/Departments in regard to the survey of Honours entry criteria which had been initiated following a request by the Students' Association (minute 523 refers). These responses would be analysed over the summer and a report would be brought to the October meeting of the UCTL.

QAA CODE OF PRACTICE ON ADMISSIONS AND RECRUITMENT

622. The Committee noted that a paper setting out the current compliance with the QAA Code of Practice on Admissions and Recruitment and highlighting those areas where action was required to ensure compliance would be considered by SRAC at its meeting on 22 May 2003. This paper would also be considered by ASC(PG). A report would be brought to the UCTL in October 2003.

DATES OF MEETING IN 2003/2004

623. The Committee noted the following dates of meetings in 2003/04 (all to be held at 2.00 p.m. in Committee Room 2):-

Friday 23 October 2003 (**Note: this meeting has been rescheduled from 17 October 2003**)

Friday 12 May 2003

Friday 6 February 2004

Friday 26 March 2003

Friday 28 May 2003

