Imperial College
London

Faculty Education Committee – Special Meeting to consider the curriculum review paperwork for the Department of Chemical Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

Wednesday 12 December 2018
10:00 – 11:00
Room 909B, 9th Floor, Electrical and Electronic Engineering Building

Unapproved Minutes

---

1 Welcome

Dr Lorraine Craig welcomed members to the meeting. Lorraine noted that this was a special meeting of the Faculty Education Committee, to consider the curriculum review paperwork for the Department of Chemical Engineering so that it could be submitted to the January 2019 Programmes Committee meeting. No regular business was to be considered at this meeting.

Present at the meeting: Dr Lorraine Craig (Chair), Dr Phil Power, Komal Patel, Dr Errikos Levis, Prof Klaus Hellgardt, Dr Stephen Green (on behalf of Dr Lorenzo Picinali), Lucy Heming, Dr Tiffany Chiu, and Dr Monika Pazio. Dr Clemens Brechtelsbauer attended the meeting on behalf of the Chemical Engineering curriculum review team.

Not present at the meeting: Prof Nigel Brandon, Prof Omar Matar, Prof Yun Xu, Richard Martin, Prof Sergei Chernysenko, Prof Martyn Boutelle, Dr Niamh Nowlan, Prof Jason Hallett, Dr Mike Templeton, Prof Bassam Izzuddin, Dr Tony Field, Dr Fariba Sadri, Dr Lorenzo Picinali, Andy Brand, Dr Mark Sutton, Prof Martin Blunt, Dr Kristel Fobelets, Prof Andrew Holmes, Dr Martyn McLachlan, Prof Jason Riley, Dr Mike Bluck, Dr Ulrich Hansen, Alejandro Luy, Joel Bilsdorfer, Zixuan Wang, Amy Tall, Raya El Laham, Dr Elizabeth Hauke, Dr Mark Pope, Dr Pavel Berloff, Prof Graham Hughes, and Prof George Jackson.

Lorraine noted that due to the short notice of the meeting, all FEC members had been invited to provide comments via email. Komal Patel confirmed that no comments had been received.

2 Curriculum Review Paperwork

Committee members considered papers EEC.2018.105 to EEC.2018.109, the curriculum review paperwork, module outlines and Reference Panel summary form for the Department of Chemical Engineering.

Discussion included the following:

- Student workload and timetabling: The department noted that 30 ECTS of content had been removed from the current programme. It was further noted that the department would be reviewing the timetabling of the programme, and it was hoped that reading weeks could be incorporated in the new timetable.

- Chemical with Nuclear Engineering programme: It was noted that the proposed programme structure did not meet the requirement in the 2019-20 Academic Regulations for students to accumulate 60 ECTS credits at Level 7, due to the allocation of the I-Explore module in Year Four of the programme. It was noted that one of the core Year Three Nuclear modules was owned by the Department of Mechanical Engineering. The Faculty Education Team agreed to review the possibility of offering a Level 7 version of this module in Year Three, following the curriculum review submission from Mechanical Engineering.

Action: Faculty Education Team

- Ordinary degree exit awards: It was noted that the department wished to offer unaccredited BEng exit awards as Ordinary degrees, with a credit requirement of 180 ECTS rather than the 150 ECTS Ordinary degree credit requirement outlined in the 2019-20 Academic Regulations. The department felt strongly that it was in the best interests of their students to ensure they accumulated 180 ECTS, given that this was the minimum ECTS credits stated in the European Quality Framework for a Bachelor's degree. The department also noted that 150 ECTS would represent only two and a half years of credit compared to the four year MEng programme. Lucy Heming noted that, although this differed from the 2019-20 Academic Regulations, the proposal from the department could progress to programmes committee without change.

- Leganto reading lists: It was noted that the department's Reference Panel had included a required amendment to ensure that reading lists were compiled in Leganto. The department noted that this was in progress, and would require significant interaction with the Library.

In addition, the department was asked by FEC to consider the following specific recommendations ahead of submission to Programmes Committee:

- I-Explore should be included in the same way as "Process Optimisation" had been listed in Year Three i.e. as an individual row, "compulsory" and 5.0 ECTS.
- The Year Three elective rules should state that one 5 ECTS elective at Level 6 must be chosen from Group A or Group B.
- In the curriculum review proposal form, "Level 6" should be revised to "Year 3" in the sentence "the I-Explore elective cannot be taken at Level 6 on the H890 programme" for clarity.
- In the Progression and Classification section of both programme specifications, the year weighting sentence should be revised to: "For this award, Year One is weighted at 7.5%, Year Two is weighted at 20%, Year Three is weighted at 36.25% and Year Four is weighted at 36.25%".
- For the Mastery module description in the Curriculum Redesign Proposal From, the wording should be revised to explain that although a student needs to achieve 80% in the examination, as this is a Pass/Fail module the student will be awarded 100% or 0%. In the Mastery I, II and III module outlines, the overall pass mark on the assessments tab should be updated to 100%, and this should be reflected in the Assessment Strategy box.
- The FHEQ level on the details tab of the module outline "Modelling of Biological Systems" should be updated. The pass mark should be 50%, in line with the rest of the Year Four modules and the College Academic Regulations.
- A brief description of the difference between long and short answer exam questions should be included in the module outlines where they are reference.
- The "Programme Structure" tables in the programme specifications should indicate which term each module is delivered in.
- The phrase "will have partially achieved the above learning outcomes" should be reconsidered in the Learning Outcomes section of the programme specifications.
- Reconsider the use of the word "Develop" when writing module level learning outcomes.
- Where module level learning outcomes include "discuss", this should align to the assessment type.
- Clarify how the learning outcome "Perform" is met by the assessment type (an examination) in the module "Separation Processes 1".
- Review whether a 100% pass mark for the portfolio coursework in the module "Chemistry 1" is appropriate, given that it is not a must pass component.

Action: Klaus Hellgardt/Clemens Brechtelsbauer

Lucy Heming agreed to send, via email, a list of additional recommendations to be completed ahead of Programmes Committee submission which she was unable raise at the meeting due to time constraints.

Action: Lucy Heming

The department was also asked to consider the recommended enhancements suggested by their Reference Panel.

It was noted that a number of actions could be completed ahead of the Programmes Committee paper deadline, however other areas would require longer term consideration. Lucy Heming asked the department to indicate which areas had been addressed when they submitted their final paperwork.

Action: Klaus Hellgardt/Clemens Brechtelsbauer

The meeting was not quorate, however those present agreed to endorsed the department's curriculum review paperwork, with the exception of the Chemical with Nuclear Engineering programme, which would be considered following the curriculum review submission from Mechanical Engineering. Lorraine Craig took Chair's Action and recommended the paperwork be submitted to the January 2019 Programmes Committee.

Lorraine Craig thanked Klaus, Clemens and the entire Chemical Engineering curriculum review team for their hard work and efforts to finalise their paperwork. Lorraine also thanked the department's Reference Panel, and Committee members for their helpful feedback and support.