



SENATE

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2009

Present: Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor T Sheldon (Chair), Dr TT Arvind, Mr J Bone, Professor C Brown, Mr J Brown, Mr N Dandy, Dr D Efird, Ms S Ford, Mr T Flynn (GSA Representative), Dr R Greenall, Ms S Hardman, Dr J Hoggett, Dr S King, Ms C Leyland (SU Representative), Dr N Milner, Dr L Perriton, Dr B Plunkett, Mr T Tew.

In attendance: Mrs S Clarke (Quality Support Officer), Ms C Lowe (Project Leader, Learning Enhancement), Mr D Carr (GSA President); and Mr K Lilley (Director of Facilities Management), Ms S Johnston (Manager of Campus Services), and Ms E Heaps (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Estates) (for M09/34)

Apologies: Dr J James (Secretary), Mr B Saynor (York College Representative), Dr H Smith (on research leave)

09/20 Welcome and Membership

The Chair **reported** that this would be the last meeting for Ms Sue Hardman, the Academic Registrar, prior to her retirement. The Chair thanked Ms Hardman for her professional and committed contribution to the Committee and the University as a whole. The Committee **noted** that this would have been Dr Juliet James last meeting before starting her maternity leave and requested that their very best wishes be passed on to Dr James. The Chair welcomed Mr Daniel Carr, President of the GSA, who was attending the meeting as an observer as part of his induction.

09/21 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2009 were **approved** subject to some minor amendments, for clarity, to M09/08 (Timetabling) and clarification that M09/12 should refer to an MEng in Computer Science with Business Enterprise Systems (not a BEng).

09/22 Health Sciences: Bridging Programme for International Students

Further to **M08/229**, the Committee **received** a summary progress report from the Department of Health Sciences, on the proposed bridging programme for international students (to be delivered by distance learning to nursing students in Malaysia in association with a local agent called Masterskills).

It was **noted** that the proposed link with Masterskills in Malaysia was currently under review. The Department was trying to resolve issues relating to the title and content of the degree to which nurses who had undertaken the bridging programme would progress. In the meantime, the Department was continuing to develop the bridging programme and e-learning modules, consulting with Cecilia Lowe's team as appropriate.

09/23 Law: LLM in International Corporate and Commercial Law

Further to **M08/233**, it was **noted** that matters raised by the Committee, in relation to the LLM in International Corporate and Commercial Law, were being addressed by the York Law School.

09/24 Physics: MSc in Fusion Energy

Further to **M08/235**, it was **noted** that the ASO had yet to meet with the Department of Physics to discuss the structure of the MSc in Fusion Energy in the light of the news that the bid for a Doctoral Training Centre in Fusion Energy had been unsuccessful.

09/25 Lifelong Learning: Certificate in Lifelong Learning in Popular Psychology

Further to **M08/244**, it was **noted** that matters raised by the Committee, in relation to the Certificate in Lifelong Learning in Popular Psychology, had been addressed by the Centre for Lifelong Learning to the satisfaction of the Chair and so final approval had been granted.

09/26 Philosophy: MA in Philosophy, Theology and Ethics

Further to **M08/245**, it was **noted** that matters raised by the Committee, in relation to the MA in Philosophy, Theology and Ethics, had been addressed by the Department of Philosophy and so final approval had been granted.

09/27 Politics, Sociology and SPSW: BA in Social and Political Sciences

Further to **M08/246**, it was **noted** that matters raised by the Committee, in relation to the BA in Social and Political Sciences, had been addressed by the Departments of Politics, Sociology and SPSW to the satisfaction of the Chair and so final approval had been granted.

09/28 Sociology and Computer Science: MSc in Social Informatics and Interactive Technologies

Further to **M08/247**, it was **noted** that matters raised by the Committee, in relation to the MSc in Social Informatics and Interactive Technologies, had been addressed by the Departments of Computer Science and Sociology to the satisfaction of the Chair, and so final approval had been granted.

09/29 Timetabling

Further to **M09/08**, the Committee **noted** that members' responses to the report on Timetabling Key Performance Indicators had been passed to Student Administrative Services.

09/30 Computer Science: MEng in Computer Science with Business Enterprise Systems

Further to **M09/12**, it was **noted** that matters raised by the Committee, in relation to the MEng in Computer Science with Business Enterprise Systems, were being addressed by the Department of Computer Science.

09/31 Oral Report from the Chair

The Committee **received** an oral report from the Chair:

Review of Combined Degrees

The Committee **noted** that the review was ongoing. Both departments and students were contributing to the consultation process. A report of the review would come to the Committee in the Summer Term.

National Student Survey 2009

The Committee **noted** that, further to **M09/06**, the response rate, as of 12 March, had been 47.30% compared to 46.95% in 2008; this was comparable with the average in the sector.

Annual Programme Review (APR)

The Committee **noted** that the meeting to consider the APR reports would take place on 27 April at 12.15 in HG15. Following this a meeting was planned (Friday 5 June) for Chairs of Boards of Studies to brief on the issues raised in APR and planned actions.

Consultations with Postgraduates Who Teach (PGWT)

The Chair **reported** that he would be writing, with the GSA UTC representative, to all postgraduates who teach and departments with a survey to assess their experiences and how the University might improve the support available to PGWTs, and how this might be coordinated by the Graduate Training Unit.

09/32 Oral Report from the Student Representatives

Teaching award for postgraduates who teach

The GSA representative **reported** that the GSA very much welcomed the proposal to establish a teaching award for PGWT similar to the Vice-Chancellor's teaching award for staff, and that they were working with the ASO to develop the proposal.

Assessment and Feedback

The YUSU representative gave notice that she would be bringing a request to the next meeting of the Committee from the YUSU Annual General Meeting, concerning turn-round times in relation to assessment and feedback.

09/33 YUSU- led Elections for Departmental Boards of Study Student Representatives 2009/10

The Committee **received** a note of the proposed timetable for the 2009/10 YUSU-led elections for departmental Boards of Study student representatives (agendum 10).

The YUSU representative **reported** that, recognising that there was a range of practice across departments in relation to student representation, the YUSU proposed to work with the ASO in producing a 'best practice' guide. The Committee had some discussion about the nomination arrangements across departments; and were unanimous in **agreeing** the need for departments to have ownership of the nomination activity. It was **noted** that there was scope to manage the nomination process on line with the appropriate protocols. It was **decided** to defer consideration of the management of the nomination process until further discussion had taken place. A report would come to the next meeting. **ACTION: JB/CL**

In relation to elections for postgraduate representation, it was **noted** that if YUSU were requested to run an election for a department, this would be possible but there was no intention to offer this service to all departments for this next session.

A note would be circulated to all departments concerning the elections early in the Summer Term. **ACTION: YUSU/ASO**

09/34 Forum for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (FELT)

The Committee **received** an update on the work of the Forum for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching and the work of the Learning Enhancement Project Officers (agendum 6).

09/35 Teaching Space

The Committee **received** (i) a note of the issues concerning space planning of interest to the Committee, and (ii) a report from the Director of Facilities Management, summarising the recent Scientia report on the utilisation of teaching space (agendum 7). The Director of Facilities Management, the Manager of Campus Services and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Estates attended for this item.

Scientia Ltd report of the University's teaching space capacity

In presenting the report, the Director of Facilities Management **reported** that the primary purpose of the Scientia review was to understand the University's ability to meet its planned growth in the intervening period prior to academic buildings on Heslington East becoming available for use. He drew attention to the key findings of the survey:

- the University would appear to have sufficient spaces based on the current expansion plans to October 2010
- the utilisation factor (a multiple of the frequency rate and the occupancy rate) for the University's centrally managed teaching space was 36%, which was in the upper quartile for the sector
- there was a significant discrepancy between the utilisation factor for the centrally managed and locally managed teaching spaces, suggesting that utilisation would improve if all teaching space were centrally managed.

The Director of Facilities Management circulated a graph indicating usage of computer rooms over a 24 hour period. The Committee **noted** that the Computer Service and Facilities Management were liaising in relation to a planned refurbishment programme for computer rooms, some to be designated as pc classrooms and some to be redesignated as open access study areas.

During a full discussion the Committee **noted** that:

- it would have been useful if UTC had been involved in the review at its inception

- there were concerns about the quality of the data analysed for teaching rooms in departments, recognising that not all use is documented and rooms are used for a variety of purposes including workspace and meetings
- it would be helpful to have more information on how and when the data were collected, the size and facilities in the rooms surveyed; and a comparison of space requested to space provided (particularly in relation to size)
- from the summary data provided, it was clear that there was good utilisation of centrally managed space and it was difficult to see how this might be improved much more
- although the report suggested that there was more opportunity for booking rooms on Mondays and Fridays, it was difficult to see how this might be achieved (*Secretary's note: the frequency rate was fairly uniform from Monday to Friday (frequency rate is the proportion of time that space is used compared to availability))*)
- including more space in the central timetable would improve utilisation but this could be at a high cost to a department; the challenge was in managing this trade-off
- a priority should be to ensure that all teaching space was of a good standard and ensuring that the facilities provided in rooms matched the expectations of users. It was also necessary to factor in the need to train teaching staff in the use of the new facilities
- potentially there was scope for meeting the demand for larger rooms by combining two adjacent smaller rooms
- in some respects the availability of teaching space was shaping teaching e.g. departments repeating lectures etc.

It was **decided** that the Director of Facilities Management should:

- ensure that there was student representation on groups considering teaching space refurbishment programmes
- consider a range of options in the consultations concerning departmental space being included in the central timetable, acknowledging that many of the departmental rooms used for teaching also contribute in a range of ways to the academic, pastoral and social life of departments; and when departmental rooms are centrally timetabled the process should include a designated member of staff in the department signing off the room for use at agreed times. **ACTION: KL**

UTC input into space planning

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Estates, in introducing the discussion, outlined the arrangements for developing the University's Estate Strategy drawing on a range of inputs including condition and options for use of buildings, and the University's range of strategies.

The Committee had some discussion on how departments' aspirations and developments in teaching and learning pedagogy, expected during the planning period, could be captured by the existing structures. The Committee **noted** that there were a number of factors to be

addressed in the provision of teaching space, including the impact on teaching arising from the implementation of the new modular scheme e.g. more project work. The teaching space provision for the York Law School had been a good example of pedagogy-led space planning. Information on space needs and users' feedback was available through the Better Management process and the open comments in the NSS returns. Information also came through Planning Committee pro-formas for new programmes, periodic review and annual programme review; but this information was frequently not current.

The Committee had some discussion on the impact of the teaching environment in relation to the quality of the student experience; and, recognising the limitations for change presented by the existing 1960s/70s space embedded in departments, the question was posed whether it was timely to consider a dedicated teaching building for Heslington West, which could be developed to provide flexible teaching space. Whilst acknowledging there was no new money for upgrades or new build, it was important to develop a plan so that a quick response could be made when money was available.

The Committee **recommended** that:

- consideration should be given as to how a representative of UTC/ASO might be involved in facilitating the teaching space brief from an individual or a group of departments **ACTION: ASO**
- a representative from UTC and from YUSU and GSA should be on the new Space Management Group to be chaired by the Registrar. **ACTION: ASO**

09/36 Strategic Review of the VLE

Further to M09/11, the Committee **received** (i) the final version of the VLE Strategic Review (12/01/09); (ii) the extract from the Committee's previous minutes (M09/11), (iii) an extract from the Strategic Information Projects Implementation Group (SIPIG) minutes (M09/07), and (iv) a response from the FELT Steering Group (23/02/09) (agendum 8).

In introducing the item, the Chair reminded members that at the February meeting, the Committee had stated its support for the continuation of the University's VLE (M09/11), for strengthening the resources to support departments, for the establishment of some form of VLE group/forum (details yet to be decided), and arrangements for improving liaison between the Head of the E-Learning Development Team (ELDT) and the Committee.

The Committee **considered** the outstanding recommendations of the strategic review of the VLE. This was informed by the view of the SIPIG, with respect to recommendation 8, and with respect to recommendation 9, by a response from the Chair of FELT.

During discussion, the Committee reaffirmed its view that it was premature to consider the use of the VLE as having moved to a stage of 'business as usual', and strongly supported the proposed continued drive towards the VLE being integrated into the work of the University.

The Committee agreed that the approach needed to support and inspire departments to use the VLE to develop their pedagogy and enhance the student learning experience, in the context of the range of different styles of teaching and learning across the University. This suggested that it was important not to be unduly prescriptive, but to continue to work with departments to support and facilitate their aspirations. To this end, it was essential to enable the ELDT to continue to encourage, demonstrate and help to initiate and develop pedagogic and curriculum innovation, and to encourage departments to embrace the VLE to assist in delivering their Learning and Teaching strategies. The Committee **noted** and welcomed the suggestion from SIPIG (M09/07), in relation to recommendation 8, that the University should seek the pedagogic visions (relating to the VLE) of its departments, rather than develop a single prescriptive vision of how the University wished the VLE to be used.

The Committee **noted** that the FELT Steering Group (23 February 2009):

- did not support a requirement for every module to have a presence in *Yorkshare* (recommendation 9), but had recommended that each department should be required to develop a policy statement on VLE usage in relation to their teaching strategies, which would address the extent to which a minimum baseline approach (with appropriate quality assurance processes in the use of the VLE) was appropriate;
- recognised the need to improve the consistency of provision of information to students (as delivered within recommendation 9), and had made recommendations to ensure the provision of clear and coherent information on the location of module information and teaching resources.

Following some discussion, the Committee **decided** that:

- departments should be asked to develop a policy statement on VLE usage in the context of their forward planning for learning and teaching development for the next academic year **ACTION: ASO/ELDT**
- departments should provide a clear policy statement on the provision of information for individual modules, to address the need to improve the consistency and quality of provision to students. There were advantages to providing information on line, but it would not be appropriate to prescribe that the VLE was necessarily used as the repository. Departments would be asked to state on their web pages where the information could be readily accessed by both their own students and those from other departments. **ACTION: ASO**

The Committee **considered** the outstanding recommendations, **noting** that those relating to the provision of resources (recommendations 10, 11 & 12) would be considered by Planning

Committee and the Senior Management Group; and the recommendation relating to the management of information was being considered by SIPIG (recommendation 6). The Committee strongly supported the proposal that a University-wide decision needed to be made about standards, compliance guidance and monitoring and that, in the first instance, this should be referred to the Librarian. **ACTION: ASO to refer to the Librarian**

The Committee also **decided** that:

- the VPIG should continue in its current form with the addition of two academic members from the VLE Advisory Group (recommendation 4);
- the roles and responsibilities of the different groups and committees involved in the management and support of the VLE and VLE -based teaching should be clarified, with consideration to the wider context, and need for clear guidance to departments;
- further consideration needed to be given to the development of KPIs for the VLE service.

ACTION: ASO/ELDT

Finally, the Committee **noted** that the E-Learning Development Team would continue to provide support to departments in implementing these proposals.

Secretary's note: Actions proposed in relation to each of the report's recommendations, are detailed in the Appendix to the minutes.

09/37 Learning and Teaching Strategy

The Committee **received** a first draft of the new Learning and Teaching Strategy, together with a briefing note outlining the background, the objectives, the consultations to-date and some key questions for the Committee (agendum 9). In the course of discussion, it was suggested that:

- consideration should be given to linking the content more tightly to the Corporate Plan;
- the role of supervisor, student well-being and personal development, and role of colleges needed to be clearly referenced;
- it should be clearer how the University develops/nurtures a culture of excellence, supported by a suitable infrastructure, e.g. teaching space and timetable, to underpin that culture;
- the plan should explicitly convey the idea that students leave with a unique memorable experience.

It was **decided** to convene a special meeting of the Committee to discuss the Learning and Teaching Strategy.

Secretary's note: A meeting of UTC to consider the Learning and Teaching Strategy has been arranged for Tuesday 21st April 12.15 to 1.45pm in HG09.

Members were invited to send any further comments to Nigel Dandy, Academic Support Office (jc42@york.ac.uk) **ACTION: all**

The Chair **reported** that he had given a presentation at the recent Council meeting (06/03/09) on future developments in learning and teaching, highlighting the challenges of developing a culture of excellence in learning and teaching.

09/38 Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)

The Committee **received** a copy of the revised Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), a briefing from the Higher Education Academy (HEA), and a paper identifying the issues for the University (agendum 11).

The Committee **noted** that the PTES was a service made available to all HEIs by the HEA, was designed to help institutions to enhance the quality of taught Masters degree provision, and was based on the same methodology as the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES), which the University was currently undertaking for the third time.

The Committee further **noted** that the online survey, which would run from 20 April 2009 for two months, was not compulsory for institutions. Institutions would be able to add questions, and would be responsible for conducting the survey and the related direct and indirect costs. The results would not be published, but institutions would be able to compare their results with the national aggregated results.

The Committee **considered** whether or not the University should conduct the PTES; if so, whether it should be undertaken this year or from next year, and if the University should include any additional questions.

During a full discussion it was **noted** that:

- both the Graduate Student Association (GSA) and the University would welcome data on the postgraduate taught student experience, which would inform the University's understanding of its strengths and weakness in relation to postgraduate taught programmes and assist planning;
- there were opportunities for departments to conduct their own surveys providing valuable feedback but the PTES would also provide comparative data with other HEIs;
- the revised survey was significantly improved from the original pilot, circulated to universities, but still had weaknesses

- the proposed timing of the survey (April for 2 months), was too early for the majority of students to give feedback on their experience of dissertations (section 7), which fundamentally limited the value of the survey;
- there would be resource implications in running the survey, which needed to be addressed
- the analysis and dissemination of the results would be handled similarly to the NUS.

The Committee **decided** that:

- the University should participate in this year's PTES survey
- the University would include an additional question: "Did you undertake your undergraduate studies at the University of York? Yes/No"

Secretary's note: Students will receive an email with details of the Survey and a link to the questionnaire on 20 April 2009. The survey will run for two months.

09/39 Policy on the Accreditation of Prior Learning

Further to M08/240, the Committee **considered** a modified version of the revised policy on the accreditation of prior learning, together with a paper responding to the comments raised by the Committee (agendum 12).

The Committee **noted** that:

- there were two outstanding items to progress:
 - including in an appendix to the policy document those special cases and exceptions to the rules, which were regularly raised e.g. in relation to Health Sciences, foundation degrees;
 - the treatment of applications by students wanting to enter programmes, who had already received an interim award from the University of York under the new modular scheme **ACTION: Policy meeting of Special Cases Committee**
- the proposals relating to fees would be referred to Planning Committee for consideration.

The Committee **decided** to approve the revised policy on Accreditation of Prior Learning subject to minor amendments to be approved by the Chair.

Secretary's note:

(i) Consequent on final approval of the revised policy on APL, a recommendation will be forwarded to Senate for the deletion of Ordinance 8 'Exemption from Part of the Attendance Requirements of the University'. Regulations 2, 3 and 4 will be amended appropriately to refer to the APL guidance for issues relating to exemption from study.

(ii) *The administrative lead for APEL will need to be decided by the new Academic Registrar.*

09/40 Postgraduate External Examiners Reports

The Committee **received** a summary of postgraduate external examiners' reports for 2007/08 (agendum 13).

09/41 Disability Services

The Committee **received** a report from the Manager of Disability Services on the roll-out of the presentation to departments on teaching students with disabilities (agendum 14).

The meeting **noted** that departments' response to the implementation of the 'train the trainer' activity, developed to support staff in teaching students with disabilities, had been disappointing. In part this was thought to be due to the time involved in delivering the existing presentation and that departmental contacts were endeavouring to do this at Board of Studies meetings. After some discussion, acknowledging the range of responses to disability across departments with consequent inconsistent experience for students, and the need to share information and guidance across the University, it was **decided** to ask FELT to review the situation and consider providing a shorter version of the presentation for departments, and an on-line tutorial resource on the VLE. **ACTION: FELT**

09/42 Lifelong Learning: Certificate of Higher Education in Lifelong Learning (Archaeology)

The Committee **considered** a proposal for a Certificate of Higher Education in Lifelong Learning (Archaeology) (agendum 15) to be introduced from October 2009. The proposal had been considered in advance of the meeting by Dr Plunkett and Mr Tew and had the support of the external assessor.

The Committee welcomed the information that students who successfully completed this 120 credit Certificate would normally be eligible to continue their studies in a full-time capacity with the Department of Archaeology with direct HE Level 2 entry.

The Committee **approved** the programme.

Secretary's note: The programme has Planning Committee approval and may be advertised.

09/43 Centre for Applied Human Rights (CAHR)

The Committee **received** the academic plan for the CAHR (agendum 16).

09/44 Standing Committee on Assessment

The Committee **considered** a report of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment held on 27 February 2009 (agendum 17).

Fitness to Practise and Academic Misconduct

The Committee supported the SCA's decision that where an academic misconduct case raises concern about a student's fitness to practise both the academic misconduct and fitness to practise issues should be considered at one hearing.

It was **noted** (i) that there were consequent changes required to the Academic Misconduct Policies, Guidelines & Procedures for taught programmes of study, and (ii) that there were consequent changes to the University procedures for handling concerns relating to students' fitness to practise, requiring Senate's approval.

The Committee **decided to recommend** to Senate that an additional paragraph be inserted into section 2 of the University procedures for handling concerns relating to students' fitness to practise as follows:

2.13 Where concern about a student's fitness to practise is raised as a result of an investigation into academic misconduct, both the academic misconduct and fitness to practise issues will be considered at one departmental hearing, in accordance with University policy relating to academic misconduct.

The Committee **decided** that the procedures for handling concerns relating to students' fitness to practice should be hosted alongside 'Appeals and Complaints'. **ACTION: SCA**

09/45 Undergraduate Modular Scheme

The Committee **received** an update on the implementation of the new undergraduate modular scheme, including updated versions of the Framework for Programme Design and the Rules of Assessment and Award (agendum 18).

09/46 Programme Regulations

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the programme regulations document as a working draft. This would replace the programme specification pro-forma (agendum 19).

09/47 Validated Provision

The Committee **received** an update on validated provision (agendum 20).

09/48 External Assessors for Periodic Review

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the following external assessors for periodic review:

- English and Related Literature (1 May 2009): Professor Michael Ball (University of Warwick), Professor Anne Janowitz (Queen Mary, University of London)
- Electronics (2 June 2009): Professor Mark Zwolinski (University of Southampton), Professor Christos Christopoulos (University of Nottingham)
- Visit to the York International Foundation Programme (30 April 2009): Dr Amanda Wilcox (University of Hull)

09/49 Coordinating Group for Supplementary Programmes

The Committee **noted** that a special meeting of the Coordinating Group for Supplementary Programmes was held on 23 February to discuss room bookings and allocations. The Group was working with the Timetabling Office with the objective of booking all the evening programmes into one building, or two adjacent buildings, thus providing a critical mass of activity which would assist the provision of portering and refreshment facilities.

09/50 Distance Learning Forum

The Committee **noted** that the notes of the meeting of the Distance Learning Forum held on 30 January 2009 were available at: <http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/aso/teach/dl/minutes.htm>

09/51 Dates of Next meetings

The Committee **noted** the dates of the next meetings:

- **Monday 27 April Annual Programme Review meeting (over lunch) 12.15 to 3 pm**
- **Monday 18 May 2009**

Secretary's note: An additional meeting has been arranged to consider the Learning and Teaching Strategy on 21st April (see M09/37).

Appendix

The response of the University Teaching Committee to the recommendations in the report of the Strategic Review of the VLE December 2008

Recommendation 1: That the VLE (and, where appropriate, the members of the ELDT) should be included in wider pedagogic discussions and developments (e.g., new programme proposals and enhancement discussions within departments, UTC, FELT and SCA) and should have a more active role in informing related strategies (e.g. Learning and Teaching; Widening Participation; Employability).

- The Committee agreed - see (d) below.

Recommendation 2: That, at least in the short-term (e.g. 3 years), the VLE Project Leader should be a member of University Teaching Committee.

- UTC was of the view that the Head of the E-Learning Team should not become a member of the Committee but he should receive papers and be invited to comment on proposals relating to new modules and programmes.

Recommendation 3: That the VLE Project Implementation Group(VPIG) should continue in its current form but with the addition of a couple of academic members from the VLE Advisory Group (see R4 below) ideally with some overlap with membership of FELT.

- The Committee agreed, and two additional academic members would be appointed
ACTION: ASO/ELDT

Recommendation 4: that the VLE Advisory Group should be disbanded in its current form, and a VLE committee that is a sub-committee of FELT should be formed with explicit membership from every subject group, and relevant administrative/support departments.

- In relation to recommendations 1 and 4, the Committee supported the establishment of some form of VLE group/forum (as opposed to a formal committee) with representation from all departments, which would act as a mechanism for two-way communication between departments, and the central VLE team about developments, priorities and strategies, and that would also act as a forum for sharing good practice. Close communication should be maintained between the Group and FELT (e.g., once a year the VLE might be a substantial item at a FELT meeting) **ACTION: ASO/ELDT**

Recommendation 5: That the roles and responsibilities of the different groups and committees involved in the management and support of the VLE and VLE based teaching should be clarified (including, UTC, FELT, SIPIG the revised VPIG (R3), the proposed sub-committee (R4), and departments).

- It was agreed - to be considered in a wider context, ensuring that there is clear guidance to departments on appropriate points of contact **ACTION: ASO**

Recommendation 6: SIPIG (in consultation with relevant bodies/committees) should produce a detailed template of where information should be stored and published, and the purpose of the University's different e-systems

- This was an ongoing action on SIPIG

Recommendation 7: That the University should make a decision about ownership of standards compliance guidance and monitoring (including copyright, DDA and accessibility, and intellectual property), and if necessary invest in obtaining/developing this expertise.

- The Committee strongly concurred that there is a need for central guidance and monitoring in relation to these matters and in the first instance suggests advice is sought from the Librarian. **ACTION: Librarian**

Recommendation 8: That the University should develop (and circulate to all teaching staff) a pedagogic vision statement or similar document, which clearly sets out how it would like the VLE to be used and the benefits of e-learning as a tool for enhancing and supporting teaching.

- The Committee supported the view of SIPIG (M09/07) that the University should seek the pedagogic visions (relating to the VLE) of its departments, rather than develop a single vision of how the University wishes the VLE to be used. It is proposed that as part of their work-plan, the ELDT would support departments in developing their aims (and associated objectives) in relation to development of their strategies.

Recommendation 9: That the University should have as a baseline expectation that every module should have a presence on the VLE, and that as minimum this should include relevant lecture materials and a reading list.

- Following detailed discussion, the Committee decided that the University should not introduce a baseline approach, but that departments should have a clear policy statement in relation to the provision of information concerning individual modules and although there were advantages in this information being provided on line, it was not essential. Departments should be encouraged to state on their web pages where

this information could be readily accessed by both the department's students and students from other departments.

Recommendation 10: As a minimum, the VLE service needs to be able to support departments in implementing the baseline expectation (see R9 above). The service will also need to be able to support the envisaged growth in demand for the VLE.

- Whilst not requiring departments to agree to a baseline expectation, the Committee wished to support the continued drive of the VLE being integrated into the work of the University and predicted growth in demand for the VLE. Proposals for additional resources as recommended below are being referred to Planning Committee and Senior Management Group.

Recommendation 11: That the ELDT should be enhanced with 3 additional learning technologist posts (with both pedagogic and technical expertise). They should each support one of the three broad departmental subject groupings of the University (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences and Sciences). The posts should be line managed by the VLE project leader.

Recommendation 12: That the business as usual budget should ensure the current quality of support and development can be maintained, and that the envisaged increasing demand for the VLE (including the baseline expectation (see R 9) can be supported. Specifically, the budget should include funding for ongoing development of the VLE in response to University and Departmental needs. There should also be money available to fund innovations and developments in departments

- In relation to recommendations 11 and 12, the Committee is unanimous in supporting the proposal that the ELDT be enhanced with 3 additional learning technologist posts, with additional funding to enable the team in initiating and supporting work in departments.

Recommendation 13: That the University should develop KPIs for the VLE service. Some suggestions for further consideration: student satisfaction; & of modules with baseline information on the VLE (see R9); % of modules with further/enhanced provision; attendance at facilitation/professional development events.

- The Committee supports the proposal that appropriate KPIs are introduced reflecting quality issues, and objectives for the VLE. **ACTION: ELDT**