

LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE



Minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2010

Present: The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Professor T.B. Ward) (in the Chair), the Director of Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes (Professor C. Vincent), the Director of Taught Programmes (Professor G. Moore), LTC Director of Staff Development (Mr P. Levy), the Dean of Students (Dr A. Grant), Associate Deans (LTQC) (Mr I. Farr, Dr S. McGuire, Mr M. Adams vice Dr N. Spalding and Dr N. Watmough), the Academic Officer of the Union of UEA Students (Mr D. Sheppard)*, and a representative of the Graduate Students' Association, Miss S. Kim* (*except for business marked**).

With: The Head of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Office (Ms A.E. Rhodes), the Library Director (Mr N. Lewis), the Assistant Registrars (Dr J. Ashman, Mr L. Daly, Ms C. Gray, Ms E. Roberts, Ms M. Steele, Mrs S. Walker and Ms L. Ward (for minute 72 only)), the Equality and Diversity Manager (Ms H. Murdoch) (for minute 72 only), Dean of UEA London (Dr R. Harvey) for minute 75, Project Manager UEA London (Ms L. Morton) for minute 75 and James Cornford (Norwich Business School) for minute 75.

Apologies: The Academic Registrar (Mr R. Evans), the Director of Partnerships (Ms E. Towner), Mrs C. Dobson (UCS Rep), Mr G. Sorrell (City College Rep), and The Director of Faculty Administration (SCI) (Mr M. McGarvie)

69. MINUTES

Confirmed

the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2010.

It was noted with reference to Minute 60 (oral report from the Associate Dean (Learning, Teaching and Quality) for the Faculty of Health), that the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology in the School of Medicine, Health Policy and Practice had also been included in the review under the new Quality Assurance Framework.

70. STATEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Reported that

(1) Learning and Teaching Day 2010

The Learning and Teaching Day had again been interesting and thought provoking. In particular, the theme of assessment and feedback was timely, noting that the University would shortly be discussing the costs of assessment and the ways in which assessment linked to pedagogical achievement. The introduction of key-note sessions in the morning and afternoon had been particularly well received.

(2) A gift of £10,000 had been received from the Vice-Chancellor, Edward Acton, to support UEA Teaching Fellowships.

- (3) Outcome of the elections for sabbatical officers of the Union of UEA Students
- The Union was congratulated on having achieved a higher turn-out than in previous years.
- (4) The impact of Iceland's Eyjafjallajökull volcano
- The Registrar had convened a group to agree advice to students who were unable to return to the University after Easter due to disruption to air traffic, which included advice in respect of missed teaching events, missed revision classes and potential impact on attendance at examinations.
- (5) The Department of Business, Innovation and Skills had published a report on postgraduate education
- The attention of members was drawn to the document under Section C of the agenda.
- (6) On 1 April 2010 the Minister for Higher Education announced the establishment of a working group, co-chaired by UUK and the NUS, to help improve information available to students, particularly with reference to student charters and agreements.
- (Further details may be found at
- <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/news/media/pressReleases/010410.asp>)
- (7) Director of Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes
- Professor Chris Vincent had announced his intention to retire from the University in the summer and therefore the post of Director of Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes was currently being advertised. The Chair thanked Professor Vincent for the contribution he had made to the role, to the enhancement of the postgraduate research student experience and to the work of the Committee.

71. CONFIRMATION OF CHAIR'S ACTION

Confirmed

- (1) Minor amendments to the Mark V Williams Postgraduate Scholarship regulations
- (2) Guidelines on proof-reading (Please refer to LTC09D106)
- (3) Establishment of the Partnerships Strategy Group (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref. LTC09D115)

72 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES AND ASSESSMENT

Reported that

- (1) A single Equality Bill had passed through Parliament on 6 April and would shortly receive Royal Assent to become the Equality Act 2010. The Equality and Diversity Manager was preparing guidance on the implications of the Act for UEA.

- (2) In 2009/10 the UEA Reassessment Period coincides with Ramadan. The University Assessments Manager, other members of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Office and the Equality and Diversity Manager had been discussing the issues this raised and reviewing the mechanisms in place for making reasonable adjustments where a student's religious beliefs may have an impact on their engagement with study or ability to undertake assessment.

Considered

a discussion paper setting out issues and options in respect of religious observance and University assessment periods (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D116)

(In discussion members noted that:

- Ramadan had coincided with reassessment in 2008/9, with concessions being granted to accommodate students who had been adversely affected;
- there had also previously been circumstances where a student's religious belief had affected their studies and progress, which had also been managed through individual concessions;
- Ramadan would overlap with the main summer assessment / examination period in three or four years, so there was opportunity for the University to consider its approach;
- there might be less flexibility in accommodating students' religious observance in assessing subjects and courses regulated by PSRBs and a dialogue with PSRBs would be necessary;
- mechanisms for discussing the issues with students and raising awareness of the University's current approach would need careful consideration. Consultation exercises were planned for 2010/11, but would not take place prior to Reassessment;
- in the interim, the Equality and Diversity Manager had had a very productive meeting with the University's Muslim Chaplain and ideas under discussion included a guidance document from the Muslim Chaplain on how to manage fasting and academic work / assessment;
- standard letters informing students that they had been offered reassessment in August or had been offered a delayed first sit in the August assessment period could be used to inform students of the steps being taken to address issues relating to religious observance during Ramadan.)

RESOLVED

to endorse the proposals set out in the accompanying paper:

- i) Manipulation, where practicable, of the August University examination timetable;
- ii) Reminders to Boards of Examiners of their powers to exercise discretion in the light of formally notified individual circumstances and reminders to students of their opportunities to inform Boards of Examiners of individual extenuating circumstances;

- iii) The use of Good Cause;
- iv) Granting of extensions for Masters dissertations where merited by individual extenuating circumstances;
- v) Access to the Academic Appeals Procedure where none of the above are considered to have been effective.

73. LTC REVIEWS

Considered

Reports from the Director of Taught Programmes as Chair of

- (1) the Review of the Common Course Structure Degree Regulations. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D117)
- (2) The Review of Disciplinary Procedures, combined with Professional Misconduct and/or Unsuitability procedures. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D118)

(In their discussion of the above items members noted that

With regard to the Review of the Common Course Structure Degree Regulations

- the Committee and Senate had previously endorsed the principle that students should be required to pass every module. This principle had raised concern in some Schools and therefore the Review Group had considered whether condoned failure / condoned progression should be offered where a student had a narrow fail;
- the document summarised the issues considered by the Review Group and the arguments both for and against the inclusion of condoned progression;
- the focus was on students demonstrating successful achievement of the intended learning outcomes for the course. Course profiles tended to concentrate the learning outcomes for a course in core / compulsory modules and therefore there might be an argument for condoned progression where there was a narrow fail in an optional module, perhaps where a student had attempted a different subject;
- the proposed changes to CCS emphasised the need for marking criteria to reflect the intended learning outcomes of the module;
- the current CCS regulations awarded credit at the level of the Stage and the award, not at the level of individual modules. The transcript offered transparency in respect of student achievement at modular level;
- the current system was complex and therefore had associated costs. There might also be a risk to the University in terms of a future QAA Audit and compliance with national and European credit and qualification frameworks. There might also be issues of portability for students who might find that a condoned fail might not be accepted elsewhere;

- a potential consequence of not permitting condonement might be that students would take optional module choices more seriously and would be committed to any more adventurous choices they might make;
- it might be helpful for external examiners to be asked to ensure that examination questions (and other assessment items where referred to them) did fully address the learning outcomes of a module;
- it was already normal practice within the Faculty of Health to map assessments onto learning outcomes;
- the expectation should be that students were capable of passing modules on which they were enrolled and it was questionable whether permitting students to progress with fail marks was in their best interests;
- mechanisms should be in place to monitor students' progress on modules at an early stage and to identify issues early enough to recommend a module enrolment change where it was clear that a student had chosen a module for which they did not have an aptitude.

With regard to the Review of Disciplinary Procedures / Professional Misconduct and Unsuitability Procedures

- substantial progress had been made by the Review Group;
- revisions to the General Regulations and the various disciplinary procedures covered by the Review Groups had been drafted and would shortly be sent to the University's solicitors for review and comment;
- subject to there being no major issues identified, it was hoped that the revised procedures and regulations would be sent to June Senate for approval;
- the changes to procedure being proposed were aimed at increasing transparency or were operational, aimed at streamlining the current complex procedures and structures – with the Senate Discipline Committee operating in different modes depending upon the disciplinary offence being considered, including: Professional Misconduct/Unsuitability, Cheating in examinations, attendance and engagement, non-academic discipline;
- given the length and the detail of the procedures and regulations it was not envisaged that the Committee should see the full text prior to Senate, noting that the Committee had charged the Review Groups with undertaking this detailed work;
- the consultation leading up to this point had involved Heads of School and the Review Group included the Chair of the Senate Discipline Committee, Heads of Schools, and a Director of Faculty Administration, among others;
- whilst the Review Group had been representative, there might be benefit in conducting a final round of communication prior to Senate.

- whilst the revised documents were too voluminous to be considered in detail, it would be beneficial and efficient for Faculty Executives to be briefed on the main amendments and proposals;
- as the procedures and regulations covered academic and non-academic discipline, they were not wholly within the bailiwick of the Committee;
- the issues identified in discussion with the Director of Human Resources in respect of staff conduct would be carried forward into the upcoming review of the Academic Appeals and Complaints procedures;
- the Disciplinary procedure would not itself address the question of staff conduct, but would refer any matters of concern to the appropriate Head of School or head of service for consideration and investigation under appropriate procedures;
- it was necessary for the disciplinary procedures to reach a conclusion irrespective of whether a student withdrew from the University. Disciplinary procedures should continue even where a student withdrew from the University in order to ensure that there was an accurate and appropriate record and to ensure that there was complete information should individuals seek readmission;
- circumstances occasionally arose where a non-academic disciplinary process was suspended pending a police investigation, but that in such circumstances a University process had nonetheless begun and could then be completed;
- it would be beneficial to review the University's admissions processes to ensure that the correct questions were being asked at (re)admission;
- there had been a case where a Board of Examiners had felt very uncomfortable in recommending an exit award to a student who had legitimately accrued sufficient credit to be recommended for the exit award, but who had been found guilty of plagiarism in a substantial component of their degree. This had prompted the Review Group to look at this issue and reinforce the powers available to Schools to revisit and investigate other work (from previous years) where there was suspicion of use of unfair means;
- there was currently no University requirement for students to retain copies of their assessed work throughout their course and therefore a student could not be penalised or disciplined for failing to produce work on request.)

RESOLVED

- 1) to endorse the principle that there should not be condoned failure / progression (and therefore that students must pass all modules) within the revised Common Course Structure;
- 2) to ask the Director of Taught Programmes to attend Faculty Executives to brief Heads of Schools on the main points of the revised disciplinary procedures prior to the June meeting of Senate;

- 3) to endorse the principles within the revised Disciplinary procedures that:
- (i) where a concern was identified in respect of the conduct of a member of staff this should be drawn to the attention of the relevant manager for consideration under appropriate procedures;
 - (ii) where a student withdrew from the University prior to the procedure being completed / a hearing taking place, the process should be completed, with appropriate opportunities put in place to ensure that a former student could participate in the process if desired;
 - (iii) non-attendance at a disciplinary meeting was in itself a disciplinary offence (but would not launch a secondary process);
 - (iv) where a student was found to have used unfair means in one item of assessment, Schools or the Senate Discipline Committee should have the power to review all of a student's work (including that from previous years) to confirm that marks had been achieved fairly;
- 4) To invest authority in the Chair to approve the revised General Regulations and revised Disciplinary procedures for forwarding to the June meeting of Senate, provided that the University solicitors and discussion with Faculty Executives did not raise any substantive issues.

74. FACULTY ASSOCIATE DEANS (LEARNING, TEACHING AND QUALITY)

Received

minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee:

HUM (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D119)
 SCI (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D120)
 SSF (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D121)

Considered

an oral report confirming that Programme Reviews had been completed in the Faculty of Science 2008/9 (pending the receipt of the formal report from the Faculty)

75. UEA LONDON / UEA INTO LONDON

Reported

as previously agreed by the Committee, the approval process for courses to be delivered at the London study centre was that in addition to its normal quality assurance and enhancement role in the approval of new award titles and of subject areas new to the University or to a School of Studies, the Committee would:

- (i) Consider for approval in principle all new courses (defined as courses which did not have a version currently running or which had previously been delivered in Norwich) proposed for UEA London;

- (ii) Consider for the granting of final approval proposals for the delivery of existing courses (those previously or currently delivered in Norwich) at UEA London;

Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Executives retained their role in giving detailed academic scrutiny to new course proposals and Faculty Executives retained their role in considering the business case for new course proposals.

Considered

- (1) an oral report from the preliminary meeting of the Institutional Approval Panel on 19 April.
- (2) approval in principle of a new course proposal from the Norwich Business School for a BSc in International Business Management (years 2 and 3), including a tabled document (Copies are filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D122)
- (3) final approval of a new course proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities for the delivery of the MA in Creative Entrepreneurship at the London study centre (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D123)

(In their consideration of the above, members

In respect of the Institutional Approval Panel

- heard that there had been a preliminary meeting of the Institutional Approval Panel on 19 April to consider both institutional approval for UEA London and approval of a number of courses;
- were reminded that this meeting, at which members of the Panel had been briefed on the proposals, was a prelude to a further meeting in London on 27 April;
- were informed that this initial meeting had identified a number of issues for discussion and resolution at the meeting on 27 April, including: physical and electronic learning resources, access to the Library at City University and planned transition to in-house provision, student services, staff-student liaison and student representation, attendance and progress on non-credit bearing activities, the mix of students, mechanisms for ensuring that there was a UEA ethos at the London study centre and that staff and students had a sense of belonging;

In respect of the proposal for the MA in Creative Entrepreneurship

- were reminded that this was a relatively new course, which had not flourished in Norwich, but which had better opportunities for success in London because of the networking opportunities provided by the capital;
- reflected that this course represented a new type of thinking and that success was dependent upon the range and nature of the students attracted to the course. As such it was more difficult to judge student needs, and particularly resource needs;

In respect of the proposal for a BSc in International Business Management

- heard that the proposed course had been designed for delivery at the London study centre rather than refocusing of an existing Norwich course, taking into consideration the teaching space and a teaching and learning style appropriate for the centre;
- learned that the proposal had been informed by discussions with a range of people and was designed for the market, but with a keen eye on the maintenance of academic quality and the potential impact on key performance indicators;
- noted that the course was initially orientated towards the international market, articulating with an existing UEA INTO Diploma course (and therefore comprised just years 2 and 3), but that it was planned that a route (including year 1) would be developed for Home / EU students, hopefully for admission from September 2012;
- were informed that the School had embraced the opportunity to internationalise its programmes and had developed the new course to complement courses currently taught in Norwich. The School aspired to learn from the experience of delivering the new course in order to enhance its courses in both Norwich and London;
- noted that students were unlikely to transfer from a Diploma course at UEA INTO Norwich to Year 2 of the BSc in International Business Management as students tended to stay at their chosen institution and that London and Norwich would attract different groups of students (which also reassured the Committee that admissions to UEA INTO Norwich and UEA courses in Norwich would not be adversely affected by the development of courses at the new study centre);
- were informed that the Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee had approved the academic case subject to some conditions and that the Faculty Executive would formally consider the business case for the new course at its meeting on 22 April;
- explored modes of delivery, teaching strategy and teaching personnel issues and were advised that some (ATS) teaching staff would be based in London (whilst being members of the School), with the initial and final parts of the module being overseen by (ATR) staff based in Norwich. The School would be drawing on existing experience and developing new expertise in managing a pool of associate staff, including ensuring that they felt a part of the School and were engaged in the development of the course. The School hoped that it would be able to share its London experience with course teams in Norwich and was also interested in developing its expertise in managing course teams for the future delivery of programmes away from Norwich;
- discussed mechanisms for evaluating the success of this teaching strategy, which included regular surveys (building on an INTO model of frequent student surveys) and feedback from teaching staff;

- noted that it was hoped that a positive student experience on the BSc in International Business Management would have a positive impact on NBS and UEA National Student Survey outcomes (noting in addition that small London institutions, offering a narrow range of subjects, tended to perform well in the NSS);
- expressed concern that whilst one of the acknowledged strengths of the University was its relationship with its students and particularly listening to its students, this might be more challenging at a distance;
- were reminded that this new course would have its first intake just one year before the planned implementation of the revised degree regulations and reflected on opportunities for implementing the new regulations a year early in London, whilst also noting that the new regulations might not be fully tested and developed by September 2011. There might, however, be opportunities to introduce some of the principles of the revised regulations (such as a requirement to pass all modules);
- reflected that if the principles of new CCS were implemented a year early for this course, students in London would have a different experience from those in Norwich, and that the same Board of Examiners would be considering the two cohorts in parallel;
- were reminded that the School and Joint Venture were anxious to be able to advertise the course as soon as possible and without a "subject to approval" flag;

In respect of the approvals process

- were reminded that the role of central offices, such as the Library and Dean of Students, in approving these new courses was somewhat different from their role in the approval of courses delivered on campus. Their role in the approval of courses for delivery in London was more in an advisory capacity, identifying issues to which satisfactory answers needed to be found, rather than confirming that the University had the resources on campus to deliver a new course;
- reflected that this different role would need to be incorporated in revisions to the new course approvals process, could be accommodated within the current configuration of Process Manager, but that in due course amendments to Process Manager to better reflect this role might be appropriate.)

RESOLVED

- (1) to give formal and final approval to the MA in Creative Entrepreneurship to be delivered at UEA London;
- (2) to give approval in principle to the proposal for a BSc in International Business Management;
- (3) to authorise the Chair to give final approval to the BSc in International Business Management following approval of the academic case by the Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, approval of the business case by the Faculty Executive and ratification of institutional approval of UEA London;

- (4) to authorise the Chair to make a decision in respect of publicity for the course;
- (5) to ask the Norwich Business School to provide feedback to the Committee at an appropriate point (suggested to be towards the end of the second year of delivery) on the experience of delivering a course away from the main campus and managing a largely off-site course team.

76. QAA: EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

Considered

the University's response to the QAA's consultative discussion paper regarding an evaluation of the Academic Infrastructure. (vide Minute 68 of the LTC on 18 March, 2010) The deadline for submissions was 7 May 2010. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D124)

(In discussion members:

- reflected that given that the vast majority of institutions did not fail Audit, indicating that quality and standards were being effectively self-regulated, the sector could legitimately question what it was paying for;
- felt that there were three themes under consideration: effectiveness, transparency and the future;
- reflected that in respect of the future there appeared to be three options: continue with an updated version of the current framework, reconsider and refocus or undertake a substantial revision; and whether members had a preference between these three;
- noted that the direction of travel appeared to be towards providing ever more information to students and applicants, but that it was inefficient and ineffective for both QAA and Hefce to be undertaking projects on this subject;
- felt that the tone of the draft response was too positive and should be more critical of the current arrangements;
- questioned the intended audience for Audit reports and similar information provided by the QAA and the sector and whether current information sets were understood by the intended audience;
- concurred that there remained questions over the purpose of programme specifications and their intended audience;
- were reminded that the University was publishing information on modules to potential applicants and had programme specifications in place, although these varied in quality, with perhaps the best examples residing in the Faculty of Health where the external demands of PSRBs prompted a high level of detail;
- felt that it would be unwise for the QAA to interfere with the relationship between professional Schools and their PSRBs and to further regulate these subjects;

LTC09M006

LTC-M12
21.04.2010
Min. 76

- wondered whether other PSRBs should be encouraged to adopt similar relationships with the sector (where appropriate).

RESOLVED

that the draft response should be amended in the light of comments from members.

77. TAUGHT PROGRAMMES POLICY GROUP

Considered

- (1) a report on the meeting of 24 March 2010 (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D125), including

List of approved calculators for use in University examinations
Regulations for the Submission of Work for Assessment
Penalties for exceeding word limits
Penalties for unauthorised late submission
Plagiarism and Collusion Reports
Revisions to the Guidance note on Co-teaching

- (2) a report on the meeting of 17 February 2010, including a recommendation for the adoption of Guidance on the Assessment of Group Work (item deferred from the meeting of 18 March, ref LTC09D105)

RESOLVED

- (1) to endorse the list of approved calculators for use in examinations from the 2010/11 academic year;
- (2) to approve revisions to the Guidance on Co-Teaching and amend its status to the Policy on Co-Teaching (with effect from the 2010/11 academic year);
- (3) to approve the Guidance Note on Group Work

78. PARTNERSHIPS

Considered

a new course proposal from City College Norwich for a FdA Journalism. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D126)

(In discussion members:

- were reminded that this course was the second strand of a previous Foundation degree which had been divided, with the new course comprising the other strand having been approved by the Committee at its meeting on 18 March (FdA Media Practice).)
- heard that the top-up degree route at UEA was the generic BA in Professional Studies (EDU), there currently being no suitable routes within the Faculty of Arts and Humanities.)

RESOLVED

to give approval in principle to the FdA in Journalism.

79. CENTRE FOR STAFF AND EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Received

an annual report on CSED activities relating to Learning and Teaching matters. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D128)

This item was moved to Section A at the request of a member of the Committee.

(In discussion members:

- paid particular attention to the numbers of staff participating in academic practice activities (Appendix 2) and observed that the average course across years had remained static;
- noted that Appendix 2 did not include the numbers of staff engaged in the Higher Education Practice programmes (which were separately recorded in Appendix 1), that new staff on this programme may not be engaging with the wider CPD programme and that it was hoped that once this cohort emerged from the programme they would continue to engage with CPD; were reminded that cases for promotion required staff to present portfolios demonstrating continuing professional development activities;
- pondered what actions might be taken to engage colleagues in CPD, considering whether the issues were time available to colleagues, the attractiveness and relevance of courses on offer or engagement;
- were advised that the CSED programme as a whole was expanding, not least in the light of broadening interests in the academic and wider University community and that the data did indicate a trend towards increased participation in an increased number of courses;
- heard that the data from the University reflected participation rates across the sector;
- were informed that there were a number of academic practice events not covered in this report since the Director of Taught Programmes and colleagues from the Learning, Teaching and Quality Office had delivered a number of sessions at the request of individual Faculties or groups of colleagues;
- questioned whether we were currently capturing the right groups of people;
- reflected that there might be time management issues which would be more appropriately considered by Heads of Schools (with perhaps a steer from Executive Team);
- were reminded that the Committee had previously discussed whether there should be compulsory training for all research supervisors in the same way as there was compulsory training for all members of recruitment panels.)

LTC09M006

LTC-M14
21.04.2010
Min. 80

80. PARTNERSHIPS

Received

a report on University Campus Suffolk (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D127)

81 CODE OF PRACTICE: STUDENT REPRESENTATION

Received

a report on the operation of the Code of Practice: Student Representation and Staff:Student Liaison Committees covering the 2009/10 academic year (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D129)

82 LTC REVIEWS

Received

a report on the LTC Review of Assessment (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D130)

(Members noted that the report used HESA data to compare degree classifications of UEA graduates in 2008-09, by School of Studies, with outcomes for the 1994 Group and the UK as a whole. This was the fourth year that these data had been presented and thus a time series was now being built up for consideration. The information had been circulated to Schools for more detailed attention.)

83. PARTNERSHIPS

Received

a report. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref.LTC09D131)

84. CONCESSIONS AND APPROVALS

Report deferred

85. NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

Report deferred to the next meeting

86. HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND

Reported

that the HEFCE review of the teaching funding method was now consulting on key principles and features. The deadline for responses was 12 July, 2010.

(The document may be consulted at:
http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2010/10_10/)

87 DEPARTMENT FOR BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND SKILLS

Reported

That the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills had published a report entitled *One Step Beyond: Making the most of postgraduate education*.

(the document may be consulted at
<http://www.bis.gov.uk/one-step-beyond>)