

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

### Minutes of the meetings held on 20 May and 3 June 2009

#### For the meeting on 20 May

*Present:* Professor WF Long (Convener), Professor G Burgess, Dr B Connolly, Professor MA Cotter, Dr D Duff, Dr P Edwards, Ms J Elliott, Dr J Geddes, Miss A Harper, Mr D Hay, Mrs L Johnson, Dr GTA McEwan, Mr D Mackay, Professor T Salmon, Dr K Shennan, Professor G Walkden and Dr MR Young with Ms K Christie, Ms A Hogg, Ms P Spence and Dr R Bernard (Clerk) in attendance

*Apologies:* Professor W Naphy, Dr G Mackintosh, Mr P Fantom and Mr D Paterson

#### For the meeting on 3 June

*Present:* Professor WF Long (Convener), Dr D Duff, Dr P Edwards, Dr J Geddes, Mrs L Johnson, Professor W Naphy, Professor G Walkden and Dr MR Young with Dr G Mackintosh, Mr N Edwards, Mr P Fantom, Ms P Spence and Ms A Hogg (Clerk) in attendance

*Apologies:* Dr B Connolly, Professor MA Cotter, Ms J Elliott, Miss A Harper, Mr D Hay, Dr GTA McEwan, Dr R Bernard and Ms K Christie

### MINUTES

233. The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 25 March 2009.  
(*copy filed as UCTL/200509/31*)

### CURRICULUM FOR EXCELLENCE

- 234.1 The Committee received a paper from Mrs Pearson, Head of School of Education, providing an overview of the *Curriculum for Excellence* (CfE) development and the proposed changes to the curriculum and assessment/qualification frameworks for children and young people in the 3 to 18 age range in Scotland.  
(*copy filed as UCTL/200509/32*)
- 234.2 The Committee noted that the focus with CfE is not on qualifications but on learning and teaching. Members further noted that the purpose of the programme is to improve the learning, attainment and achievement of children and young people in Scotland.
- 234.3 The Committee further noted that CfE involves significant changes which would, in time, affect all academic staff throughout the University. Although the new qualifications will be awarded from 2014, new approaches to teaching and learning and assessment will be implemented with senior pupils before that date and will therefore impact on approaches to learning and teaching within the University.

### CURRICULUM REFORM

#### 1. Statement of Rights (Recommendation 29)

- 235.1 The Committee discussed the paper on the Draft Statement of Rights and Responsibilities, which had been initially discussed at the meeting in March. The Convener informed the Committee that the paper had already been to Heads of School for comment the previous week and the revised paper had incorporated their comments into it.  
(*copy filed as UCTL/200509/33*)

- 235.2 The Committee noted that in order to ensure that the statement is relevant to all students including part-time, summer school and those on collaborative programmes / articulation programmes, it had been circulated to Janine Chalmers (Equality and Diversity Adviser), Donald Patterson (Deputy Director, Centre for Lifelong Learning), and Marion Strachan (Assistant Registrar, Academic Services), for comment.
- 235.3 Members agreed that there needs to be a balance of expectations between staff and students. Further discussion in relation to this centred around the title of the paper, with several suggestions including 'Statement of Expectations', 'Partnership Agreement' and 'Rights and Responsibilities' being proposed. Several members agreed that 'Partnership Agreement' indicated that both sides would need to be monitored and therefore could be seen as a more 'student friendly' title. The Committee did not agree on a final title.
- 235.4 Some members of the Committee felt that it may be necessary to produce a postgraduate version of the Statement of Rights along with an undergraduate version; however other members were opposed to that suggestion and were keen to produce one document that covers all students.
- 235.5 Although Heads of School requested that the first bullet-point of the section entitled 'Ensuring and Enhancing Quality' be amended to remove the sentence which states '*and take advantage of both internal and external-led training, enhancements, and innovations in learning and teaching practices*', the Committee requested that this sentence remain in this section and instead the wording be altered slightly to include 'strive to'. The sentence would therefore read as follows: '*and strive to take advantage of both internal and external-led training, enhancements, and innovations in learning and teaching practices*'.
- 235.6 The Committee agreed that it was extremely important to spell out the number of hours of notional student effort per week rather than across the year. The Committee further agreed that students would be able to relate to this example, if defined per week rather than a total across the year.
- 235.7 Following further discussion amongst the Committee, the Convener agreed that all comments would be taken on board and considered and that a revised draft would be brought back to a future meeting of UCTL. As this is work in progress, it was agreed that this draft would not be put forward to the Implementation Board at this stage.

## **2. Draft Feedback Framework (Recommendation 30)**

- 235.8 The Committee received a progress update from the Centre for Learning and Teaching on Recommendation 30 of the Curriculum Reform Commission's final report that includes '*There should be an institutional framework for the provision of feedback on assessment to students*'.  
(copy filed as UCTL/200509/34a)
- 235.9 Members noted that a Working Group had been formed which comprised representatives from the Centre for Learning and Teaching, the Registry and the Students' Association.
- 235.10 The Committee noted the attached paper was revised in line with earlier UCTL comments from its meeting on 25 March 2009. Previous comments/criticisms have been addressed and the draft had been sent out to all Colleges for comment.
- 235.11 Following general discussion, all members were in agreement that feedback must be given to students before the final examination to allow students to prepare sufficiently/adequately.

235.12 The Committee agreed that this was very much a general paper covering all areas including undergraduate and postgraduate and was therefore hard to make specific, however on the whole, they were content with the revised content of draft framework. Several members were concerned with the comment relating to feedback being provided to students within a maximum of two working weeks. The Committee was concerned that this could mean having to provide feedback to students within a week, especially for courses that have final assignments one week before the end of the course e.g. Computing Science. The Committee were of the opinion that a three week period for turn around of feedback would be better than two weeks especially when taking into account courses in which there are a large number of students.

235.13 There was overall agreement from members that there should be different ways of reporting feedback for different types of assessment. In terms of implementation, the Committee agreed that several of the proposed principles were areas that Schools could fall in line with as soon as possible.

235.14 The Committee noted that the Students' Association would also be making representation to the University to adopt several principles in relation to all Assessment, Marking and Feedback.

235.15 Taking account of the Committee's discussion, it was agreed that an updated version of the Draft Feedback Framework would be forwarded to the Implementation Board.

**Action: Clerk**

235.16 The Committee noted a paper prepared by the Students' Association which had been considered by the Student Affairs Committee on 18 May 2009.

*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/34b)*

### **3. Good Practice Identification/Dissemination (Recommendation 36)**

235.17 The Committee received a paper from the Centre for Learning and Teaching outlining the Draft Strategy for the Identification and Dissemination of Good Practice in Learning and Teaching. The Committee noted this paper is a result of Curriculum Reform Recommendation 36 which states that *'There should be a strategy to identify and communicate best practices in learning and teaching to all staff.'*

*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/35)*

235.18 Following general discussion, the Committee agreed that dissemination of good practice in learning and teaching was particularly challenging and also extremely difficult to measure. The Committee further agreed that informal conversations, networking and other interactions between staff provided valuable opportunities to learn from colleagues.

235.19 Members noted the aim of the strategy was to raise awareness, improve understanding and stimulate activity using a structured and targeted approach. Ultimately the overall purpose of the strategy would be to enhance teaching and learning within the University.

235.20 The Committee noted the proposed channels of communication and examples currently used for the identification and dissemination of good practice within the University, included: Institutional; Centre for Learning and Teaching; College Activities; and School Activities.

235.21 The Committee agreed that whilst there were many examples of good practice across the University e.g. Annual Best Practice Fair, an awareness of activities across the HE sector, both at national and international level also provide ideas for enhancement. The Committee further agreed that this type of good practice was very much a two-way process.

235.22 Further discussion centred round the timing of the draft plan and members agreed that it should perhaps have '2009 onwards' rather than highlighting a specific time period (2009-2014).

235.23 Members agreed that a timetable of events should be brought to UCTL for information to increase the publicity and recognition of ongoing events. It was felt that this may be a good way of increasing participation numbers at certain events.

235.24 In addition, in order to evaluate the success of the proposed Strategy the Committee noted that the Centre for Learning and Teaching would report annually to UCTL on activities relating to the identification and dissemination of good teaching practice. The Centre would then review and update the Strategy in light of those aspects deemed to be most successful.

235.25 Taking account of the Committee's discussion, it was agreed that an updated version of the Draft Strategy for the Identification and Dissemination of Good Practice would be forwarded to the Implementation Board.

**Action: Clerk**

#### **4. Graduate Attributes, Generic Skills and Personal Development Planning**

235.26 The Committee was invited to consider the proposed implementation plan from the Centre for Learning and Teaching to address Recommendations 4, 5, 33 and 34 from the Curriculum Reform Commission's final report. These recommendations related to inter-related aspects covering graduate attributes, generic skills and Personal Development Planning.

*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/36)*

235.27 Members noted that a Working Group had been formed which comprised representatives and nominees from each College, the Centre for Learning and Teaching, the Careers Service and the Students' Association.

235.28 The Committee further noted that the Working Group had reviewed some of the tools recommended by the Curriculum Commission including the Learning and Study Strategies Initiative (LASSI), which was a commercial software package used by several organisations. However, it had been agreed that it would not be possible to tailor this package to the University's specific requirements. As a result of the Working Group's investigation and discussions, an implementation plan has been identified to address the recommendations (with the exception of Recommendation 34).

235.29 The Committee noted the proposed implementation plan which recommends the development of a suite of tools which will be progressive, enabling students to identify gaps in their skills and in the achievement of their graduate attributes throughout their University career.

235.30 In terms of generic skills, several members of the Committee noted concerns regarding the ability of students to identify numeracy skills. Members agreed that it was essential to embed numeracy skills within the courses. Ms Spence confirmed that this issue was being addressed.

235.31 The Committee noted that, over the summer, it is planned to revise/enhance PDP and develop pilot resources and that this would form part of the *Implementation Plan Phase 1*. The Committee further noted that throughout this phase there may be possible re-branding of PDP; however members requested that External Affairs be kept in the loop to ensure the appropriate University branding throughout.

235.32 Members further noted that throughout academic year 2009-2010, *Implementation Plan Phase 2* will be ongoing with pilots and further developments. It is anticipated that the launch of the resources (*Implementation Plan Phase 3*) will be implemented from September 2010 to August 2011.

235.33 In terms of Recommendation 34 which states that all programmes should '*review the ways in which they deliver these skills*', the Committee noted that the development of a revised Programme SENAS form to encourage staff to review ways in which they deliver generic skills and graduate attributes in the curriculum, was underway/currently being developed.

235.34 The Convener acknowledged that this was a rolling development but would be taken forward to the Implementation Board on 1 July 2009 for comment.

## **5. Framework of Degrees**

235.35 The Committee considered the five year framework' for the University's taught qualifications as produced by the Academic Administration Sub-Group. It was noted that the proposed framework should be considered by the Implementation Board on 21 May 2009:

*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/37)*

235.36 The Committee noted the proposal to market the Undergraduate Certificate and Diploma in a positive way as routes providing flexibility for students to exit and re-enter the Degree Framework i.e. the building block approach. The Sub-Group felt it should also be marketed to those wishing to study a sub-degree qualification in its own right.

235.37 Members agreed that the 'Enhanced Ordinary Degree' should retain the current titles of Degree of Master of Arts and Degree of Bachelor of Science. It was also noted that there were strong views to retain the Designated Degree and members of the Committee agreed that it was essential to retain this type of degree as students value being able to graduate with a degree which recognises they have specialised in a particular discipline to SCQF level 9.

235.38 The Committee were supportive of the proposed introduction of the Accelerated Three Year Honours / Integrated Masters Degree on a pilot basis. It was noted that this would be an elite route available to students holding good A-level/Advanced Higher (or equivalent) qualifications. It would allow the study of a combination of level 1 and 2 courses together with 30 credits of Enhanced Study before progressing into Programme Year 3 of the Honours Degree / Integrated Masters Degree. In relation to this, the Committee noted that the Sub-Group do not envisage that Accelerated Degrees would be offered before 2011.

235.39 The Committee noted that certain programmes would not be suitable for the Accelerated Degree option.

235.40 Finally, the Committee were pleased to note the proposal to continue to provide five year undergraduate Masters programmes i.e. MChem, MEng and MSci. In the case of Arts, the Committee further noted that the Sub-Group was looking into what would be the most appropriate title for such awards.

## **FINAL REPORT FROM THE UCTL WORKING GROUP ON THE POSTGRADUATE GRADE SPECTRUM**

236.1 The Committee noted that an earlier version of this paper was considered by Heads of School at its meeting on 7 May 2009. The Committee noted that two recommendations had been put forward by the Working Group. Opinion amongst the Committee regarding the recommendations was split: some were extremely supportive whilst others were not.

*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/38)*

236.2 There was wide-ranging discussion from members from across the Colleges but the general consensus amongst the Committee was that the current arrangements were unworkable. However the Committee was unable to agree and opinion was split in regards to the best possible route forward.

- 236.3 It was noted and agreed by the Committee that the current system may be penalising students, in particular international students, for marks gained at an early stage of the programme when they are in a period of 'settling-in' to a new academic culture. Other members were concerned that by removing the progression hurdle between Diploma and Masters level that students would then not try as hard and that the University would need to be prepared for more fails from students. As a result of this concerns were raised that some students may go home with nothing and that by removing the progression hurdle, the University may be seen to be lowering its standards.
- 236.4 Further discussion amongst the Committee centred on re-sits. Several members agreed that this further complicated the issue of progression since a re-sit may be taken after a student has already started the Diploma or Master's stage, and re-sit marks are capped at 9 thereby limiting progression possibilities.
- 236.5 The Students' Association wanted to ensure that the issue of support for students was addressed within the paper. Concerns were raised amongst members regarding a small number of students who failed to achieve the progression requirement of CAS 12 but according to the Students' Association could have progressed on to Masters level had adequate support been in place.
- 236.6 As the views of the Committee were divided as to the most appropriate route forward, the Convener asked that the Working Group reconvene to consider the comments received from both Heads of School and UCTL with a revised paper being brought to the meeting of UCTL in November.

**Action: Clerk**

### **SPARQS TOOLKIT FOR STUDENT ENGAGEMENT**

- 237.1 The Committee were invited to consider a paper outlining how best to disseminate and encourage the use of student engagement toolkits in Schools.  
*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/39a)*
- 237.2 The Committee noted that following a 5-day consultation process with SPARQS, working in conjunction with the Students' Association, three draft toolkits had been developed to encourage student engagement within Schools. The Committee further noted that the draft toolkits could be used at School level for staff and students to reflect upon and improve their individual practices in student engagement. The draft toolkits are:
- The Class Representative System
  - Feedback Methods
  - The Quality Environment
- 237.3 Following general discussion within the Committee, several members were of the opinion that these toolkits were in fact another example of good practice and that the only perceivable 'issue/problem' would lie in terms of how the information from these toolkits is disseminated throughout the Schools.
- 237.4 Given the large quantity of information contained within each draft toolkit the Committee agreed it best that Schools pick and choose areas of good practice as and when they feel appropriate/necessary.
- 237.5 Following wide ranging discussion, the Committee agreed that in order to ensure the toolkits are disseminated to Schools effectively it was imperative that College DoTLs meet with their respective School DoTLs to identify key areas which could be implemented relatively quickly and easily. The Committee further agreed that it would be then up to the School DOTL to disseminate the information appropriately within the School.

**Action: College DoTLs**

237.6 The Committee noted a paper prepared by the Students' Association which had been considered by the Student Affairs Committee on 18 May 2009.

*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/39b)*

### **REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR**

238.1 Following consultation with Colleges and the Students' Association and in light of discussion in UMG and Senate, the Committee received a paper outlining possible revised structures for the academic year.

*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/40)*

238.2 The Committee noted that, following Senate, two new scenarios (X and Y) were being proposed. These scenarios centre around 5 key criteria, based on areas which drew most agreement at Senate:

- Late-registration brought forward from 3 weeks to 2 weeks in each half session for EU students.
- First half-session examination diet brought forward to before Christmas
- Start date of the autumn semester to be earlier in September
- Teaching semester decreased from 12 to 11 weeks
- Easter vacation reduced to 2 weeks

238.3 The Convener informed the Committee that the main difference between both scenarios being proposed was that one model included resit examinations and the other did not.

238.4 Following wide-ranging discussion amongst the Committee the following points arose:

- The Committee were in full agreement with the proposal to reduce the period for late registration (from 3 weeks to 2 weeks) in each half session for home/EU students.
- In terms of first half-session examinations being brought forward to before Christmas, opinion was split amongst the Committee. Some were very supportive of this proposal whereas others were completely opposed.
- Members were concerned with the proposed start date of the autumn semester being brought forward to be earlier in September. This was due to concerns relating to PgT and international students, in particular, being unable to make it here on time to register (some of whom already struggle to make it here by mid October).
- The Committee were split in terms of the proposal to change the teaching semester from 12 to 11 weeks. Several members from the College of Life Sciences and Medicine made the case for stability; in light of the current restructure of level 1 courses for Curriculum Reform they were concerned that the prospect of changing the academic year would lead to the requirement to restructure teaching at Levels 2-4 also. Some members expressed concern at having to change 4 years simultaneously, however others were of the opinion that since Level 1 was changing anyway it would make sense to change everything. The Committee noted that students would not be in favour of a move from 12 to 11 weeks of teaching, as this would result in reductions in contact hours. Other members were concerned that a change from 12 to 11 weeks would have a negative impact on their current system of timetabling, in particular for 6 week courses, resulting in more clashes of common course choices.

- In relation to August resits, there was a consensus amongst the Committee to retain this resit diet of examinations. Several members felt that the removal of this diet of examinations would be a mistake and may have a detrimental affect on retention. Other members felt it inappropriate to move resit examinations to June as they followed on from the May examinations far too quickly, leaving insufficient time for students to prepare adequately.

238.5 The Convener assured the Committee that its comments would be forwarded on as appropriate.

### **EXAMINATION, GRADUATION AND PROGRESSION ISSUES IN EVENT OF INDUSTRIAL ACTION OR PANDEMIC FLU**

239.1 The Committee were briefed on 'Examination, Graduation and Progression Issues' in the event of industrial action or pandemic flu. This paper was previously noted by Heads of School at its meeting on 7 May 2009.

*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/41)*

239.2 A number of comments had been received from the meeting of Heads of School and it is intended to include these in the updated version of the paper. At the time of the meeting any threat of industrial action had been withdrawn, however the fundamental principles of the paper remained the same.

239.3 The Committee were reminded that detailed contingency arrangements were planned for the last period of industrial action in 2006 and it is proposed that these be used to guide planning should a period of industrial action occur again this year.

239.4 Committee members noted that in terms of the impact of a pandemic flu, it was more difficult to know when this might occur. However the current assumption is that University business would continue as far as possible, however this might change depending on circumstances.

239.5 The Committee noted the draft attendance and assessment policies put forward as well as the proposals for graduations in light of pandemic flu.

239.6 Dr Mackintosh welcomed any comments from UCTL members in relation to both the planned action of pandemic flu and industrial action.

239.7 The Committee agreed to allow the Convener to take Convener's Action on any necessary policy matters should this become necessary before the next meeting of UCTL.

### **POSTGRADUATE TEACHING**

240.1 The Committee received a paper on Postgraduate Teaching from the Students' Association.

*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/52)*

240.2 The Committee noted that the Centre for Learning and Teaching were already involved with the Colleges in terms of induction material and training session. In the case of the College of Physical Sciences, the Committee noted that the College set the context and agenda for induction and the Centre for Learning and Teaching then assist with provision.

240.3 The Committee noted that the Centre for Learning and Teaching has been working to identify good practice from other institutions in terms of training and development of postgraduate students.

- 240.4 Following general discussion of the report, several members of the Committee were concerned with the recommendation which requests that *'teaching be incorporated as an aspect of all 9 month reviews so that both the student and supervisor can identify separately the provisions, if any, made for teaching and teaching development.'* Members felt that this may further complicate the current monitoring process and also felt strongly that not all PgR students wanted to teach and that by enforcing this as part of the 9 month review it would mean that it did not necessarily 'fit' with all students.
- 240.5 Several members of the Committee agreed that it might be appropriate to establish a framework of recognition for postgraduate students to allow them to identify their graduate attributes. However some concerns were raised about inputting a lot of money into a framework if students do not have enough time to participate. Members therefore agreed that this should perhaps be looked at holistically and linked to the changes afoot with the ASPIRE programme.
- 240.6 The Committee noted the recommendations contained within the paper but agreed to send the paper to Centre for Learning and Teaching and the DoTL for further consideration at College Learning and Teaching Committee.

### SKILLS FORGE

- 241.1 The Committee received a paper from Professor Houlihan outlining 'The Skills Forge' software which features tools to support both delivery and tracking of the personal and professional development of PgR students.  
*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/53)*
- 241.2 The Committee noted that a review of the University's approach to PgR training was undertaken in February 2009 by the Directors of Research and Heads of the Graduate Schools. The outcome of this review was a proposal that general skills training should be promoted as important elements of the University's strategy for research excellence.
- 241.3 The Committee noted that following this review the University has agreed to purchase 'The Skills Forge' software. The Committee noted that this software focused on PgR students only and allows them to use an online system to analyse and reflect on their skills and attributes. It was anticipated that this would become a central tool for them to use throughout their studies at the University.
- 241.4 Following general discussion, the Committee agreed that it was crucial to get staff involved with 'Skills Forge'. The Committee further agreed that the software was beneficial to both supervisor and student as it kept everything electronically in one place and was easily accessible i.e. both parties know where to go to access the information.
- 241.5 The Committee noted that 'Skills Forge' has been used by the University of York for the last three years and that there may be a possibility of using this software as a means of a reporting tool for overseas PgR students under Tier 4.
- 241.6 The Committee endorsed the proposal that 'The Skills Forge' will be mandatory for all new PhD students and as many continuing students as possible.
- 241.7 The Committee noted several points in connection to the amendment to the Postgraduate Codes of Practice. The Committee also noted that further amendments to the Postgraduate Codes of Practice were currently being drafted and would be put to ASC (Pg) for approval in the first instance. Following approval of these amendments at ASC (Pg), the Committee agreed to allow the Convener to take Convener's Action for final approval.

## ATTENDANCE MONITORING AND IMMIGRATION CHANGES

- 242.1 The Committee received a paper detailing the forthcoming changes to Immigration and Attendance Monitoring in light of the Points-Based Immigration System (PBS).  
(copy filed as UCTL/200509/54)
- 242.2 The Committee noted that from the end of March 2009 Tier 4 for students commenced, affecting new admissions and students seeking an extension of their leave to remain in the UK to complete their studies. Members further noted that increasingly academic policy has to be changed due to Points Based Immigration.
- 242.3 The main concern for members related to UKBA's requirement that '*Institutions will also need to notify us where a student has missed 10 expected contacts.....*'. The Committee noted that as the Higher Education sector does not keep daily registers, in this instance it would refer to 10 expected 'interactions'.
- 242.4 The Committee further noted that consideration is being given to a number of approaches which might be adopted by the University to address the Tier 4 attendance monitoring requirements. Members noted that these might approaches include smartcard technology for UG & PgT students and '*Skills Forge*' for PgR students.
- 242.5 Given that this would be the final meeting of UCTL for this academic year, the Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Convener to take any necessary action in regard to this issue.

## AMENDMENTS TO THE POSTGRADUATE CODES OF PRACTICE

- 243.1 The Committee noted several points in connection to the amendment to the Postgraduate Codes of Practice. The Committee also noted that further amendments to the Postgraduate Codes of Practice were currently being drafted and would be put to ASC (Pg) for approval in the first instance. Following approval of these amendments at ASC (Pg), the Committee agreed to allow the Convener to take Convener's Action for final approval.
- 243.2 On the recommendation of the Academic Standards Committee (Postgraduate) the Committee approved amendments to:
- (a) Code of Practice for Postgraduate Taught Students ....  
(copy filed as UCTL/200509/43)
- (b) Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Students ....  
(copy filed as UCTL/200509/44)

## AMENDMENTS TO REGULATIONS

244. On the recommendation of the Academic Standards Committee (Undergraduate) the Committee approved:
- (a) Regulations for new awards from the Centre for Lifelong Learning: Certificate and Diploma in Archaeology  
(copy filed as UCTL/200509/45)
- (b) Regulations for a new award from the School of Education: Professional Graduate Diploma in Education (Adult Literacies)  
(copy filed as UCTL/200509/46)

## **SCHEDULE FOR THE PRODUCTION OF THE REFLECTIVE ANALYSIS FOR ELIR 2010**

245. The Committee approved the schedule for the production of the Reflective Analysis for submission to the QAA for the forthcoming Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR).  
*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/47)*

### **UCTL WORKING GROUPS**

246. Previously, UCTL established two working groups: on the Common Assessment Scale (CAS); and on Student and Graduate Feedback. The Committee approved the proposal that further groups are formed in the coming months to continue work started by these two groups. In particular it is proposed to complete the review of CAS with a view to bringing forward proposals to UCTL in the next academic year; and also to undertake an evaluation of the revised Student Course Evaluation Form (SCEF) introduced by the UCTL following recommendations from the Working Group.

### **UPDATE ON LEARNING OPERATIONAL PLAN 2008/09**

247. The Committee noted the update on actions in connection with the Learning Operational Plan 2008/09.  
*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/48)*

### **UPDATED EMPLOYABILITY STRATEGY**

248. The Convener of the University Committee on Teaching & Learning had approved an updated Employability Development Plan 2008/09 which is available at <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/central/employability.shtml>. The Development Plan for 2009/10 is currently being prepared by the Careers Service and will be brought to a future meeting.

### **POINTS BASED IMMIGRATION UPDATE**

- 249.1 The Committee noted the update paper on Points Based Immigration.  
*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/49)*
- 249.2 The Committee noted on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009 Tier 4 for students commenced, affecting new admissions and students seeking an extension of their leave to remain in the UK to complete their studies. Members further noted that increasingly academic policy has to be changed due to Points Based Immigration.
- 249.3 The Convener briefed the Committee that the issues raised in the paper would be included in the Attendance Monitoring paper which has been deferred to extraordinary meeting on 3 June 2009.

### **CURRICULUM REFORM**

- 250.1 The Committee noted the recommendation paper and model for a University award for accrediting students' co-curricular achievements.
- 250.2 The Committee noted the recommendation paper and model for a Typology on Development of Work Placements.

250.3 The Committee noted two papers which would be considered by the Implementation Board of Curriculum Reform on 21 May 2009:

(a) A Recommendation paper and model for a University award for accrediting students' co-curricular achievements  
*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/50)*

(b) A Recommendation paper and model for a Typology and Development of Work Placements  
*(copy filed as UCTL/200509/51)*

**THE QAA SCOTLAND ENHANCEMENT THEME "GRADUATES FOR THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY": INTEGRATING THE ENHANCEMENT THEMES**

251.1 The Committee noted the paper outlining the proposal to establish a team or group to take forward the work of the Theme within our own institution and to stimulate discussions around the attribute of our graduates and how the development of these attributes can be best supported.

251.2 The Committee agreed to the recommended/proposed institutional team which includes VP Learning and Teaching, Dean/Vice Dean, Course/programme leaders, Manager with research, learning and teaching responsibilities, Student Association member(s) and members of staff who have been involved in previous Enhancement Themes.

251.3 The Committee further noted that the next meeting of the 'G21C' would be held on 25 June 2009.

**DATES OF MEETINGS IN 2009/10**

252. The Committee noted that meetings in 2009/10 will be held as follows (all to be held in Committee Room 2, University Office):

Wednesday 4 November 2009 at 2 p.m.

Wednesday 27 January 2010 at 2 p.m.

Wednesday 17 March 2010 at 2 p.m.

Wednesday 19 May 2010 at 2 p.m.