Informatics Teaching Committee
Minutes of the meeting held at 2.00pm Thursday 3rd May 2012 in Appleton Tower, 4.13.

Present: F. Keller (Convener), S. Anderson, J. Longley, M. Rovatsos, D. Robertson, H. Pain, E. Klein, N. Goddard, N. McGillivray, G. Bell, K. Weston (Secretary)

1. Apologies for Absence: J. Moore, A. Lascarides, A. Bundy, B. Fisher, A. Storkey

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

J. Longley requested an amendment to his action for item 6, QA Report. He was actioned to return feedback on this item to the College QA Committee not the External Examiners.

ACTION: K. Weston to amend minutes. Action Complete.

3. Matters Arising

3.1 National Student Survey/Enhancing Feedback - S. Anderson

ACTION CARRIED: S. Anderson to arrange staff workshops on feedback and practical design.

3.2 Revision of UG3 Structure and Curriculum - S. Anderson

ACTION CARRIED: S. Anderson will revise the paper the Committees discussion and present the revised paper at the next meeting. This should be accompanied by KK's analysis of the curriculum.

ACTION CARRIED: S. Anderson to add the following item to a future Board of Studies agenda "5 Yearly Review of Course Descriptors".

3.3 Student Project Confidentiality - S. Anderson

ACTION CARRIED: S. Anderson to amend the proposed policy as discussed.

3.4 Tutorial Absence Reporting - S. Anderson

ACTION CARRIED: S. Anderson to bring this item back to Teaching Committee next year.

3.5 QA Report - J. Longley

ACTION COMPLETE: J. Longley to return feedback to the College QA Committee.

3.6 Innovative Learning Week - S. Anderson

ACTION COMPLETE

3.7 Improving our use of Questionnaires - S. Anderson

G. Bell reported on the progress made by the working group set up at the last meeting. Following a number of meetings, the group have produced an updated questionnaire for use in the future. It was queried if the results of these questionnaires would be published, with a suggestion that the results could be linked from the Sortable Course List which would allow easy access for students. For the same reason, it was recommended that the Course Introduction Videos were linked from the Sortable list as well. Staff would like the opportunity to comment on the feedback, any comments could be included in the published results.

ACTION: N. McGillivray to investigate the feasibility of linking items from the Sortable list.

3.8 Informatics Education Advisory Board - S. Anderson

ACTION CARRIED: S. Anderson to add an item re. this at the next meeting.
4. **Academic Infrastructure Working Group - J. Longley**

J. Longley presented his report on the work carried out by the Academic Infrastructure Working group to date. Their work has focused on four main areas, PhD students, student assessment, disabled students and programme specifications and design. The discussion at the meeting was centred on the later two items.

Disabled Students - The group found that improvement could be made on the accessibility of course delivery. Specifically, lecturers/tutors should be expected to routinely comply with adjustments made to cover the most commonly arising impairments in their course delivery. With more specialised adjustments made for individual students when the need arises. The Committee agreed that this was a good idea but queried how staff would be made aware of these new requirements for course design and delivery. It was decided that following consultation with the working group, as Chair, J. Longley should bring a draft policy to a future TC meeting, after which it could be added to the TC policy page.

**ACTION:** N. McGillivray to provide a list of the known academic adjustments ordered by commonality. *Action Complete.*

**ACTION:** J. Longley to bring a policy on accessibility of course delivery to a future meeting.

Programme Specification and Design - The group propose that there should be a one-off overhaul of our existing Programme specifications as a more coherent and useful set of prog specs would have a number of advantages. The Committee agreed with this proposal.

**ACTION:** J. Longley to bring a KIS friendly draft policy/guidelines on how to do this to a future Board of Studies meeting.

F. Keller as Convener wish to thank the Academic Infrastructure Working group on all of their hard work to date.

5. **Quality Assurance Model - N. McGillivray**

N. McGillivray wanted to raise awareness of the the School's Quality Assurance Model which can be found at the following link:


Should staff have any feedback/amendments this should be sent to N. McGillivray.

6. **Key Information Sets - N. Goddard**

N. Goddard provided a short introduction to Key Information Sets (KIS) and asked the Committee to form a small working group, a recommendation made by Recruitment Committee. The group should aim to resolve how we secure correct KIS data without imposing excessive audit work on staff.

**OUTCOME:** The Committee agreed to set a up a working group to address these issues. N. Goddard agreed to chair, with S. Anderson, N. McGillivray and G. Bell as other members.

7. **UG4 Project Moderation - H. Pain**

H. Pain presented her report on the work carried out by the working party charged to improve the consistency of dissertation marking. She highlighted the main changes that have been implemented for this year, including using a smaller pool of moderators who will also consider the spread of
marks, consistency on marking across markers and project types. The group of moderators will then meet to report on their set of projects with the aim of cross-comparing and checking consistency amongst all projects. If inconsistencies are found, further moderation or mark change recommendations may be implemented.

There was some concern over the feasibility of point 7 and it was felt that the UG4 Convener and Course Organiser should certainly be present, especially if the group would be able to recommend mark changes.

It was queried by the ITO if projects required moderation if marks were over a borderline, H. Pain did not believe this had ever been done for UG4 projects.

F. Keller as Convener wished to thank the working group for all of their hard work to date.

**ACTION:** ITO and H. Pain to check if moderation over a borderline is required. **Action Complete:** This has not been done in the past for UG4 Projects only for MSc projects. Moderation is not required if markers cross a borderline as long as they agree a mark and are not more than 10 marks apart. **ACTION:** H. Pain to report back to Teaching Committee on how the new guidelines worked in practice.

8. Year Organiser Reports

**Year 1**

E. Klein reported to Teaching Committee on 1st year issues that had arisen including:

- The online programming exam has been extended from 2 to 3 hours, he noted that a good proportion of the class seemed to take advantage of the additional time. He wished to not his thanks Computing Support, especially G. Dutton, A. Downie and R. Bell, for all of their input on producing and running the exam.
- It was wnoted that Informatics 1: Cognitive Science has assessed coursework, even though Teaching Committee previously agreed that there should be no assessed coursework in the first year.
- E. Klein found that increasing the remit of the INF1 Course Organiser to include the service courses was a positive change.

**Year 3**

It was noted that the marking for AILP and IP (Semester 1 courses) had still not been returned to students. S. Anderson suggested that these structure of these courses may have to be revisited as the marking of both practicals is a huge undertaking. However, it was decided that it was unlikely anything could be done in time for next semester. S. Anderson may bring an item regarding this to a future meeting.

The remaining reports were taken as read.

9. Recruitment Report

The tabled report was taken as read.

S. Anderson reported to the Committee on our expected undergraduate intake for the coming session:
10. Director of Teaching Report

S. Anderson reported to briefly on the following items:

- Personal Tutors
- Graduate Attributes
- Online Open Courses

11. AOCB

Computing - Future of DICE?
S. Anderson was actioned by the Strategy Committee to discuss with Teaching Committee the "future of DICE". This was briefly discussed with general agreement that there is still a need for a common desktop for students, that perhaps, in the future could be virtualised.

**ACTION:** S. Anderson to add an item on this at the next TC meeting.

NSS Survey Feedback
S. Anderson would like to set up a working group on this following feedback from students.

**OUTCOME:** The Committee approved the set up of this working with S. Anderson, G. Bell, J. Hulme and I. Trendafilov as potential members.