

## University Teaching Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 July 2025, 09:30-12:30, in BS/104, Berrick Saul and via video conference.**

### Meeting Attendance

Members present:

Tracy Lightfoot, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning and Students (Chair)  
Steve King, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning and Students (Deputy Chair)  
Duncan Jackson, Head of Academic Quality and Development (Secretary)  
Jan Ball-Smith, Head of Student Success  
Claire Hughes, Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Sciences)  
Sam Hellmuth, Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Arts and Humanities)  
Tom Banham, Academic Registrar and Director of Student Education and Experience  
Jen Wotherspoon, Deputy Director: Student Services  
Petros Kefalas, Vice-President Learning and Teaching, CITY College  
Kirsty Lingstadt, Director of Library, Learning, Archives and Wellbeing  
Paul Bishop (representing Sciences)  
Michael Bate (representing Sciences)  
Michelle Alexander (representing Arts and Humanities)  
Claire Ball-Smith (representing Social Sciences)  
Zoe Devlin, Head of Online Partnerships  
Kaitlyn Beattie-Zarb, York SU Activities Officer

In attendance:

Sally O'Connor, Academic Quality (Assistant Secretary)  
Richard Walker, Associate Director: Digital Education, Library, Learning, Archives & Wellbeing [UTC.24-25/104]  
Maeve Pearson, Senior Academic Practice Adviser, Academic Quality & Development Team [UTC.24-25/106]  
Paul Wakeling, Dean, York Graduate Research School [UTC.24-25/106]  
David Gent, Evidence and Impact Manager, Inclusive Education Team [UTC.24-25/107]  
Adrian Lee, Academic Quality Policy Manager, Academic Quality & Development Team [UTC.24-25/107]  
Amy Muckersie, Academic Quality Manager, Academic Quality & Development Team [UTC.24-25/110]

Apologies: Louise Thurston, Associate Director for Careers and Employability; Jill Webb, Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Social Sciences); Daniel Keith (representing Social Sciences); Simon O'Keefe (representing Sciences); Richard McClary (representing Arts and Humanities); Aya Haidar, York SU Academic Officer.

### Section 1: Standing Items

#### Welcome

24-25/222 The Chair welcomed the Committee and noted:

1. This will be the last UTC meeting for several members:
  - Claire Hughes, who will be stepping down as Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Sciences);
  - Sam Hellmuth (until January 2026) as she takes research leave in Semester 1;
  - Simon O'Keefe, whose tenure as a co-opted member finishes this month;

- Fenella Johnson, whose term as York SU Academic Officer for 2024/25 is ending.
2. The Chair thanked these members for their contributions to the Committee.
  3. New members for the 25/26 academic year will be:
    - David Barrett as the new Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Sciences);
    - Louise Cooke (Archaeology) as interim Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Arts and Humanities), for Semester 1;
    - Iain Brennan (IPC) as a co-opted member;
    - Aya Haidar as the new York SU Academic Officer;
    - two additional co-opted members.
  4. Kaitlyn Beattie-Zarb has been re-elected as York SU Activities Officer and will remain on UTC. The Chair congratulated Kaitlyn on her re-election.
  5. Claire Hughes will continue to be involved with UTC by leading collaborations with Askham Bryan College and serving as the sustainability education lead.

**Declarations of interest in items on the agenda [oral report]**

24-25/223 Members were invited to declare any potential conflicts of interest relating to the business of the meeting; none were declared.

**Unreserved minutes of the last meeting held on 15 May 2025 [UTC.24-25/101]**

24-25/224 The Committee confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 15 May 2025 as an accurate record.

**Action tracking and matters arising from the minutes not covered elsewhere on the agenda**

24-25/225 No updates were noted.

**Report of Chair's Action taken since the last meeting [UTC.24-25/102]**

24-25/226 The Chair (Pro-Vice-Chancellor Teaching, Learning and Students) has taken the following action on behalf of UTC:

1. **Recommended** to Senate the approval of a new award title: 'Master of Public Policy (MPP)'.
2. **Approved** a new Institution Wide Language Provision Policy after amendments made in response to Committee feedback via an email circulation to UTC in June 2025.

**Action:** UTC Secretary to circulate the approved policy

3. **Approved**, in principle, the Policy on Agreeing Marks and Awards for Collaborative Provision Programmes.

**Chair's report [oral report]**

24-25/227 The Chair reported:

1. NSS results are now available, and thanks were expressed to the Strategic Insight and Analysis team for efficiently processing the results and enabling messages to be released

more quickly than in previous years. In summary, overall increases in NSS scores were observed, alongside increases in sector ranking across some areas, particularly in identified areas of focus. Results pertaining to the Learning Resources theme were good, and the Library, Learning, Archives and Wellbeing team should be praised for maintaining and increasing satisfaction despite some challenges. Some schools/departments had unsatisfactory results; these will be addressed during the reporting stage and will feed into the Annual Review cycle.

- a. It is important that the work started by Claire Hughes and the NSS Steering Group is maintained.
2. Meetings have been held this week with Mumbai colleagues, and wider communications will be shared soon. This initiative will offer opportunities for innovation and should improve the experience for Indian students here at York.
3. Aligned with the name change to “University Education Committee”, the suffix to the titles of Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Associate Deans will be ‘Education and Students’ from 2025/26.
4. A PwC audit focusing on partnerships and collaborative provision has recently been conducted. No risks with current operations were identified, however some areas of medium risk were noted in light of the University’s ambitions for scaling up future partnerships as noted below:
  - a. Develop overarching up-to-date *Teaching Partnership Quality Manual* (action: in hand).
  - b. Create a single source of truth, authoritative register of partnership-delivered programmes and articulation agreements (action: centralised record to be put in place by January 2026).
  - c. Diversify partnership expertise to avoid single points of failure (action: review AQ team to support provision by September 2025).
5. A Collaborative Provision Committee will be re-established as a sub-committee of UTC to support the increasing activity in this area.
6. The Centre for Lifelong Learning is closing and the Student Protection Plan is being enacted to support current students. Jen Wotherspoon, Adrian Lee and Steve King have been supporting this process. Unfortunately, there was a lack of advance communication with York SU and a lack of student involvement in discussions. The closure is seen as a broader consequence of the current state of adult education and learning, rather than solely an issue affecting York. York College is actively engaging in this space, indicating that adult learning will not disappear from the region.
7. A recent positive meeting with York College took place to discuss enhancing collaboration, including increasing student recruitment and providing opportunities for York College students to progress to the university, and exploring direct entry routes into the University for the international A-level students York College is admitting from 2026. More staff-to-staff interaction is being explored, and York College is interested in learning from the University regarding sustainability. York College is also interested in setting up a Students' Union, which York SU is supporting them with.
8. Committee meetings for 25/26 have been released on the University Calendar of Meetings and will be circulated to members.

**Action:** UTC Assistant Secretary

**Deputy Chair's report [oral report]**

24-25/228 The Deputy Chair reported that a review by the Hellenic Authority for Higher Education recently took place in Thessaloniki regarding the change in CITY College's legal status to a non-profit, non-state university legal entity. If approved, the University of York Europe Campus will become a university legal entity with a licence in Greece. The review was positive, with a formal decision expected in August. The licence is expected to be issued in July, with programme accreditation beginning in September. Follow-up visits are expected in July or August for 6 undergraduate programmes, followed by postgraduate and PhD programmes. There will be a requirement for a dual system for progression and awards; students already admitted to 3-year bachelor's programmes will continue on that track, while newly approved bachelor's programmes will be 4 years to achieve parity with existing state universities. Tracy Lightfoot will have an important role as the Academic Provost of the Europe Campus, and wider collaborative opportunities can now be explored.

**Student Representative's report [oral report]**

24-25/229 Kaitlyn Beattie-Zarb, York SU Activities Officer, **reported:**

1. The recent Excellence Awards ceremony was successful and well-received. Congratulations to Steve King, who won the Academic Officer's Award for positively impacting student learning. The full list of winners is available on the [York SU website](#).
2. The academic representatives structure within York SU is changing. Last year's academic committee and other co-existing groups will be combined for efficiency and to avoid duplication. The Student Voice team is working with the new Academic Officer to design this new structure, ensuring that the inclusion of diverse learner voices remains a priority.
3. York SU recently held a successful round of recruitment for school/department roles, and will liaise with schools/departments over the summer regarding implementation plans.
4. There has been a significant increase in withdrawal notifications due to low attendance, primarily affecting international students. Some students have been confused by the notifications, often not understanding the implications or the need to leave the country while issues are resolved.
5. There are many ongoing academic misconduct cases. The tight timeframes and stretched departmental capacity are concerning, particularly regarding delays to graduation. The main caseload remains academic appeals.

24-25/230 The Committee **observed:**

1. It is likely that the increase in withdrawal notifications can be attributed to improved student engagement tracking via the check-in process. Reconsideration is possible in exceptional circumstances, though often still requires the student to leave the country and return when they are able to engage with studies. Efforts will be made to clarify this process to students in advance.
2. Only one finalist has an outstanding academic misconduct case. All other cases relating to finalists have been resolved and students will graduate as planned. The team is actively working to resolve the remaining case in time for graduation.

### AI update

24-25/231 In his capacity as Chair of the UTC AI Working Group, Steve King, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor, reported:

1. A five-level framework has been designed to inform students about the permissible use of AI tools in particular assessments. This transparency tool was successfully piloted in the School for Business and Society and will be implemented across the entire school in 2025/26. Seven other schools/departments across all three faculties are also piloting the framework.
2. Web pages have been updated to be a "one-stop shop" for AI information, linking out to internal and external resources. These will be launched at the beginning of the academic year, and internal communications are planned.

## Section 2: Strategic Development, Performance Monitoring and Student Insight

### NSS Recovery Plan [UTC.24-25/103]

24-25/232 Claire Hughes, Associate Dean (Teaching, Learning and Students) for Sciences, **reported** that:

1. The recent NSS results saw some increases in positivity measures, but sector ranking improvements remain a longer-term goal. The NSS Recovery Plan outlines proposed actions to improve 2026 survey results and beyond.
2. The NSS Steering Group will continue under new leadership, and will implement the recovery plan upon UTC approval.
3. Four priority areas were approved at the last UTC, and working groups defined actions within these. The actions fell into two categories:
  - a. Mobilising existing projects or groups to improve NSS scores. This can be addressed by:
    - i. Engaging the following projects/groups to contribute towards improving NSS scores: Assessment and Feedback Project; Annual Review; No Gaps; Interdepartmental Teaching; Work-related Learning; Student Voice; Module Evaluation; Student Comms Network; and the Digital Skills Team;
    - ii. Asking project teams/groups to report to the NSS Steering Group on a 6-monthly basis progress against agreed actions
  - b. Enhancing awareness and leadership of NSS in schools/departments. This can be addressed by:
    - i. Continuing successful approaches to enhancing response rates;
    - ii. Asking Heads of Schools/Departments to identify a lead, who will be responsible for NSS planning, reporting and action planning. The Academic Quality and Development team are to create, maintain and annually update a register of the NSS leads in each school/department.
 

**Action:** Academic Quality and Development team
    - iii. Introducing an annual meeting for teaching leads to discuss NSS and other learning and teaching enhancements, to be organised and led by

the Head of Academic Quality and Development, with the involvement of the Associate Deans for Teaching, Learning and Students;

**Action:** Head of Academic Quality and Development

- iv. Introducing a mechanism to ensure schools/departments have a full annual cycle of NSS business and do not just focus during the survey period.
- 4. The Chair thanked the NSS Steering Group for their work.
- 5. The Committee **approved** the recovery plan and associated actions.
- 6. The Committee **recommended** that a report from the NSS Steering Group should become an annual item on future UEC agendas.

**Action:** UTC Secretary

#### **Annual Review of VLE Site Design Principles [UTC.24-25/104]**

24-25/233 Richard Walker (Associate Director: Digital Education, Library, Learning, Archives & Wellbeing) presented a paper on the review of the VLE site design principles for non-professional programmes and reported:

- 1. General adherence to the principles is very good, with no negative feedback received.
- 2. Areas for improvement include content organisation; assessment information; reading lists and out-of-date material.
- 3. Schools/departments hold responsibility for reviewing their content and meeting the principles, and it is not within the remit of the Digital Education team to undertake this.
- 4. The Committee was asked to endorse the Digital Education team's approach to:
  - a. Working with schools/departments during the summer to:
    - i. Use the automated template usage review report and as a basis for discussion on template requirements;
    - ii. Draw attention to the design principles, underlining the need for consistency of presentation;
    - iii. Deliver refresher training on Ultra functionality;
    - iv. Promote the need for schools/departments to take responsibility for quality assurance and template adherence.

24-25/234 The Committee **observed** that:

- 1. Endorsing school/departmental self-review might lead to a lack of consistency over time, undoing the significant work put into standardisation;

24-25/235 The Committee **suggested** that:

- 1. Inconsistencies on the VLE may be identified through student comments in the NSS or via other feedback mechanisms such as pulse surveys, especially with more students now

taking shared modules.

2. Reviewing VLE content and principles could be part of the work considered by the NSS Strategic Leads meetings when they are set up.

24-25/236 The Committee **agreed** that:

1. Instead of producing an annual report, the Digital Education team should continue to monitor issues, and only return to the Committee if necessary. Accordingly, this report should be removed from the Committee's annual cycle of business.

**Action:** UTC Secretary

24-25/237 The Committee **endorsed** the Digital Education Team's proposed actions.

**Student Protection Plan Update [UTC.24-25/105]**

24-25/238 Tracy Lightfoot (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning and Students) **reported** that:

1. The updates reflect a review of practice elsewhere in the sector, changes in York's provision, and ongoing challenges within higher education. The main changes include the following:
  - Institutional closure has been added as a separate category (previously this was part of the University campus or delivery location closure);
  - School/department closure has been updated to include Faculty closure;
  - Programme closure has been replaced with Changes to programmes including programme closure/suspension;
  - Other material programme changes has been amended to specifically mention including in year changes to core modules;
  - Qualification changes or withdrawals has been amended to specifically mention including loss of programme accreditation;
  - A new category on delivery in collaboration with other partners has been added given the increase in partnership delivery and associated scrutiny. This will also cross-link to the new quality framework for collaborative provision and will be linked to partnership contracts;
  - A new category on changes to academic staff has been added;
  - Industrial Action has been added as a separate category (previously this was part of external influences);
  - A new category on Student Sponsor License has been added.
2. The plan covers taught and research students.
3. The plan will be reviewed annually, and more frequently if external regulatory changes occur.

4. The plan needs to be submitted to the Office for Students for approval. Any feedback from OfS might necessitate further revisions before final publication in September.
5. The plan has received endorsement from UEB, Council and the Dean of YGRS. It will be submitted to the upcoming YGRSB as category 2 for information.

24-25/239 The Committee **observed**:

1. Temporary amendments may be necessary due to upcoming changes to Ofsted frameworks.

24-25/240 The Committee **suggested** that:

1. The reference to specific issues affecting the University of Hull should be removed before publication, as it will quickly lose currency.

**Action:** Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning and Students

2. It is important to raise awareness of the plan in schools/departments and central services.

24-25/241 The Committee **approved** the Student Protection Plan subject to the removal of the reference to the University of Hull.

### Section 3: Policy and Regulatory Matters

#### Congregation for Awards In Absentia

24-25/242 The Committee enacted an extraordinary private Congregation to confer awards on all eligible students graduating in absentia, with the Chair acting as the Presiding Officer.

#### Assessment and Feedback Policy Proposals [UTC.24-25/107]

*[Secretary's note: this item and the following item were presented in the opposite order to the agenda]*

24-25/243 David Gent (Evidence and Impact Manager, Inclusive Education) introduced the *Policy on Specific Aspects of Reasonable Adjustments in Assessment*: noting that it is designed to work alongside the overarching reasonable adjustments policy approved in May, with further work planned in 2025/26 as part of the ongoing Assessment and Feedback project. The specific changes include the following:

- a. A clarification of the policy on extra time in online exams;
  - b. The inclusion of York Online;
  - c. A slightly adjusted policy on urgent or severe cases to allow students to take an exam and then claim Extenuating Circumstances;
  - d. A clarification that Graduate Teaching Assistants are considered staff for purposes of this policy.
2. The Committee were asked to approve:
    - a. Revision of the ECA policy to achieve consistency with this policy;

**Action:** Standing Committee on Assessment

- b. Updating of the student-facing website to achieve consistency with this policy.

**Action:** Deputy Director: Student Services

- c. Asking the Assessment and Feedback project team to work with schools/departments to develop a procedure for sharing adjustment information for electives and cross-departmental modules (a temporary measure until the SSP project resolves this).

**Action:** Evidence and Impact Manager, Inclusive Education

24-25/244 The Committee suggested that:

1. The first column of the table in section 26(b) should be removed to clarify that extra time is based solely on the submission window.
2. The policy's title should be clearer. Suggestions of 'Supplementary' or 'Overarching' Policy on Reasonable Adjustments in Assessment were offered.
3. It should be clearly stated which takes precedence where reasonable adjustments conflict with PSRB requirements or competency standards, as unlike other policies, this one does not explicitly mention PSRBs in the exceptions section;
4. It would be useful to review the University of Bristol's policy to draw on areas of best practice.

**Action:** Evidence and Impact Manager, Inclusive Education (items 1-4)

5. There is inconsistency in policy around occasional extensions where solutions are released immediately after the deadline. It was clarified that this will be addressed next year; the current policy remains unchanged for now, allowing schools/departments to continue existing practices.

24-25/245 The Committee **approved** the actions and policy, subject to adjustments being made in relation to the feedback provided.

24-25/246 Adrian Lee (Policy Manager, Academic Quality and Development) introduced the *Policy on the Assessment of Work Based Learning* noting that it focuses specifically on work based learning, having removed the study abroad elements that were previously incorporated, including placement or work experience elements within taught modules as well as longer placements such as the years in industry, but not placement learning within professional programme settings.

24-25/247 The Committee suggested that:

1. The "Definition" section should be revised as it gives examples of work based learning rather than a definition.
2. The exact scope of work based learning should be clarified to confirm if it includes, for example, voluntary work, internships, or placements within the university (eg law or sustainability clinics).
3. This policy should be limited to longer placements, ie those amounting to 60 or 120

credits.

4. Work based learning within taught modules should be covered by standard assessment policies, unless the external partner contributes to the students' marks.
5. Other university policies should be reviewed to ensure they are inclusive of work based learning.
6. The reference to "placement staff," should be clarified to refer specifically to staff from the work-based learning provider.

**Action:** Policy Manager, Academic Quality and Development (all items)

24-25/248 The Committee **approved** the policy, subject to adjustments being made in relation to the feedback provided.

24-25/249 Adrian Lee (Policy Manager, Academic Quality and Development) introduced the *Policy on Provision of Summative Feedback* and noted:

1. The primary focus on summative feedback, with formative feedback being a development area for the next academic year.
2. The incorporation of the 25-day marking and feedback rule as discussed at the May UTC meeting.
3. Inclusion of making student access to exam scripts mandatory. Annotations on scripts should therefore be student-focused rather than aimed at other markers or moderators.
4. Thanks to UTC members who have provided input into updating these policies.

24-25/250 The Committee **suggested** that:

1. The reference to PSRB requirements should be amended to allow professional programmes to adhere to expected practices as well as regulatory requirements.

**Action:** Policy Manager, Academic Quality and Development Team

24-25/251 The Committee **noted**:

1. Concerns over the accessibility of Turnitin in-line comments has meant there is inconsistency in their use across the University.

24-25/252 The Committee **observed** that:

1. Stating annotated comments should be linked only to academic criteria could constrain markers from providing useful feedback on wider aspects of professional learning.
2. Stating the feedback summary should include 2-3 actionable points might constrain markers or lead to unhelpful feedback if more or fewer points would be appropriate
  - a. It was clarified that this is existing policy, however a need for new guidance to supplement the policy has been identified and will be developed as soon as possible. This will support markers in providing the appropriate volume and content of actionable feedback, which may in some cases be more or fewer than 2-3 points.

3. The policy references "feedback on drafts of summative assessment," which is technically formative assessment. This may also compromise the anonymity of the summative work.
  - a. It was clarified that whilst the university's policy on anonymous marking applies specifically to the point of marking, not necessarily to interactions before or after, this point should be kept under review in case of any issues upon implementation.
4. Making script access mandatory may generate significant numbers of student requests for individual feedback, and suggested that this section should be revised to state that students are permitted to ask questions if they choose, but schools/departments are not required to engage in individual meetings.
5. The term "module documentation" is ambiguous and should be replaced with "assessment information on the VLE".
6. External Examiners find script annotations useful, and therefore aiming all comments at students may not be helpful. If comments assisting examiners and markers are permitted, markers should ensure it is clear where their comments are intended as student feedback.
7. The policy should incorporate that feedback must be issued/reissued if an academic misconduct allegation is not upheld, in addition to the mark being reinstated.
8. NSS results and module evaluations should be the primary indicators for reviewing this policy, alongside external examiner feedback, rather than what is stated in the policy; ie that SCA will monitor implementation via feedback from stakeholders, including staff.
9. The policy is overlong, which may limit engagement, and suggested that it could and should be condensed.

**Action:** Policy Manager, Academic Quality and Development Team (items 1-9)

24-25/253 As a general point relating to all policies, the Committee noted that the Institutional Policy Framework may not be appropriate for UTC policies, and its continued use should be discussed with the Governance Office.

**Action:** Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning and Students; Head of Academic Quality and Development

24-25/254 The Committee **approved** the policy subject to adjustments being made in relation to the feedback provided.

#### **Graduate Teaching Assistants Policy [UTC.24-25/106]**

24-25/255 Maeve Pearson (Senior Academic Practice Adviser) introduced the revised GTA Policy and asked the Committee to **consider**:

1. Should policy define whether the GTA Coordinator must be a professional services or an academic member of staff?
2. If the current standard of IELTS 7 or equivalent should remain policy.
3. If distance learners should be permitted to work as GTAs.
4. Integrated Masters students should be permitted to work as GTAs (with or without requiring UTC permission)

24-25/256

The Committee **observed that:**

1. The role involves both administrative and professional support and development responsibilities for GTAs, and suggested that the policy be reworded to reflect this. Academic GTA Coordinators may need to have assigned administrative support from professional services and/or professional services. GTA Coordinators may need assigned support from an academic for GTA mentoring and training.
  - a. It was agreed that wording around this should be updated using flexible phrasing and shared with the PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students and the Dean of York Graduate Research School for sign-off.
2. Specific IELTS 7 requirements may act as a barrier for otherwise competent students, and suggested that the policy should emphasise competency standards relevant to the specific discipline. The PhD supervisor, as part of their recommendation for a GTA to teach, should affirm the student's language competency as they have direct knowledge of the student's abilities.
3. If distance learning PGR students can demonstrate UK residency and their right to work and study in the UK then it should be permissible for them to become GTAs, where teaching can be offered online only.
  - a. It was clarified that this would require separate online training, which would be a resource consideration, and that broader discussions about how this relates to new collaborative partners, - particularly with the increase in PhD numbers from the Mumbai initiative - may need to take place.
4. It is not known the extent to which schools/departments are currently allowing GTAs to teach at PGT level without the express permission of UTC. Existing practice has recently been surveyed, and the results of this should be used to inform the policy.

**Action:** Senior Academic Practice Adviser (items 1-4)

5. Additional training and checks may be needed before a GTA teaches on specific programmes such as apprenticeships. Guidance on this could be combined with the rationale for recruitment.

**Action:** Head of Student Success

6. It is disappointing that it is still possible to employ GTAs on a casual basis.
  - a. It was clarified that a meeting is planned with HR to address this and other HR concerns.

24-25/257

The Committee **suggested that:**

1. The statement that GTAs are "not responsible for providing pastoral support" should be reconciled with the new *Policy on Specific Aspects of Reasonable Adjustments in Assessment*, as a student may declare their need for support to a GTA. The policy should provide guidance to GTAs on how to respond to urgent student needs without taking on full pastoral responsibility.

**Action:** Senior Academic Practice Adviser

24-25/258 The policy will be updated based on feedback received, and circulated to UTC for

a final review for approval. Going forward, the policy will be reviewed annually.

**Action:** Senior Academic Practice Adviser

#### **Design Policy Proposals [UTC.24-25/108]**

24-25/259 This item will be considered by circulation; the Committee should provide feedback by 25 July. An extraordinary UTC meeting may be convened to discuss these if necessary.

**Action:** All members

#### **Programme and Module Evaluation Policy Proposal [UTC.24-25/109]**

24-25/260 Duncan Jackson (Head of Academic Quality and Development) asked the Committee to **discuss** and **approve** the proposed policy, with feedback on the following questions:

1. Section 18 & 19: How long should students be given to complete a module and stage/programme evaluations?
2. Section 26: Should qualitative comments be checked for confidentiality and abuse, and redacted if necessary?
3. Sections 28 & 29: Should a maximum time be set between the closure of an evaluation and students receiving a staff response to the evaluation?
4. Section 30: Should a recommended threshold be set for minimum expected response rate, below which action is triggered within the department?
5. Section 31: Should threshold for acceptable performance in quantitative responses be set and, if so, how should the threshold be determined?

24-25/261 The Committee **observed** that:

1. It is important to close the feedback loop and address issues raised. Staff responses are not expected to address individual issues but rather overarching themes at module level, in proportion to the amount of responses received.
2. Enhancement work may be possible in the future, such as integrating module feedback with data from the VLE such as lecture capture statistics, to identify areas students re-watch multiple times and cross-reference them with evaluation comments. This could help to improve teaching quality.

24-25/262 The Committee **suggested** that:

1. Module evaluations should open for responses towards the end of teaching, and be available for ten working days after the end of teaching.
2. Students should be given an opportunity to complete the evaluation in timetabled teaching time.
3. The timing of evaluations may need to differ for some professional programmes that aren't taught in a modular way.
  - a. It was clarified that all programmes are in scope, and that there are no exemptions.

4. Comments should be checked, and redacted if inappropriate, before being shared with module leaders.
5. Staff responses should be provided within ten working days.
6. Instead of including a strict threshold in the policy at this point, response rate data should be provided to feed into existing standard processes such as Annual Review, as setting response rate thresholds too high could create excessive work for schools/departments.
7. Minimum threshold expectations on quantitative evaluation questions should not be included in policy at this point, but perceived issues or underperformance should be addressed through Annual Review and annual performance reviews as appropriate.
8. When drafted, the associated procedure/guidance should be submitted to UEC for review

**Action:** Head of Academic Quality and Development (items 1-8)

24-25/263 The Committee **approved** the policy in principle.

**New Programme Approval Policy Proposal [UTC.24-25/110]**

24-25/264 Amy Muckersie (Academic Quality Manager, Academic Quality and Development)  
**reported that:**

1. UEC will be responsible for all taught programme approvals from academic year 2025/26.
2. The annual cycle of business is being reviewed to identify what genuinely needs to come to UEC, what can be handled elsewhere, and what can be removed entirely from the Committee's agenda. This streamlining will allow dedicated time for focused discussion of new programme proposals.
3. Proposals will be submitted to standard scheduled UEC meetings and will be considered in the third hour of the meeting.
4. Individual UEC members will be specifically tasked with reviewing proposals.
5. All UEC members, including student representatives, will be asked to comment on proposals.
6. Programme leaders will be invited to these meetings to receive comments and facilitate discussion.
7. Associated changes to the Terms of Reference for both UEC and FLTGs need to be approved.
8. Stages 1-3 of the current approval process are not changing, although a review of these stages may be beneficial, as some inconsistencies are currently occurring.

24-25/265 The Committee **observed:**

1. Some professional programmes require alternative arrangements and the need to coordinate with accrediting bodies, and it was clarified that this will not change, and such approvals will still take place in the manner required by the PSRB. The policy and procedures should ensure this is acknowledged.

**Action:** Academic Quality Manager

24-25/266 The Committee **approved** the changes to UTC's Terms of Reference.

#### **Section 4: Quality Assurance Processes**

No items in this section

#### **Section 5: Sub-committee Summaries and Meeting-related information**

No items in this section

#### **Section 6: Category 2 Items**

Items for Information

[Secretary's Note: With regard to its Category II agenda, UTC was provided with the following Category 2 Agenda Items which were provided for: [a] information only, where UTC discussion is not required or anticipated, unless a request is made to escalate an item is from Category II to Category I for consideration OR as [b] supplementary information and data for items on the Category I agenda.]

- 24-25/267 Standing Committee on Assessment: Summary of the meeting held on 27 June 2025
- 24-25/268 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups: Summary of the meeting: Social Sciences held on 18 February 2025
- 24-25/269 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups: Summary of the meeting: Social Sciences held on 7 May 2025
- 24-25/270 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups: Summary of the meeting: Social Sciences held on 18 February 2025
- 24-25/271 Apprenticeship Monitoring Board: minutes of the meeting held on 27 March 2025
- 24-25/272 York-HEP Quality Review Group: report for the Joint Monitoring Board held on 28 April 2025
- 24-25/273 Joint Learning and Teaching Strategy Group: minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2025
- 24-25/274 Employability Advisory Group: notes from the meeting held on 12 March 2025
- 24-25/275 Academic Skills update
- 24-25/276 Reading lists: an update on activities and outcomes so far
- 24-25/277 SSP Project: progress update

**Sally O'Connor, Academic Quality**

**July 2025**