

**Minutes of Meeting**  
**Terrorism Studies Programme Board**  
**26 May 2006**  
**Best Western Scores Hotel**  
**St Andrews**

**In Attendance:**

Sir David Veness (DV) Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security, United Nations, New York

Dr Louise Richardson (LR) Executive Dean, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University

Mr Nigel Churton (NC) CEO, Control Risks Group, London

Dr Francoise Haut (FH) Organized Crime and Terrorism, Institute of Criminology at the University of Paris II

Mr Oliver Gadsby (OG) Director, Informa

Professor Max Taylor (MT) Director of Terrorism Studies, CSPTV, School of International Relations, University of St Andrews

Professor Paul Wilkinson (PW) Chairman of the Advisory Board, CSTPV, University of St Andrews

Professor Alex Schmid (APS) Director, CSTPV, University of St Andrews

Professor William Walker (WW), Head of School of International Relations, University of St Andrews

Professor Keith Brown (KB) Master, University of St Andrews

Dr Andrew Silke (AS) Criminology Field Leader, School of Law, University of East London, London

Dr Peter Lehr (PL), Maritime Fellow and Module Coordinator, CSTPV, University of St Andrews

Dr John Horgan (JH) Senior Research Fellow, CSPTV, School of International Relations, University of St Andrews

Mr Jon Purcell (JP) Director of Library Services, University of St Andrews

Dr Anthony Richards (AR) Module Coordinator, CSTPV, University of St Andrews

Ms Gillian McIlwaine (GM) CSTPV Secretary and Secretary to Director

**Apologies:**

Professor John Anderson

Professor Clive Walker

Dr Fernando Reinares

Professor Xavier Raufer

Mr David Garbutt

## Agenda Item 1 Welcome

MT welcomed everyone to the meeting. MT acknowledged the wealth of expertise gathered and stressed that he wanted the project to benefit from it. MT highlighted how exciting the new E-Learning project is but that it was necessary for all involved to present and run it right.

The Terms of Reference for the Board were circulated. MT highlighted that the role of the board would consist of two elements. The First element was that of an advisory role – inter disciplinary and inter professional and the second would be one of quality control and the review of quality control provisions.

MT said that while the Certificate course would be presented as an overview in the first half of the meeting, the main purpose of today was to look at the M.Litt and Diploma courses which are still at the conceptual stage.

By the end of the meeting, MT envisaged the setting up of a smaller working group who will make decisions on further modules content for the M.Litt and Diploma courses, who would then submit to the Board for approval and then to the University.

## Agenda Item 1 Welcome - University Welcome

KB also welcomed everyone to the meeting. He envisaged 'good times' for the University. The St Andrews 'brand' was better than ever with students flocking to St Andrews. The School of IR is one of the top 3-4 Schools in the University and the quality of students could not be better. KB highlighted that the interest in IR was not just a product of 9/11. Students came to St Andrews to undertake serious academic study in the area of IR. He also stressed that the University was not supporting this project as a money making venture – the University does not need the extra money, nor the extra students. Rather, it was a show of confidence in the Centre, School and the University as a whole.

## Agenda Item 1 Welcome - School Welcome

WW added his welcome and thanked all who had traveled considerable distance to be here. WW gave a background on the School of IR saying it was one of 17 schools in the University and 1 of 4 in the faculty of Arts. It is the fastest growing school in the University comprising of 3 research centres namely: CSTPV, MECACS (Middle Eastern Studies) and the soon to be established, Conflict Studies Centre.

WW went on to give a brief background on CSTPV in particular saying how PW has founded the Centre in 1994. He thought this new initiative would add strength to CSTPV but stressed that it would have to be done well. He was aware that this was a long term venture but had no doubt that with MT and AS on board, PW and associated staff in place and with the Board this was an exciting opportunity for CSTPV, the School and the University.

#### Agenda Item 1.2 - Membership Introductions

MT asked that everyone around the table introduce themselves. (Please refer to front page of the minutes for details).

#### Agenda Item 2 - Centre Developments

APS advised how he had only been in position for one month at the time of the meeting but wanted to bring to attention the consistent outputs and research from CSTPV. There is to be a further publication of Terrorism Versus Democracy (Paul Wilkinson) 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition in July of this year, there is ongoing research into aviation by PW, maritime and piracy by PL, psychology by JH and MT, Northern Ireland by AT and JH. All members of staff are involved in outside research either as project co-directors or as part of a bigger consortium.

APS also mentioned the other projects CSTPV were involved in i.e. the CSTPV database which benefits from the input of 60/70 interns. ITES and ITI conferences being run in conjunction with Eden Intelligence and which will be held in June this year. APS highlighted that there would be joint bid for Government monies with MIT as a result of the ITES conference.

APS also gave an insight into his own research saying how he is conducting research for his Handbook of Terrorism and is hoping to compile a World Conflict and Terrorism Map. APS stressed that to continue with all these projects and more there was the need for steady income and this is what the new E-Learning Project would bring to CSTPV.

#### Agenda Item 2.2 - E-Learning

MT explained that the cooperation with Informa had produced a suite of programmes, namely the Certificate Programme. This programme is designed for Security orientated people and involves 16 weeks study around 4 modules. It is to be launched in October and it is on track for that date.

MT explained that the Certificate programme would be a 'rolling' venture. The development of the Certificate is established and the role for the Board in the case of the Certificate will be that of quality control.

The second thread of development is that of the graduate diploma and M.Litt. MT envisages that entry at this level will be confined to graduates working in appropriate professional environments and that progress through the diploma will yield some credit towards the M.Litt. Both will be offered through e-Learning and also perhaps offered as a full time course in St Andrews. Modern technology is involved and MT highlighted how fortunate St Andrews were to have the experience of Informa.

MT again asked that the formulation of the diploma and M.Litt programmes be the core activity of the Board meeting.

### Agenda Item 3 - E-Learning Context and Process

OG gave a presentation to the Board (please refer to attachment for copy).

OG also went on to highlight that the Informa group had contacts in defence and government with a mailing database of over 20 million names, they were experienced in key account selling and the administration of same, marketing, vetting procedures and invoicing. They have employed the Services of LearningMate for the student admin support and Janes (JTIC) for course resources.

Within OG's presentation, the Board was taken through an example module. Elements of the process were highlighted as follows:

- The student would be given a password and login.
- This would bring the student to a welcome platform which would include their own profile and the studies of the course. The content can be assessed worldwide using any browser.
- Once launched, the student will be taken into the lesson which shows objectives and activities which are built into the material.
- There are a variety of MCQ and mix and match activities.
- There is access to a discussion forum where the student can interact with the subject matter expert.
- Janes (JTIC) database of terrorist events abroad is available to students for the duration of the study period.
- In the research centre part of the course there was the opportunity for online chat. It was stressed that this would have a degree of structure but might enable exciting interaction with guest presences for example.

MT stressed that the chat room and forums would have to be monitored.

KB and JP left the meeting.

#### Agenda Item 4.1 – Certificate in Terrorism Studies - Content

PW went into detail about the Certificate and the key issues. The anticipated learners are security professionals or individuals or even people retiring from senior positions. He said the certificate was challenging with essay tasks. Students would be challenged to think constructively but that the technology enabled the university to monitor how much the student had grasped.

More teachers will be required and the beauty of the e-learning is that they could be virtual teachers in a setting wherever they are based but still with the ability to have personal interaction with the student through the chat and forums.

Students, dependent on their location, may have to rely on online material and St Andrews are aware of the constraints. The Certificate course is not asking students to achieve on the basis of access to resources. The online materials given are what students should be able to work with.

Other modules e.g. law based are not available at the moment although there is a policing option written by David Garbutt, Former Head of the Scottish Police College. Further modules will be looked at after the start date. We will be in a position to recruit people with a specialism in their environment or a country based specialist for particular country based students. (See attached abstract of Policing module).

PL was asked to give a brief overview of the maritime module (Please refer to document attached). PL highlighted that maritime security was not only of interest to maritime but also to finance and security professionals. PL also stressed to OG that that access to the JTIC site alone was not enough for students taking his elective module; he suggested that Module coordinators at least would require full access to Janes. (See attached abstract of module).

PW gave a brief overview of Aviation highlighting that there was a constant demand for quality academic teaching in this field. He also said that his core module would be of use to all in the security profession. (See attached abstract of module).

AR gave an overview of his two modules i.e. Modus Operandi and Ideologies and Beliefs and Aims which he summarised as being of interest to front line

practitioners and all areas of the security profession. (See attached abstracts of modules).

PW brought the subject of validation to the table. He said that the Certificate course was designed for beginners and to the University could not give any accreditation to this course. However, they could provide a certificate of completion. Validation had not been an issue in the US it was more of an issue for UK employers who assisted potential students with fees. Employers have to make a strong case to their funding bodies for monies to assist students.

OG agreed with PW and said that Informa were still investigating what validation the UK is looking for. He also went onto to report that IISS and an Australian University were happy to accredit the certificate for admission to their courses.

LR asked how much the certificate cost. OG advised that it was £1400 for the full course. NC and LR agreed that this was great value for money. OG reported that the pricing of the course all through the market research had never been a hurdle.

LR asked for further details on the core content. OG said that each module lasts 4 weeks. Some students were going to study outside work for 16 hours module equating to 4 hours per week but that some e.g. Washington Police (who have 20 signed up for the Certificate course) would be able to work in their work time on the course.

NC has some reservation about the content of the Certificate and who it was aimed at. MT stressed that the certificate only gave a basic level of understanding. It was not meant to be equivalent to a first year course at university - something in between. MT also stressed that this was something for monitoring after the Certificate course had been launched. Only then would we be in a position to value expectation of the course.

APS highlighted that some of the modules are very specific i.e. maritime and policing. In the Diploma these would be able to be incorporated and expanded - designed to give a balance.

DV suggested that the course should make a point of letting student know what they should know i.e. global dimension, North/South inclusive issue and future methodology. He also suggested we should be aiming for a Gold Standard of Excellence.

PW agreed with DV and said that the core module included a look at traditional and new terrorism and is a key part of the module.

Again, MT suggested looking at the Certificate once it is online and working. It was suggested that it be looked at in more detail a year from now.

#### Agenda Item 5 – Diploma/M.Litt in Terrorism Studies – St Andrews Context

MT started the discussion by advising that there has been no development done on either the Diploma or M/Litt. This is what he wanted to do at this meeting. MT suggested a meeting in September/October to decide on the curriculum for the diploma and M.Litt.

The task of today's meeting was to decide what Terrorism Studies needed.

MT was keen to air views and then the sub-group which is to be formed would create a model or number of models based on this to present to the Board again in September/October and from that process feed the outcome to the University.

PW highlighted that St Andrews has a long experience of teaching taught Masters over the calendar year in the form of the ISS. There has to be a mechanism in place whereby it is assured that students complete. A dissertation should be included in the calendar year of work. In the past – if a student qualifies for dissertation level they are expected to complete the degree combined with the taught course.

Core lessons are taught on the ISS course with options in second semester. It is thought that an e-learning based M.Litt will be able to attract enough interest and identify subjects for teaching e.g. psychology.

The research based degree has a requirement in a research and techniques module. PW suggested this should be kept as an essential part.

#### Agenda Item 4.2 Development Process and Curriculum Development

MT asked then, is it a course with 2 core subjects i.e. basic conception and theories and research and methods and 2 electives and a dissertation that we are looking for?

WW highlighted that the School of IR ran 3 taught M.Litts at the moment – The International Security Studies (ISS) 30 students, Middle East 30 students, International Political Thought 10 students and the Conflict Studies M.Litt which will be launched in 2008. WW said that the format for these M.Litts was that in

1<sup>st</sup> semester the student completed the core course and in the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester the optional modules were taken.

MT thanked WW for the insight and suggested that the relationship between taught and e-learning courses would have to be ironed out. Nevertheless there was a need to do best by the course, using the best people and the material from St Andrews and worldwide.

MT asked if methodology should be a core element, exploring quantitative and qualitative methodologies and empirical and conceptual studies. MT suggested this might be an easy module to design (it has already been done for a Masters course in Dublin) and there were lots of resources.

MT was keen to also emphasise that the quality of the student would not be compromised. He wanted to attract students of as high a calibre as already attended St Andrews. A University degree is an entry requirement to enter a Masters course and this will stay the same. When asked about professional qualifications in this concept, MT suggested these would have to be worked on and principles set out for acceptance without a compromise to quality.

MT also stressed the clear distinction between the Diploma and M.Litt. Attainment in the diploma did not mean automatic entry into the M.Litt. There would be a level of attainment to be able to go from one to the other and it was not thought that dual qualifications would be offered. This was not an option at St Andrews.

MT explained that the course had to be flexible. It could consist of full time students based in St Andrews, people on secondment and also people engaged in it who will not be supported. The principles to move forward had to be the process of the curriculum development.

MT referred to the sample courses (see attached document) which listed a huge variety of courses searched for under 'terrorism studies'. They range from simple minded politically driven to very technical courses. Again, MT stressed that St Andrews has a distinguished record and this is not to be an offering that will run for only 2 years. It should be meaningful and conceptually demanding. MT then asked how we deal with the practical and conceptual practice. Integrating theory and practice is very difficult.

#### Agenda Item 4.3b Nature of Terrorism Studies

JH went on to ask what terrorism studies are. What do the students think it is? What do we teach students? JH suggested that the St Andrews objective should



be to teach students to understand terrorism, to appreciate the view and approach of terrorism and through this provide research informed activities. There are a number of ways of doing this; integrating theory and practice and using teaching tools (7/7 time line).

MT again raised the issue of practice and concept. He didn't think there was a suitable conclusion.

#### Agenda Item 4.3c Terrorism and Counter Terrorism

APS spoke about counter terrorism and terrorism - operational or academic/scientific interest - he did not think there was enough common ground. APS thought it important to include the theoretical approaches even if they are wrong. Or to use models e.g. war model, serious crime model or communication model. APS was keen to stress that academia can provoke wider comprehensive views. Under reaction is as provoking as over reaction as in guerrilla warfare. The students have to understand theoretical underpinning and ideologies.

The understanding of terrorism is where academia can specify their research and should stress independence and critical policy relevant assessment.

#### Agenda Item 4.3 Professional -v- Academic Issues

PW agreed with APS and stressed the need for independence. PW went on to explain that this is why there is an interest - we are non partisan. What we are providing is much more comprehensive and we should be looking at a lasting contribution. PW went on to highlight the huge literature source and asked what should be we equipping students with at Masters Level. PW stressed that it is not something that should cause a conflict of interest, professionals and academics need this.

PW highlighted the tensions between academics and professional approach:

- Some think academic training is not something that can be offered to security professions.
- Some think it dangerous to make information too accessible to academia.
- Professions cannot be seen to give too much information away on exercises or hijack situations (media already do this)
- Academia cannot compete with specialist training for in house and would not want to tread on the toes of front line trainers.
- Knowledge based training joining empirical and theoretical would provide understanding of the phenomena and how it came about.

PW went on to highlight that there has been so little research done even since 9/11 in Europe and none in the US – interest has moved on to other things but this area is just as deserving as other areas e.g. Arms control. .

Multidisciplinary approaches are essential. All areas are important. It is a field that can draw all fields together providing overall value.

MT highlighted the comments received from other Board members. Clive Walker (Absent) had sent in a paper outlining the legal context. He suggests that law may be a discipline in many modules. Fernando Reinares (Absent) also raised the issue of background of students and lead disciplines.

LR and FH both commented on playing to strengths within the course. Firstly understanding what we know, not precluding the legal perspective. Secondly we have to work out how to structure this. LR highlighted the Executive education courses she has been involved in in Harvard and suggested more student/teacher interaction.

It was important to have well integrated students and an organised framework so that some control could be maintained over the faculty.

With this in mind, PW highlighted the proposed residential training which may or may not benefit the shy, quite student. They may do well through an interactive medium but would not excel when put in a classroom situation.

NC highlighted that the success rate for the courses may be age dependent. He had experience of young starts who were motivated and were able to take e-learning and the technology associated in their stride. Senior staff, however, never focused on the e-learning. LR suggested that – as at Georgetown, a residential followed by 2 modules, followed by another residential may engage and focus students better with a re-grouping at the end. AR agreed. He has spoken with Colin Mason of Saltire at the University of St Andrews and he recommends residentials to motivate the student.

MT said that the decision on residentials would be based on student numbers world wide, the expectations of the groups and the academic value of such schools.

NC suggested that at Certificate level residential was not required by at diploma and M.Litt it should be looked at. MT agreed with this.

Another way to motivate students was to have 'leading lights' and stimulate students with online Q&A's as a means of interaction. It would open up student interests. It is not expensive and some contributors may be flattered to be asked. This should maybe introduced as a 'master class' or have seminars with a leading expert.

DV responded by saying the course is ideal to be more ambitious - adding benefit for the student and tutor. Academic issues can be used in the broadest context. The value of academia is to bring all together DV suggested that there would be opportunities that would appeal to a variety of groupings with an opportunity to buy in from senior staff - useful provocations.

MT invited FH to contribute - FH was concerned more with the substance rather than the design. He said that today's terrorism is not only ideological but that this should be used as a base. The course should be forward looking with enough interest for students. He suggested investigating the nexus between terrorism and organised crime or money and political crime as an idea and said we should take the lead in not offering only on a terrorism basis but also on a counter-terrorism basis. Perhaps a module could be made up of history, ideology, organised crime, modus operandi, forward thinking and defining the future. Terrorism but also counter-terrorism. FH also thought that e-learning was the right way to do it, better than a real physical course. The student is able to think at their own pace and level of difficulty.

FH also raised the security of the course and suggested that something should be dedicated to student and teachers. Leaks are dangerous and content may be sensitive. FH asked how the process of security and accessibility would be met?

MT advised that a monitored chat room would be vital.

#### Agenda Item 6 - Discussion

MT went over what had been discussed previously. He understood that there was the need for a methodology module and a qualitative and quantitative methods module. What he wanted to know was what else would be covered in the Core issues?

He suggested that included should be a module covering the Ideology of IR (sociology, psychology and political) but that it should not tie in so closely to IR or any other discipline. This gives primacy to the approach of being included but not core.

It was suggested that the Core may be titles Theories of Terrorism and Political Violence i.e. not theories of the terrorist but the theories that have been developed by different disciplines - social science. In this context it was suggested to draw upon the disciplines of sociologists, political economists, psychologists and criminologists. This would ensure that law and history students could take advantage of the course offered.

JH suggested that there be 2 core items regardless of background. Firstly, an introduction to terrorism - case studies of terrorist events with outcomes, which raises awareness, analysis and introduces values, historical and contemporary overview i.e. what makes it distinct from conventional terrorism and secondly, understanding terrorism - determination, theoretical approaches, disciplinary approaches and multidisciplinary frameworks.

FH commented on these saying that case studies would have to be looked at carefully. These should be both proactive and reactive. Case studies are usually stories of failures.

MT hinted that there was a danger that you would end up producing manuals for investigation.

PW suggested choosing a major event and asking the student to source through open sources, what motivated the attack and who was involved.

JH said that case studies already included development, motivation, leadership, capacity and organisation and management. As academics we should be encouraging relevant of theory by case studies.

Following on from the, MT asked if a core activity should be absorption of case studies.

APS suggested as part of the thesis for the Master the student project would integrate an element of the project. MT said that no Masters thesis is empirical.

PW said that empirical emphasis doesn't include partial theory. One would expect to be informed in theory. The idea of combining case studies in a core would be of interest to a student.

DV asked about the consequences of violence as a subject. The need to know about theory with the emphasis on violence rather than politics produced consequences. APS suggested that this needs empirical data and needs indicators. There had been considerable progress in the prevention of terrorism

by that it was essential to distinguish where there were footprints. This could bring about critical thinking and could be suggested as a pre-requisite.

MT suggested that this would not be a very interesting pre-requisite for someone interested in applying with a degree in IT and that the group should think in those terms. An IT degree, for example, does not have a social based context within it.

LR said how surprised she was that the course was not trying to appeal to people without a related background. If the initial part of the course covered courses, types of terrorism etc this should challenge the outsider who may not have a notion about the course content.

MT then asked if we should look at a pre-requisite for applying students.

PW pointed out that there was no where else the applying student could get the suggested pre-requisite than here. It has to be provided as part of the core, giving them a clear idea of major theories and dynamics and methods.

OG highlighted that the benefit of the technology Informa had was that these gaps could be tested in a technical environment and through market research. This would be looked at over the coming year. APS suggested something along the lines of an entry test might not work but OG said that it could be done either formally or informally.

MT suggested that this might prove an unattractive barrier to adult learners and professional learners. MT suggested that the certificate may be a requirement for entrance to the Diploma if no qualification in a relevant discipline was held.

NC said that if you made the certificate a pre-requisite for entry into the Diploma course you would create a funnel for intake. PW and MT then suggested that the entry system to the M.Litt should be the same as was at St Andrews now i.e. a good 1<sup>st</sup> class degree. It is envisaged that the Diploma will be launched in the next year although MT insisted he did not want to be held to a timeline.

MT referred back to the core issues. He suggested looking at MBA models where case studies are used for core building.

NC suggested that a well modeled background, why, where etc, well researched and well based should be the main priority and on the back of this the creations of a case study. He also pointed out that, in his opinion you could not do a terrorism course without including counter-terrorism.

WW agreed with NC. WW realised that the subject was difficult to teach although he came from a different background, but he realised the complexity of teaching about groups and organisations. In his mind there should be intellectual fragmentation. Students need to understand definitions and theories before coming directly to case studies. These are very complex and may cause confusion.

WW suggested that students should be encouraged to do more reading and research to increase understanding. Recruitment of teaching was also chiefly important. We should try and approach it by finding common threads.

MT suggested that the teaching model in the Certificate is not necessarily appropriate for the M/Litt. He was pointing toward reading material and wished to create rich resources of books and materials.

OG agreed and said that Informa could facilitate this by building the teaching content as part of the learning environment.

Following this discussion, MT suggested a time frame for the course. He suggested the diploma would run for 1 year full time which would translate into multiples of part time and the M.Litt would be for one year including the appropriate thesis - 2 years maximum. It was highlighted again that there would be no dual certification.

AS asked what the general focus of the modules would be and what goes into each one.

WW answered that at the moment 4 modules were marked out of 20 with a student requiring a minimum of 14/20 to graduate to dissertation. This was University wide and should apply to this M.Litt.

APS asked if we should not focus on what we would like as the 4 modules.

MT said that the outcome of the working group discussions would make this decision. AS asked if there would be an elective element and MT advised that this would be cost relevant.

MT suggested then that the first two modules would be as follows:

1. Methodology
2. Core course studies (theoretical context, multidisciplinary elements to theoretical context, case studies to illustrate theoretical elements).

PW thought there may be some resistance among students on theory. He suggested looking at the justification for an event to get them interested then leading on to empirical theory.

MT then raised the question of what constitutes a set of coherent modules. Does there have to be a continuous narrative? Does it have to be a full year? Perhaps it can be 2 modules over 1 year. He invited views and ideas on this issue.

PW confirmed that the University's taught Masters consisted of 12 substantial week modules over semesters.

APS asked if there could be a multidisciplinary approach, e.g. modules on maritime or psychology or a module that concentrated on a number of approaches bringing them in rather than gliding over them. MT thought there had to be something more grounded.

NC suggested that electives would create difficulties especially in maritime or aviation as these are tactics rather than subject. He suggested a module including law, regulations, Acts and the counter-terrorism acts. He also suggested including government. At this suggestion MT suggested contacting Clive Walker to ask for his input and perhaps suggests that he design a module.

JH was concerned about grouping big areas and asked how this would be approached.

MT suggested the following model for a basis to build on

1. Fundamental issues – core issues, definitions and theoretical issues.
2. Processes and responses – (sociology)

This constitutes the Meta core and an element of this process would also be legal.

NC asked where research and research teaching skills would be included. MT suggested this would be a different module and is substantive enough to warrant a core module.

WW suggested that the format of the course could be that the first half i.e. that core courses could be designed around the present curriculum and set out as what you want the students to know. In the second half of the course – the elective – there would be a selection which is either interest or teacher based. WW also asked to what extent we are trying to shape the module round content and not by who can teach it. MT stressed that this was not an in-house venture and that people would have to be invited to teach on it.

MT suggested that there may be an elective of 4/10 modules at any one time which means more flexibility. PW suggested that the teaching be region based with an option to commission private and public sector teaching on a specialised aspect, e.g. aviation.

MT said that he expected the input of Board members as to candidates for teaching and this should be discussed between each other.

MT then asked if there was agreement on the 4 proposed modules:

1. Methodology
2. Core- fundamental issues and theories
3. Processes and responses
4. Elective

MT also asked if the Board thought the running order was correct. Should the student have to do the core first? MT also thought that a methodology module could not last one semester and suggested spreading this across the load.

PW said that the student should be starting to think about their dissertation almost immediately and that they would need methodology to do that. JH suggested distributing methodology by issues and papers.

APS then asked about the cost element of the course. Are students paying as they go? Are they able to purchase the first module to see how they go and then cut their losses if needs be? APS also asked if the course would be cheaper because it is e-learning.

OG advised that the price would be at the same level as the University taught courses. APS then highlight that there were different prices for domestic and overseas students in normal circumstances. OG said he would investigate this. OG also asked if the intake for the course would be throughout the year. MT said it would work in line with the academic year. The certificate might need to be tweaked but can be left to flow, but the M.Litt would fall in line with the academic year to facilitate exams, graduation and the traditional framework.

#### Agenda Item 7 - Establish Working Group

MT said that he had deliberately kept this meeting vague and very open. Clearly no decision on curriculum had been made but the smaller working group should be able to generate modules from this meeting. MT proposed that the members of the small working group be MT, AS, JH, LR and DV. This was agreed and



they will convene again at the end of the summer with a curriculum design for September/October.

#### Agenda Item 8 – External Moderation of Certificate, Diploma and M.Litt

MT then went on to explain the importance of quality control in both the University and externally. MT suggested Ken Pease be retained as an external moderator of the Certificate course in a position similar to that of an external examiner. Ken Pease is a Professor of Social Policy and has links with the Jill Dando Centre. He is very well respected in his profession. His views will be valuable to this project. If Ken Pease does not accept, MT will come back to the Board for suggestions.

WW asked if this position was ad hoc.

MT stressed that this was not part of the university procedure.

OG asked when Ken Pease would take up his role and MT assured OG that this would not be at the development phase, it would be one year on.

#### Agenda Item 9 – AOB

DV stressed again the need for some form of symbolic validation from the University as a record of achievement for the Certificate course.

MT said that CPD was underplayed and would only be recognized in some areas. They don't have such a process in the US for example.

WW again said that the University could not validate individuals who had taken the course but that it could validate the certificate course itself.

DV suggested that there could be recognition of attendance. This might be able to liberate funds by way of achievement.

NC said how he had been interested in the security debate. NC encouraged the course to be bold. This was the ideal platform to encourage this.

FH again highlighted his concerns on security. MT said that this will have to be looked at but that gaps in the discussion groups and forums seemed relatively straightforward to police.

OG gave an online update of acceptance to the course – the number is now 81 high level practitioners.

APS highlighted the residential issue and suggested not committing blindly to anything. APS suggested checking later what could be delivered. MT agreed saying that the Diploma and M.Litt summer schools will have to be quite explicit. PW said he did not think there would be a huge cost element in London or the US and also to stress that attendance is not mandatory.

MT agreed that the Board had achieved a lot during the day. It was agreed that there would be another meeting September/October and GM is to circulate proposed dates.

MT and APS thanked attendees on behalf of CSTPV and WW thanked attendees on behalf of the school.

End.