SENATE

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2012

Present: Deputy Vice-Chancellor Professor T Sheldon (Chair), Dr H Altink, Dr TT Arvind, Prof W Bonefeld, Mrs L Booth, Mr N Dandy, Ms K Diaconu (GSA Representative), Prof P Drew, Dr S King, Dr R Ogden, Mr G Osborn (YUSU Representative), Dr A Parsons, Ms E Roberts, Mr B Saynor, Prof L Siciliani, Dr H Smith, Prof C Thompson, Dr R Vann, Dr R Waites, Dr M White

In attendance: Mr M Burton (for M11-12/101), Mrs K Dodd, Dr D Duncan (for M11-12/87), Ms L Crossley (for M11-12/108), Dr J James, Ms S Johnston (for M11-12/101), Ms C Lowe, Ms K Mitchell (for M11-12/99 and /100), Ms C Moore (Secretary), Prof J Robinson

Apologies: Ms B Akua-Sakyiwah (GSA Representative)

11-12/86 Minutes and Action Log
The minutes of the meeting held on the 14 December 2011 were approved.

The UTC action log was considered and it was noted that:

- the Chair, the incoming PVC for Learning and Teaching, the Chair of the SCA and the Deputy Director of Corporate Planning would meet to discuss whether the proposed deep analysis of degree classifications should be postponed in the light of changes to degree classification resulting from the introduction of the New Modular Scheme. ACTION: Chair
- the Blackboard Action Group had been formed and would report to the next meeting. ACTION: Dr Vann
- data on the outcomes of PhD vivas should be presented at a future meeting. ACTION: Mrs Dodd
- data on students seeking advice and support from the GSA should be presented at the next meeting. ACTION: GSA
- discussions relating to the concentrated nature of the Summer Term Common Assessment Period should be extended to include the Spring Term Common Assessment Period and should be linked to discussions about the structure of the academic year (see M11-12/87). ACTION: SCA
- the University had fed back to HEFCE regarding the importance of contextualised information in the KIS. This point would be reiterated when the University met with its HEFCE contact the following week.

11-12/87 Structure of the Academic Year
The Registrar and Secretary informed the Committee that the Senior Management Group had been discussing possible changes to the standard academic year from 2013, namely starting the Autumn Term a week earlier, extending the Christmas vacation by a week (to four weeks), reducing the Easter vacation by a week (to four weeks) and finishing the Summer Term a week earlier. The Committee was generally supportive of the proposal to start and finish the academic year earlier as this would benefit students (a longer Christmas vacation would give students more time to prepare for assessment in week 1 of the Spring Term and help international students who wished to return home for the holiday, and finishing the academic year a week earlier would help students compete for jobs and internships). The Chair noted that a more fundamental review of the structure of the academic year would be undertaken by a working party in due course (M11-12/48 refers).

11-12/88 Centre for Women’s Studies: Masters in European Gender and Equality Studies (EGALES)
Further to M10-11/210, it was noted that most matters raised by the Committee had been addressed but a revised programme specification for the programme (which is a University award but includes one or more compulsory mobility periods) had yet to be submitted.

11-12/89 Politics: Politics Mundus MAPP (Erasmus Mundus Programme)
Further to M11-12/20, it was noted that the Netherlands accreditation agency, NVAO, is being asked to re-assess the programme in April 2012 and the programme team at ISS and in the wider consortium will endeavour to provide reassurance to the NVAO on the amount of public policy in the programme, its coherence, and its excellent track record. Work is ongoing on the remaining conditions.

11-12/90 Theatre, Film and Television: ‘In Principle’ Approval of a BSc in Interactive Media
Further to M11-12/74, it was noted that the matters raised by the Committee were still to be addressed.

11-12/91 Mathematics: MSc in Statistics and Computational Finance
Further to M11-12/75, it was noted that the matters raised by the Committee were still to be addressed.

11-12/92 Computer Science: MSc in Large Scale Complex IT Systems
Further to M11-12/76, it was noted that the matters raised by the Committee were still to be addressed.

11-12/93 Computer Science: MSc in Cybersecurity
Further to M11-12/77, it was noted that the matters raised by the Committee were still to be addressed.

11-12/94 Biology: BSc in Biomedical Sciences
Further to M11-12/78, it was noted that the matters raised by the Committee were still to be addressed.
11-12/95 Theatre, Film and Television: Major modification to BSc in Film and Television Production
Further to M11-12/79, it was noted that the matters raised by the Committee were still to be addressed.

11-12/96 Oral Report from the Chair
The Committee received an oral report from the Chair, as follows:

QAA Institutional Review
The QAA Institutional Review (IR) panel had carried out its first visit to the University on 3rd and 4th January and met with senior staff. The IR panel had now provided the University with the timetable for the main visit (tabled at the meeting) in the week commencing 13th February and requests for additional evidence. A main theme for the visit would be the relationship between central bodies and departments. The IR panel would meet with a range of staff and students but had not asked to see external examiners, employers or student work. The Head of the ASO, who was serving as the Institutional Facilitator, noted that the two Lead Student Representatives (Mr Osborn and Ms Diaconu) were doing an excellent job.

HEA Grant
Dr Robert Gunn from Department of Social Policy had received a Departmental Teaching Development Grant from the HEA. This development grant funding (to which the hosting institution would also contribute) existed to stimulate research and encourage innovations in learning and teaching that have the potential for sector-wide impact. Dr Gunn’s project would draw on the experience of current students, alumni and potential employers/funders to improve the teaching of social entrepreneurial skills and the effectiveness of work placements. It would aim to form partnerships with potential employers and mentors (for students who wished to become social innovators) and thereby improve levels of employability for social science students.

Student Representation Policy
Following approval of the student representation policy, the recommendations would be considered by Senate in January. A workshop had been scheduled for February at which the working group would build on the session delivered in November “creating a strong staff student community”, and present the policy (assuming Senate approval). The establishment of a steering group to oversee the implementation of the policy and its recommendations would not be proposed to Senate (M11-12/17 – recommendation two), instead the Committee would assume the role of the proposed steering group and receive termly reports from the working group.

11-12/97 Oral Report from the Student Representatives
The Committee received an oral report from the student representatives, as follows:

YUSU Representative
The YUSU Representative noted that YUSU was preparing to publicise the NSS and was also dealing with issues arising from the Spring Common Assessment Period. The YUSU representative stressed the importance of examinations being included on students’
individual timetables: it was noted this was the intention, as was the earlier production of the examinations timetable.

GSA Representative

The GSA Representative noted that the GSA was working with the Maths Skills Centre to ensure that the timing and availability of statistics courses met students’ needs. The GSA was also working on a project on departmental communities.

11-12/98 Annual Programme Review (APR) Reports 2010/11

The Committee considered a summary report of the discussion at its meeting on 19 December 2011 to look at the APR reports for 2010/11 (UTC.11-12/48), and list of possible actions. It was noted that the summary report had been discussed at the meeting of the Chairs of Boards of Studies earlier in the day.

The Committee agreed that the summary report was a fair reflection of the discussion at its last meeting. It was, however, suggested that two additional common themes had been the need for assessment to focus on assessing students’ critical engagement with subject material (rather than ability to regurgitate knowledge), and concerns about the logistics of hosting visiting students.

It was noted that departmental issues relating to central offices or services had been extracted from the APR reports and would be sent out to the relevant offices/services shortly. The Committee decided that the central offices/services should be asked to respond to each of the issues raised, so that the Committee could assure itself that appropriate action had been taken where necessary. An initial response would be required by the March meeting. ACTION: Secretary. The updated document would be circulated to departments to feed into the next APR cycle.

With regard to the identified actions, it was noted that the actions relating to infrastructure, mitigating circumstances and attendance policies would be dealt with as above, the actions relating to curriculum design had been previously identified by the Committee and were included in the action log, and the action relating to the scaling of marks had already been dealt with by the SCA.

It was decided that the Director of PGCAP should clarify if the concern about staff undertaking PGCAP not being given a reduced teaching load related to a small number of departments or was more general. If the former, those departments should be approached individually; if the latter, the issue should be raised with HR and all Heads of Department. ACTION: Director of PGCAP

It was noted that departments should be reminded to reflect, as part of the APR process, on the introduction of recent policies, for example the undergraduate supervision policy, the combined degree policy, the peer support for teaching policy, and the student representation policy. Departments would not, however, be expected to reflect on policies that had not been in operation during the year under review.

11-12/99 Postgraduate Students Annual Programme Review (APR) Focus Groups
The Committee considered a summary report from the GSA on the outcomes of focus groups with postgraduate students (UTC.11-12/49). The report was considered alongside the APR summary report (M11-12/98) to ensure that any key issues had been included in the APR summary. Information pertaining to individual departments had been submitted to those departments for consideration during the APR process. It was noted that key issues identified included:

**Communication**
Better communication between staff within and between departments, and between staff and postgraduate students would help to ensure that students’ expectations were met e.g. in relation to programme content, and assessment and feedback. The importance, for postgraduate taught students, of the first term of their programme could also not be underestimated.

**TAP meetings**
TAP meetings were essential for monitoring research student progress and the health of supervisory relationships but some students felt that the organisation of TAP meetings within their departments was not ideal. It was decided that this issue should be discussed when the University’s Code of Practice on Research Students was reviewed later in the year. In particular, consideration should be given to making TAP meetings a progression hurdle and/or routinely monitoring their occurrence. ACTION: Secretary

**Training and development**
There was a strong desire from postgraduate students for department-based, rather than generic, training and development (whether in relation to academic or transferable skills, employability and careers development, or training for PGWT). It was decided that the balance between central and local provision of training and development for PGR students should be reviewed. ACTION: Chair and PVC for Research

**11-12/100 Post-PRES (Postgraduate Research Experience Survey) Focus Groups**
The Committee considered a report from the GSA on post-PRES focus groups carried out in six departments (UTC.11-12/50).

The Committee noted that the report highlighted research students’ concerns in relation to study space and access to facilities, departmental communication and community, supervision, teaching opportunities, and professional development and employability. Across all these themes, a key message was the need for departments to communicate clearly with students in order to manage their expectations.

The Chair noted that a number of recent initiatives should address some of the concerns raised, e.g. the introduction of Print Plus and the agreement to establish a book-drop on Heslington East. With regards to study space, it was noted that for hot-desking to be acceptable to students the ratio of students to desks needed to be appropriate and lockers provided.

The GSA would send the report to the six departments so that they could take action as necessary. ACTION: GSA
11-12/101 University Teaching Timetable 2010/11

The Committee considered a report from the Timetabling and Room Bookings Office on the production of the 2010/11 University teaching timetable and the Autumn 2011 University Room Audit (UTC.11-12/51). Mr M Burton, Timetabling Officer, and Ms S Johnston, Head of Campus Services, attended the meeting for this item.

In introducing the report, Ms Johnston noted that three main challenges to the production of a good teaching timetable were:

- late changes to the timetable
- poor teaching space i.e. the space available not fitting with booking requirements (particularly a lack of smaller rooms and large lecture theatres)
- a lack of facilitating technology.

Late changes to the timetable

The Timetabling Office noted that it was now year two of a three-year project to roll-back the production of the timetable, with the aim that the 2012 timetable would be available to students prior to the summer vacation. Progress had generally been good but the major challenge was to ensure that the earlier production of the timetable did not lead to a decrease in its stability arising from late changes.

The Timetabling Office noted that whilst it recognised that some late changes to the timetable were necessary to improve the student experience (for example changes in response to student feedback on modules running until the end of the academic year), a significant number of late changes appeared to have arisen as a result of the draft timetable not having been properly checked during the designated checking period. It was noted that in 2012 the window for checking the timetable would occur during the Summer Term (rather than the vacation) and it was hoped that this would improve matters.

It was decided that the Chair should work with the Timetabling Office to try to find ways of ensuring that late changes were only made for essential reasons and to identify appropriate incentives to encourage good citizenship by departments. ACTION: Chair and Timetabling Office

Poor teaching space

The Timetabling Office noted that it was about to undertake a modelling exercise to find out what the University would need to provide in terms of teaching accommodation (numbers of rooms, including size and layout) to satisfy current demand. The Committee supported this initiative.

The Chair noted that within the Senior Management Group there was increasing recognition that Heslington West contained some less than satisfactory teaching accommodation, and that he hoped that this would eventually lead to the development of a new teaching building with high quality flexible teaching space.

Facilitating technology
The Timetabling Office noted that further investment in software would enable it to improve the service offered to Languages for All and its students by enabling LFA students to choose a timeslot on a self-service basis. The software could also benefit other departments, for example by enabling students to swap seminar groups without administrative input. The Chair noted that the software concerned was expensive and the Timetabling Office would need to make a strong case if it wished to pursue this. **ACTION: Timetabling Office**

*Future of the timetable*

The Chair noted that significant progress with timetabling had been made in recent years, reflected in more positive feedback from departments and students, for which the Timetabling Office must be congratulated. Further initiatives (e.g. the inclusion of examinations) were in the process of being introduced but there was, however, still room for improvement (e.g. in the factoring in of travel time across the University). Moreover, the continued growth of the University meant that pressure on the timetable was not diminishing.

The Chair noted that he was concerned that the University was reaching a point where it might be impossible to make further improvements to the timetable within the current constraints. It was therefore decided that the Timetabling Office should produce a discussion paper for the Summer Term which would consider ways forward (including an analysis of other institutions’ approach), for example whether the University should concentrate on addressing the issue of poor teaching space (see above) and/or change its model of timetable construction (so that students select between pre-timetabled options rather than the timetable being constructed around student choice). **ACTON: Timetabling Office**

It was noted that the needs of visiting students should be taken into consideration when dealing with timetabling matters (e.g. to ensure that visiting students had access to popular module choices). **ACTION: Timetabling Office**

It was also noted that it would be useful to consider whether the KPIs for timetable production properly reflected the needs of staff and students. **ACTION: Timetabling Office**

*Room audit*

It was noted that, in the room audit, a significant number of booked but apparently unused slots were attributed by departments to auditor error or the slot not being used for the entirety of the booked period. It was suggested that a sample, e.g. around 10%, of the slots in the room audit should be independently double audited as a check. **ACTION: Timetabling Office**

*Departmental rooms*

It was noted that there were no plans to remove departmental rights with respect to departmentally controlled rooms but that it was important that the utilisation of such rooms was measured as HEFCE required this.
The Committee **noted** that the new QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education had been launched in December 2011 and would supersede the existing Academic Infrastructure (on which the new Code was based). A report on the new Code would be presented to the Committee at its next meeting.

The Committee **approved** a draft response to the QAA’s consultation on Part C of the Code: *Information about higher education provision* (UTC.11-12/52) subject to the response: (i) noting that with respect to indicator 8, universities should only be expected to provide information on students’ academic achievement, (ii) suggesting that in the phrase ‘higher education experience’ the word ‘experience’ was unnecessary and suggested a consumer model of education.

**11-12/103 Module/Programme Evaluation**

The Committee **considered** a report on module and programme evaluation which had been deferred from the December meeting (UTC.11-12/53).

The Committee agreed that there was a need to review the University’s approach to module and programme evaluation in light of variation in current practice within the University, the changing national context and competitor analysis and, therefore, **decided** that a working group should be established to take this forward. **ACTION: Professor Robinson and the Secretary**

The report included a number of questions to be explored by the working group and, it was suggested that the following issues should also be addressed:

- the use of student evaluation in performance review and for promotion purposes
- the need to evaluate stages of an undergraduate programme (not just modules and the overall programme)
- evaluation of assessment.

**11-12/104 Clearer Paths for Students to Raise Concerns With the PVC for Teaching and Learning**

The Committee **considered** a report on identifying clearer paths for students to raise concerns with the PVC for Learning and Teaching (UTC.11-12/54).

The Committee **approved** the procedure whereby, once informal departmental procedures had been exhausted, issues of concern relating to Learning and Teaching policy and quality assurance which affect the student cohort or groups of students, may be raised by student representatives with the relevant ASO Quality Assurance departmental contact, and, if still unresolved at this stage, be considered by the PVC for Learning and Teaching. It was **noted** that this procedure would not replace the formal complaints procedure but would instead provide a less adversarial alternative to making a formal complaint to the Registrar and Secretary and would formalise a process which was already practised.

*Secretary’s note:* the procedure will need to be published on the web alongside existing information on complaints. **ACTION: Ms Dodd**
11-12/05 Politics (PRDU): MSc in International Humanitarian Affairs by Online Distance Learning

The Committee considered a proposal for ‘in principle’ approval of an MSc in International Humanitarian Affairs by online distance learning from the Politics Department (UTC.11-12/55). The proposal had been considered in advance of the meeting by Ms Roberts and Dr Ogden and had the support of the external assessor. Ms Roberts and Dr Ogden noted that they had raised a number of questions with the PRDU and had been reassured on many but not all points.

The Committee agreed that the programme was an exciting new venture for the Department and the University and strongly supported its introduction. It was, however, decided that further development of the programme and reassurance on certain key points would be required before the University could approve it. The programme should, therefore, be re-submitted to the next meeting and the re-submission should include:

a) the amendment and clarification of module descriptions, taking into account the detailed comments forwarded from the nominated members;

b) evidence of further work in relation to programme content and delivery, taking into account the detailed comments forwarded from the nominated members and following further discussion with the E-Learning Development Team (ELDT), including: (i) the module design process and the respective roles of the ELDT and the programme team, (ii) how synchronous events would be supported, (iii) the weekly learning and teaching process, including the asynchronous components and student workload, (iv) the training and monitoring of tutors and the production of a tutor service level agreement, and (iv) an evaluation plan that had greater depth and was relevant to the mode of delivery;

c) confirmation that the necessary arrangements were in place with internal and external partners;

d) confirmation that the essential arrangements were on course for the launch of the programme, in particular that a draft of the first module had been completed and could be reviewed and finalised in time, and that the first Teaching Fellow post had been approved and could be appointed in time for the start of the programme;

e) confirmation that the programme’s steering group was active;

f) confirmation that the Board of Studies and Head of Department were supporting and monitoring the programme’s development, and that the latter was allocating the necessary staff and other resources to support its development and launch.

ACTION: Dr Connolly

The Committee noted that given the amount of work to be undertaken, the resources currently available, and the need to publicise the programme, the proposed Autumn 2012 start date was probably not achievable. It was further noted, however, that as the programme was an online distance learning programme it was not constrained by the standard academic year and, therefore, the programme team would not need to wait until Autumn 2013 before launching the programme, once approved.

11-12/06 Language and Linguistics: Introduction of a Work Placement Pathway to the Four Year Language Degrees
The Committee considered a major modification to four-year language degrees in the Department of Language and Linguistics to allow students to undertake a work placement on their year away as an alternative to studying at a university abroad or undertaking a teaching assistantship (UTC.11-12/56). Dr Altink and Dr White had considered the proposal in advance of the meeting.

Initially (in 2012/13), the option of taking a work placement would apply only to students taking German and interested students would be required to use the services of a placement broker (and meet the associated cost). In future years, the scheme would be expanded to cover students taking French and Spanish and also allow students to find their own placements. The Committee approved the major modification.

**11-12/107 Health Sciences: Revision of the MSc in Cognitive Behavioural Therapy for Advanced Practice**

The department asked that this be deferred to the next meeting (UTC.11-12/57).

**11-12/108 Weald & Downland Open Air Museum Validation**

The Committee considered a panel report and external assessor’s report on a validation visit to the Weald & Downland Open Air Museum (WDOAM) in West Sussex (UTC.11-12/58). It was noted that a tabled paper provided a number of minor corrections and clarifications to the panel report, as received from the WDOAM. The corrected version of the panel report would be circulated to members with the minutes.

The purpose of the validation visit had been to see if the WDOAM was a suitable collaborative partner for the University of York and whether the MSc in Timber Building Conservation and MSc in Building Conservation programmes, developed and delivered by the WDOAM and currently validated by the University of Bournemouth, should be validated by the University. The link with the WDOAM had been proposed by the Department of Archaeology on the grounds of strategic fit and value.

Professor Robinson, who had chaired the validation visit, noted that the validation panel had been convinced of the strategic nature of the proposed collaboration and had been impressed by the WDOAM and the two programmes it offers. Particular strengths had included the exceptional learning environment and teaching, the ethos of the programmes, the sense of community, and the positive student engagement.

The Committee recommended to Senate that:

(i) the WDOAM should be approved as a collaborative partner;
(ii) the Timber Building Conservation programme, developed and delivered by the WDOAM, should be validated as a Master of Science (with Postgraduate Diploma and Certificate exit awards) from October 2012 for an initial period of two years;
(iii) the Building Conservation programme, developed and delivered by the WDOAM, should be validated as a Master of Science (with Postgraduate Diploma and Certificate exit awards) from October 2012 for an initial period of two years;
with (i), (ii) and (iii) subject to the WDOAM addressing as soon as possible the conditions identified in the report and detailed in the action plan to the satisfaction of the Chair of the validation panel and the Chair of UTC. The report and action plan also included a number of recommendations to be addressed.

The Committee considered the periodic review report, the draft action plan, and external assessors’ reports for the Department of Economics and Related Studies (DERS) (UTC.11-12/59).

It was noted that the panel believed that the Department was at a pivotal moment and that, with a new Head of Department in charge, there was an opportunity for the Department to resolve long standing issues relating to the student experience. Strong leadership from the Head of Department and his Senior Management Team, and support from the University, would be required to ensure an effective and consistent culture of learning and teaching within DERS.

The Committee noted that the Department had been asked to revise its initial action plan to make its actions more specific and measurable, and that the University would need to monitor the action plan closely. The Chair noted that there were indicators that the Department was taking positive steps but that this momentum would need to be maintained.

11-12/110 Standing Committee on Assessment
The Committee considered a report from the Standing Committee on Assessment (UTC.11-12/60).

It was noted that:
   a) a simplified version of the draft proof-reading policy had been requested for discussion at a future SCA meeting (M11-12/8 refers);
   b) the intensity of the Common Assessment Period and possible solutions would be discussed at the SCA’s meeting in February (M11-12/48 refers);
   c) the SCA would be sending out information to departments to clarify that external examiners could meet with students to discuss their programmes (M11-12/25 refers);
   d) chapter B7: External examining of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, which incorporated the recent Universities UK and GuildHE report on external examining, would be considered at a future SCA meeting (M10-11/173).

The Committee received a recommendation from the SCA to change the Academic Misconduct Policy with respect to penalties for students who complete with early exit awards but decided that, rather than make piecemeal changes, the entire policy should be reviewed to ensure that it was still fit for purpose. ACTION: SCA

The Committee approved the proposed procedures for the operation of progression boards for taught postgraduate programmes under the New Modular Scheme and their inclusion in the Guide to Assessment, Standards, and Feedback 2012-2013. It was noted that feedback
from departments on the proposals had already been sought. The Committee noted that the reference to ‘stage’ in the agenda paper was erroneous and should be deleted.

11-12/111 Validated Provision
The Committee received an update on validated provision (UTC.11-12/61).

11-12/112 HYMS Joint Learning and Teaching Committee
The Committee received the minutes of the meeting of the HYMS Joint Learning and Teaching Committee held on 16 June 2011 (UTC.11-12/62).

11-12/113 Student Exchange between University of York and Rhodes University
The Committee noted that the Chair had approved a student exchange between arts and humanities departments at the University of York and the Faculty of Humanities of Rhodes University, South Africa.

11-12/114 Erasmus Student Exchange with the Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”
The Committee noted that the Chair had approved an Erasmus student exchange between the Department of Politics and the Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”, Italy.

11-12/115 Modifications to, and Withdrawals of, Programmes of study
The Committee received a report on modifications to, and withdrawals of, programmes of study approved by Chair’s action between December 2011 and January 2012 (UTC.11-12/63). The Committee noted that the Chair, acting on behalf of the Committee, had approved modifications to, and withdrawals of, programmes of study as follows (further details are available from the Academic Support Office):

**Combined French/History degree**: Approval, from 2013 to change the programme name from French/History to History/French in an attempt to reverse the drop in recruitment on this programme.

**English**: Approval of a minor programme modification to BA in English and Related Literature from 2012/13 (impacting on the current stage one cohort students), all single honours students are required to take at least four period modules across their second and third years, including one from each of the four period bands (medieval, early modern, 18th century and modern); whereas previously they could have taken those period modules in any combination in any term, they must now take one in each of the four ten-week terms of their degree (i.e. terms 4, 5, 7 and 8).

**Health Sciences**: Approval for a name change for the degree of Masters in Public Health (International) to Masters in Public Health: International

**Centre for Lifelong Learning**: Approval for the introduction of interim awards at 60 credits: University Certificate of Lifelong Learning: Arts and Humanities and University Certificate of Lifelong Learning: Social Services.
**Education**: Approval of the withdrawal of the Mathematics and Education module from 2012-13.

**Centre for Health Economics**: Approval of a major modification to MSc Economic Evaluation for Health Technology Assessment by Distance Learning to allow six modules to be shared with the PG Cert and PG Dip in Health Economics for Health Care Professionals.

**Social Policy and Social Work**: Approval of a new module “Introduction to Research Methods” for the online Masters programmes in Public Policy and Management, in Public Administration, in Public Administration in International Development, and in Policy Management and Government.

**Dyslexia Action**: Approval of a request that students on Dyslexia Action’s programmes can remain under the “old scheme” assessment regulations for the 2011/12 academic year.

**11-12/116 Date of the Next Meeting**
The Committee noted the date of the next meeting: Monday 12 March at 2.15pm in room HG15, Heslington Hall