

**UNIVERSITY OF YORK**

**Senate**

**TEACHING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2019**

**Present:** John Robinson (Chair)  
Jane Baston  
Michael Bate (M19-20/1 to 12; M19-20/17 & 18)  
Mike Bentley  
Wayne Campbell (M19-20/8 to 16; M19-20/18)  
Gill Chitty  
Sabine Clarke  
Sam Cobb  
Nigel Dandy  
Jen Gibbons  
Steve King  
Barry Lee  
Tracy Lightfoot  
Sinéad McCotter  
Lisa O'Malley (M19-20/1 to 15; M19-20/17 & 18)  
Giang Nguyen  
Mark Nicholson  
Matthew Perry  
Andrew Pickering  
Jill Webb  
Jez Wells

**In Attendance:** Elizabeth Allen (ASO, Minute Secretary) and Jane Iddon (ASO, Secretary).

Apologies were received from Ed Braman, Claire Hughes and Dave Smith.

**CATEGORY I BUSINESS**

**M19-20/1 Welcome**

The Chair welcomed new members.

- Andrew Pickering
- Mark Nicholson
- Sam Cobb
- Jill Webb (ex officio member – newly appointed Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students for Faculty of Social Sciences)
- Giang Nguyen (Undergraduate Student Representative - YUSU Academic Officer)
- Jane Baston (Postgraduate Student Representative - GSA Vice President Academic)
- Elizabeth Allen (Minute Secretary – in attendance)

Other members were welcomed back.

## **M19-20/2 Minutes and Matters Arising**

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2019 (UTC.19-20/1), subject to:

- the addition of Tracy Lightfoot as present at the meeting;
- the replacement of 'National' with 'Nursing and' in the first paragraph of the oral update from the Chair (M18-19/149 refers).

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC. 19-20/1 **Appendix 1**).

- The action arising from the Annual Report on Timetabling and Space was now closed (M18-19/102 refers). The action was to provide data that would allow UTC to make a decision on a request from Space Services. Because the modelling data with respect to the impact of greater availability of staff on Timetable Key Performance Indicators had not been provided by Space Services, the original motivation for the action had lapsed.
- The revision of the Management Periodic Review Action plan (M18-19/162 refers) was ongoing and would be carried forward to the next meeting.
- The proposed LLM in Law (Juris Doctor) (M18-19/161 refers) had been approved. The single UTC condition of approval was to obtain confirmation from the QAA that the proposal was FHEQ-compliant. The QAA's response to the University's proposal advised that there was no objection to this programme being developed. The QAA's response satisfactorily met UTC's condition.

## **M19-20/3 Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Committee **considered** revised terms of reference and membership for 2019/20 (UTC.19-20/2). Minor edits had been made to the terms of reference to correct terminology and to make explicit that the withdrawal and suspension of taught provision, with respect to the academic case, resided with UTC. The Committee's membership had been updated to reflect the appointments made by Senate.

The Chair advised that, subsequent to the circulation of papers, there had been a discussion with the Director of Planning regarding the relationship between UTC and the Access and Participation Steering Group (APSG). The outcome of that discussion had been a recommendation that the APSG be a formal sub-group of UTC.

The Committee **decided to recommend to Senate approval** (i) of its revised terms of reference (ii) that the reporting line from APSG to Teaching Committee be formally recognised in the governance structure via the APSG being a sub-group of UTC.

## **M19-20/4 Annual Cycle of Business**

The Committee **received** its annual cycle of business, a list of members' roles and responsibilities, and a provisional allocation of members to periodic review and other UTC visits for 2019/20 (UTC.19-20/3).

The Chair reported that, subsequent to the circulation of papers, there had two revisions to Periodic Review Chairs:

- Jen Gibbons had been nominated to Chair the Women's Studies Periodic Review;
- Sinéad McCotter had been nominated to Chair the Social and Political Sciences Periodic Review.

## M19-20/5 Oral Update from the Chair

The Committee **received** an oral update from the Chair:

- The Chair congratulated Professor Gabrielle Finn (Hull York Medical School) who had won a National Teaching Fellowship from Advance HE.
- The Chair congratulated Professor Nicky Milner who had been shortlisted for Research Supervisor of the Year in this year's Times Higher Education Awards.
- The Chair noted that York is top of the Russell Group for 'teaching quality satisfaction' in the Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide 2020. The guide puts York in 25th place overall out of all the UK's 134 universities for teaching.
- The Chair raised to the attention of the Committee a Category II paper: Outcome of the UK Standing Commitment for Quality Assessment's (UKSCQA) consultation regarding degree classification. The Committee had previously received the institutional response to the consultation (UTC.18-19/82). The outcome was a UK HE sector-wide commitment to protecting the value of UK degrees via a 'Statement of Intent' (signed by sector representative groups and endorsed by the UKSCQA) which articulated the ways in which the sector would continue to protect the value of degrees. In order to implement the Statement of Intent, Higher Education Institutions had been invited to publish a 'Degree Outcomes Statement' articulating the results of an internal institutional review which considered:
  - quantitative trends in student degree outcomes;
  - whether assessment criteria meet common sector reference points;
  - whether the rationale for degree algorithms is clear and publicly accessible;
  - whether the institution is making use of Advance HE's external examiner professional development programme and subject-specific calibration activity or providing alternative arrangements.

The QAA was taking the lead on drafting guidance for institutions. A small group (led by the Standing Committee on Assessment) would undertake some exploratory work to analyse the Degree Outcomes Statement and some of the surrounding issues. Once the guidance was available, a decision would be made on whether to undertake the institutional review activity necessary to develop a York Degree Outcomes Statement. It was reported that, should the decision be taken to develop a York Degree Outcomes Statement, a Working Group (comprising members of SCA, UTC and Professional Services) would be established to undertake the work necessary.

- The validation collaboration with STEM Learning had now come to an end. The Chair noted that the final cohort of the Senior Technicians Accredited Co-Leaders in Science programme completed in July 2019. The University and STEM Learning had exchanged letters (with thanks) for the high quality provision delivered over the last 12 years.
- Subsequent to the circulation of papers the University had now received approval from the Nursing Midwifery Council for the FdSc in Health and Social Care: Nursing Associate (Category II agendum 32 refers). Revised programme documentation, for University sign-off, was being reviewed by the Chair of the conjoint approval panel.

## M19-20/6 Update from the Student Representatives

The Committee **received** an oral report from the YUSU representative as follows:

- A number of YUSU events were coming up including an Open Event on 23 October and *Start the Conversation: Decolonising and Diversifying Curriculum at York* on 30 October. Members were encouraged to attend and to promote the events to colleagues.
- The nominations for Undergraduate Course Representatives were currently taking place and would be closing at the end of the week.

The Committee **received** an oral report from the GSA representative as follows:

- Nominations for Postgraduate Course Representatives were finished, with voting to be closed on 11 October. The representatives would be in place by the end of October.

#### **M19-20/7 National Student Survey**

*Sally O'Connor, Academic Support Office, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report on the results of the National Student Survey (NSS) 2019 (UTC.19-20/4).

The report provided analysis of institutional and departmental results. A total of 2,531 University of York students responded to the NSS, a response rate of 68%, which was an increase of 2% from 2018. Overall Satisfaction increased from 84.61% to 88.66%, with an OfS benchmark for York of 85% and a sector average of 83.65%. The University improved in all dimensions (with the exception of the students' union question) and exceeded sector-wide averages.

The Overall Satisfaction result placed the University first out of the 22 Russell Group members that had results reported in the NSS (from joint sixth place in 2018). With the exception of the students' union question, the University maintained or improved (significantly, in some areas) its position in all rankings.

For the 22 reporting Russell Group members, York ranked 1<sup>st</sup> for Overall Satisfaction, Teaching on My Course, Learning Opportunities, Assessment and Feedback, Academic Support, Organisation and Management. It maintained 7<sup>th</sup> position for the Student Voice. The Chair noted that overall the University had done well, seeing an upward trend on a par with 2016 and 2017; this suggested that 2018 was an anomalous year (with results being affected by the industrial action).

The University had maintained a first quartile position in the sector in both Organisation and Management and Learning Resources. Overall Satisfaction, Teaching on My Course, Assessment and Feedback and Academic Support had risen by one quartile into the first quartile position. More subjects had maintained or improved their position than had declined, in all dimensions except the Students' Union, and more were in the top two than the bottom two quartiles.

It was noted that departments with a vision for structured change, for example Biology, had seen improvements in the NSS scores in response to these changes. Likewise, departments with targeted interventions in place, who had engaged in making improvements (for example Management), had seen an increase in their NSS scores. Furthermore it was reported that the positive impact of Institution-wide policies, such as Recording of Lectures, had begun to make a difference to the student experience (and therefore satisfaction).

Members discussed the results:

- The overall results in general were very pleasing, especially in comparison to the Russell Group institutions.
- There was a decrease in satisfaction rates for welfare resources and support for students with a disability. It was reported that a Task and Finish Group, involving staff and student representation, had been established to produce a new student welfare support model.
- Whilst the Assessment and Feedback dimension had improved it was noted that there were a large number (299) of negative comments related to marking and feedback. It

was noted that SCA would consider a report on assessment issues raised in the NSS at its November meeting.

- There was a decline in satisfaction rates for the Students' Union. The steps being taken by YUSU to address the negative comments were noted (UTC.19-20/4, **section C**).
- Whilst a long-term upward trend had been observed by the PVC (from Tableau Workbooks), members noted that the report contained (for the most part) comparative data only for the previous year; the long-term trends were therefore difficult to see. The PVC agreed to explore whether longer term trend data could be included in 2020 report.

**Action: PVC (LTS) / Academic Support Office**

- The results for HYMS were disappointing and members queried whether the data could be segregated for Hull and York. The PVC advised that, whilst the data could be segregated, he did not anticipate that this would show discernable difference (between the two parent universities). It would be the responsibility of the HYMS Joint Senate Committee to review the data in more detail. Members suggested that recent improvements, such as the introduction of longitudinal placements, could address some of the issues affecting the low satisfaction rates last year.

The Chair thanked Sally O'Connor and Karen Payne (BIU) for their support with the analysis of the results.

**M19-20/8 Student Engagement project – Freshers' Survey results**

*David Gent, Student Engagement Project Manager, Academic Support Office, attended for this item.*

The committee **considered** an analysis, arising from the Student Engagement project, of the Freshers' Survey results for 2017 and 2018 (UTC.19-20/5).

The results supplemented previous analyses of the Freshers' Survey results prepared by Zoë Devlin (UTC.17-18/100) and (UTC.18-19/110). The paper presented a statistical analysis of the past two years' worth of data, using a binary logistic regression analysis, plus a qualitative analysis of open comments, on questions within the survey relating to settling in, study routines, community and engagement in learning. The recommendations included in the paper arose from the results and were designed to inform strategic thinking rather than short-term actions.

During discussion the following points were made:

- Making friends appeared to be a key determinant of whether or not a student felt settled and part of the University community: it also influenced whether students developed a good study routine. The Committee identified that academic communities (in addition to colleges and student societies) were important ways in which students could make social connections, and therefore that contact events such as lectures, seminars, supervision and laboratory sessions were important in building relationships *between* students.
- An understanding of University study appeared to be an important factor as to whether a student had a good study routine and felt engaged in their learning.
- Mental Health appeared as an important area affecting student engagement in the first year: students who self-identified as needing support for their mental health (39% of respondents in 2018/19) were less likely to feel settled and part of the University community.

In the light of three key themes the Committee **recommended** that the following findings be presented to Faculty Learning and Teaching Group October meetings with a request to disseminate within departments as appropriate:

- that it would be useful to consider ways in which departments might facilitate social connections for first years within the curriculum. This might, for instance, be through formal or informal group work or pair work; use of icebreakers in small group teaching. Departments may also wish to consider developing models (such as that in Sociology) where small group teaching in first year core modules is structured around college membership in order to facilitate cohort-building;
- that it would also be useful for departments to check that personal supervision meetings in the first term are probing key themes such as settling in and the establishment of a good study routine. Departments may wish to consider establishing structured questions for this, where these do not already exist.

**Action: Secretary**

The accuracy of statistical significance values reported in the paper as  $p=0.000$  was queried.

*Secretary's post-meeting note: Subsequent to the discussion, it was clarified that these values were as reported by the SPSS software package (which reports such values only to three decimal places). The values should more correctly have been written as  $p<0.005$ .*

The Committee suggested that the findings in the paper might usefully inform the development of the 'Back on Track: Repeating your first year' student guide. A further suggestion was to incorporate the findings into freshers' week, through incorporating managing expectations within the Preparing to Study websites during freshers' week. It was also noted that the findings from the graduate welcome week survey, may provide further insight into the student engagement project. The Committee **agreed** that it would be useful to explore the feasibility of amending the freshers' survey to more closely probe friendship information and to extend the scope of the survey to postgraduate taught students.

**Action: Student Engagement Project Manager**

The Committee **endorsed** the three proposals (below) included in the paper. It was **agreed** that the Student Engagement Steering Group give consideration to these and report back, as appropriate, to a future UTC meeting. In respect of the third recommendation, the Committee **agreed** that prioritising student mental health and wellbeing should continue.

1. Review departmental induction and first term activities, with a view to ensuring these are effective in supporting students to make connections with peers and in helping students to develop an understanding of University study within their discipline.
2. Whether existing actions designed to build both academic and social connections, such as basing first year groups on college membership (done in Sociology and Chemistry) could be rolled out to other departments.
3. Continue to prioritise student mental health and wellbeing, and publicise sources of support in this area.

**Action: Student Engagement Steering Group**

The Chair thanked David for presenting the paper.

## **M19-20/9 Subject-Level Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework**

*David Gent, Academic Support Office, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report on the results of the Subject TEF 2019 pilot (UTC.19-20/6).

The report outlined the pilot Subject TEF method and results. It was **noted** that results closely tracked the 'step 1b' hypothesis. Narrative submissions were successful in securing higher awards for borderline hypotheses in five cases. The University retained its institutional

Gold award in the pilot and the Subject Level results comprised 11 Golds, 11 Silvers and 1 Bronze award. Departments had been asked to reflect on Subject TEF results and data in their Annual Programme Review report and in relation to action planning for this year. It was reported that the Government had asked the Office for Students (OfS) to 'publish' Subject TEF in 2021, adapting the method in light of the Pearce review; what this meant in practice was, as yet, unknown.

It was reported that the subject TEF results had not been accompanied by a narrative commentary; the absence of feedback had constrained the analysis of the results. Nevertheless, the pilot had provided an opportunity for departments to demonstrate areas of good practice, and were an exemplar of how well individual departments can share excellence with other departments.

The Chair thanked David for presenting the paper.

#### **M19-20/10 YUSU Excellence in Teaching and Supervision Awards**

The Committee **considered** a report on the YUSU Excellence in Teaching and Supervision Awards (UTC.19-20/7). It was reported that 270 students had submitted 369 nominations for 196 members of staff. Whilst the number of nominations had decreased this year the 2018 awards saw the highest ever number of nominations received for individual staff members (in various categories), which suggested that students were taking the time to recognise those staff that had gone above and beyond.

It was noted that attendance was lower than in previous years. The Committee suggested that, for future awards, YUSU fix the date earlier; fixing the date earlier would give the University and departments longer to promote it and may facilitate attendance through reducing the number of event / meeting clashes.

The Committee congratulated: Ed Braman, Highly Commended, Academic Officer's Award; Jane Iddon, winner of the Academic Officer's Award; Dave Smith, winner of the Most Inspiring Award.

#### **M19-20/11 Student Voice**

The Committee **considered** a proposal, from the Student Voice Group, to develop a bank of resources to support staff with enhancement of student voice practices (UTC.19-20/8).

During discussion the following points were made:

- Members were strongly in favour of the principle of developing a bank of student voice resources.
- Members queried whether a web-based repository would be the most appropriate platform for the resource bank. Further consideration was needed with respect to the most effective way to disseminate the resources.
- Student Voice and Student Representation were not clearly defined terms. Members noted that, prior to the development of a project plan, it would be useful to explore these terms in greater depth with a view to reaching a shared understanding. The Committee suggested that the Annual Strategy meeting (5 December 2019) could be used to reflect in a structured way on student voice documents from elsewhere.

The Committee **endorsed** the principle of developing a bank of student voice resources and **recommended** that the resources referenced in the paper be reviewed and the best three identified. The three resources identified would be read by members in advance of the Annual Strategy meeting and inform discussion therein.

**Action: Academic Officer, YUSU**

## **M19-20/12 Degree Apprenticeship Project**

The Committee **received** a report on the Degree Apprenticeships Project (UTC.19-20/9).

The Committee **noted** the work undertaken, to date, to develop the capabilities for the University to deliver Degree Apprenticeship programmes. During discussion the following points were made:

- employers were integral to the design of an apprenticeship programme;
- Apprenticeship Standards specify the knowledge, skills and behaviours (KSBs) required to demonstrate occupational competence in the relevant role and also whether the apprenticeship delivery was 'non-integrated' or 'integrated';
- a 'non-integrated' apprenticeship included a separate independent end-point assessment (EPA) which was undertaken after completion of the degree – the EPA would test the learner's occupational competence; [Thus, it was possible for a learner to successfully complete the degree but not the apprenticeship]
- an 'integrated' apprenticeship encompassed the EPA within the degree; [Thus, it was not possible to complete the degree without also completing the apprenticeship]
- it was a requirement for the learner's prior experience to be mapped against the KSBs prior to enrolment; this 'initial assessment' would inform the programme delivery for the learner as well as the financial resources received;
- the learner's progress would be monitored through regular tripartite review meetings involving the learner, the University and the employer.

There had been investment, through new posts, to support the implementation of degree apprenticeship provision. An Apprenticeship Unit to support the operational focus, in particular the employer focus, and the EFSA and OFSTED requirements, had been created.

The approval process incorporated an additional 'endorsement' step, to permit development of the programme. Endorsement did not guarantee approval at either the planning stage or the academic stage. It was reported that the initial target with respect to employers was the NHS; the first degree apprenticeship developed (*approval pending*) was the Nursing Associate (M19-20/5 refers) and an MSc in Advanced Clinical Practice was currently in development. That said, other organisations had expressed an interest in collaborating. It was noted that some existing University programmes would lend themselves more easily to be aligned to an apprenticeship degree.

It was noted that the Degree Apprenticeship workstream lead for Academic Quality and Teaching and Learning Design would be working with departments where placements are key to programme delivery, to identify and share good practice with respect to placement quality assurance.

*Secretary's post-meeting note: The Professional Practice Programmes Forum is being launched on Monday 18 November, 12.30-14.00. The aim of the Forum is to provide an opportunity for staff involved in professional practice, work-based learning and apprenticeship programmes to come together, share practice and identify areas for further development and wider support.*

## **M19-20/13 The Department of Sociology: LLB in Law and Criminology**

The Committee **considered** a proposal (UTC.19-20/10) for an LLB in Law and Criminology programme from the Department of Sociology, with York Law School and the Department of Social Policy and Social Work, to start in September 2020. The programme had planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Social Sciences (this had been granted via Chair's Action, 4 October 2019).

The proposal had been considered by two external assessors who had both recommended that the proposal should proceed. In addition, an existing external examiner from the Law

School had reviewed the proposal to ensure alignment with the requirements of the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) and the Bar Standards Board (BSB); the external examiner had confirmed that the proposal met the knowledge, skills and outcomes of a Qualifying Law Degree. The programme had been reviewed in advance by Sinéad McCotter and Barry Lee. The proposal had the Reviewers' support, subject to addressing the following conditions and recommendations:

Conditions, that:

1. the Statement of Purpose and Programme Learning Outcomes be revised to more clearly articulate the distinctiveness and interdisciplinary elements of the programme. The Statement of Purpose should articulate what a graduate might use the skills developed in the programme to do. It was noted that the Employability element could also draw on the existing knowledge of collaborating departments, to assist them in areas of marketing.
2. arrangements be made to recruit a suitably qualified External Examiner to oversee the programme as a whole. It was noted that the nominated External Examiner should have sufficient expertise to assure the University that, as a Qualifying Law Degree, quality and standards are met from the perspective of the SRA and BSB. It was noted that the External Examiner would need to participate in the relevant Sociology Programme Exam Board and the Module Boards (as relevant) of partner departments.
3. further detail be provided as to how the departments would work together to ensure there is a spirit of intellectual community among the students on the programme, reflecting the programme's interdisciplinary ethos (as per condition 1).
4. the overall purpose and assessment design of the capstone module be articulated with greater clarity in a way which clearly aligns it with the overall aims and purpose of the programme. The Reviewers noted that, currently, the capstone appeared heavily weighted towards Law (with insufficient focus on the Criminology aspect in the light of the intended 50:50 split). There was further scope for developing solutions to problems in criminal law by application of the findings, skills, and methods of criminology, through creative dialogue with stakeholders. The Reviewers also raised questions about the details of the proposed assessments, for example (i) the practicalities of making reliable judgements about the individual student contribution to group presentations and (ii) the way in which the two very different tasks (on the final assessment) could be balanced and addressed in a 3,000 word report.

Recommendations, that, further thought be given to:

1. the assessment balance (to ensure a balanced workload for students);
2. the ways in which a Law and Criminology student community could be developed (to ensure that students did not feel like 'add-ons' to the existing departmental student body);
3. learning support (such as academic writing) to ensure that, due to the interdisciplinary nature of the programme, students understand different departmental expectations (in particular, the different rules with respect to reassessment for the Foundation modules for the purpose of the Qualifying Law Degree – see below – would need to be made very clear to students);
4. the ways in which administrative processes would be shared between the partner departments (to ensure clear and effective communication to students);
5. the communication and promotion of the programme's distinctiveness, in terms of marketing, to sell the value of the York programme over and above competitors;
6. the ways to ensure consistent and focused support for Graduate Teaching Assistants across the partner departments (to ensure that students receive a consistent teaching experience).

The Committee **noted** that the programme team had addressed satisfactorily the external assessors' comments and suggestions. The Reviewers reported two further assurances: (i) Law and Criminology students would be grouped together in Student Law Firms and Problem-Based Learning (PBL) sessions and not dispersed amongst the wider cohort; (ii) the Law School had offered to facilitate an away-day to enable teaching staff from across the departments to develop an understanding of the distinctiveness of PBL teaching.

The Committee **noted** that, whilst the standard University compensation and reassessment rules applied, in order to meet the requirements of a Qualifying Law Degree (which permits compensation, within narrow parameters, in relation to Foundation modules on one occasion only) students would be encouraged to undertake reassessment 'at risk' instead of using compensation. It was reported that this was normal practice with respect to the University's Qualifying Law Degree provision.

The Committee raised a number of queries that required clarification:

- the number of credits in Stage 3 (including which modules were core). The Committee noted that, as presented, it appeared to comprise 140 credits. In relation to this query the Committee expressed concern about the workload in the Autumn term which, dependent on option choices, appeared to be between 70-80 credits; this did not represent a balanced workload for students and, if the Committee's understanding of the proposed structure of Stage 3 was correct, would need to be revised (as a condition of approval);
- whether there were any conditions with respect to transferring out of the programme (section 11f of the programme design document);
- whether applicants would be subject to an interview (as is the practice for Law School provision);
- the ways in which strong programme leadership would be developed (specifically given the PBL pedagogic approach and the programme leadership residing in Sociology);
- external examiner oversight of the capstone module.

The Committee **agreed to approve** the programme subject to the four conditions (above), clarification of the queries and consideration of the recommendations.

The Committee **agreed** that:

- the revised proposal should be reviewed by the UTC Reviewers and be subject to final sign-off by the Chair of UTC;
- normal practice should be followed with respect advertising the programme (i.e. the programme must not be advertised until the conditions had been met).

#### **M19-20/14      Periodic Review: Politics**

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessor report and action plan arising from the Periodic Review of Politics (UTC.19-20/11).

Barry Lee had chaired the Review and Sinéad McCotter had been the second UTC Panel member. Charlotte Chamberlain had been the student representative and Sally O'Connor had been Secretary.

The Panel identified many strengths and examples of good practice including: a good proportion of the high quality, research-led teaching; the provision of a Peer Assisted Learning scheme; strong employability figures which indicated that the provision was

effectively preparing students for graduate-level careers and; rigorous attendance monitoring procedures.

Recommendations included consideration of procedures relating to underperformance in teaching, sharing of best practice, and ways to acknowledge and encourage teaching excellence. The Panel had also recommended that the Department consider ways of ensuring marking procedures and practices fully recognised student performance. The Panel endorsed the Department's ongoing exploration of forms of assessment beyond essays and closed exams.

The Committee **noted** that the Panel had made three University-level recommendations.

- In respect of the Department's concerns regarding unplanned growth in student numbers, UTC noted that the Medium Term Planning process had recently been revised. This had encompassed a re-setting of student number targets to ensure that targets were realistic and aligned with the department's strategy (M18-19/151 refers).
- The recommendation with respect to obtaining key numerical information had been referred to the Business Intelligence Unit (BIU). The BIU had explained that a Student Number workbook, presented by 'route owner', was available on the Management Information Gateway. Further guidance on how to use the workbook was available from BIU.
- In respect of the recommendation regarding the structure of the academic year UTC noted that, whilst a decision not to embark on a consultation on restructuring the academic year had recently been taken (M18-19/32 refers), the Committee noted that the development of the new University Strategy may necessitate that the issue be revisited.

The Committee considered the action plan and the following points were made:

- Report para. 6.3, 6.5: The actions identified appeared to focus primarily on the feedback dimension of the recommendation. The Committee resolved that an action(s) be identified to address the marking dimension.
- Report para. 5.1-5.4: The MA in Social Research (overseen by the Research Centre for Social Sciences) included a Level 7 module 'Professional and Transferable Skills'. The Committee noted that the content of this module may overlap with the 'Personal and Professional Skills' module. The Committee advised the Department to liaise with the Programme Leader for MA in Social Research with respect to planning a new MA Methods module to understand the nature of gaps in provision.
- Report para. 4.9: The Committee noted that the Department might also wish to consider further ways to promote nominations for the YUSU Excellence Awards (10 nominations were received for the 2019 Awards).
- Report para. 6.4: The Standing Committee on Assessment had recently developed guidance on stepped marking; this guidance had been included in the 'Guide to Assessment, Standards, Marking and Feedback 2019-20'. The Committee resolved that the Department should provide a more engaged response to the recommendation and that action in this area should be timely (the Committee agreed that September 2020 was not sufficiently timely).
- Report para. 6.1: The Committee was interested to know the outcome of the review (which was due for completion in November 2019) and resolved that an update on progress in respect of 6.1 be received by UTC at its November meeting.

**Action: Politics**

The Committee **approved** the report and, subject to consideration of the comments made by UTC, agreed that appropriate actions in response to the Panel's recommendations had been identified.

#### **M19-20/15 Interdepartmental and Cross-Faculty Teaching Working Group**

The Committee **considered** the membership and terms of reference for the UTC Working Group: Interdepartmental and Cross-Faculty Teaching (UTC.19-20/12).

The Committee noted that the aims of the Group would be to consider the benefits and challenges with respect to interdepartmental and cross-faculty teaching, including, for example, the provision of curated elective models and bespoke electives. The Committee **agreed** that the membership should include the GSA Vice President Academic.

The Committee **approved** the membership and terms of reference of the Working Group subject to the addition of the GSA Vice President Academic.

**Action: Secretary to the Working Group**

#### **M19-20/16 Learning and Teaching Strategy Action Plan**

The Committee **considered** a review of progress with the action plan arising from the Learning and Teaching Strategy 2015-20 and the priorities for 2019/20 (UTC.18-19/13).

It was reported that this was the final period under the current strategy, running to the end of the academic year. The York Pedagogy had moved to business as usual, and a number of action areas had been drawn together under this theme. The scope of the new successor strategy was to be confirmed and was dependant on the development of a new University Strategy led by the new Vice-Chancellor.

Members **endorsed** the updated action plan.

#### **M19-20/17 Standing Committee on Assessment**

The Committee **received** the membership, terms of reference and annual priorities of the Standing Committee on Assessment (SCA) for 2019/20 (UTC.19-20/14).

The SCA had proposed minor revisions to its terms of reference to include, in relevant places, explicit reference to marking and feedback. The SCA had also proposed that, in consultation with the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning and Students, a Deputy Chair be appointed. Post holder titles for Student Services staff (in attendance) had been amended to reflect the revised structure of Student Services.

The Committee **agreed** that 'all' should be replaced by 'University' in the first part of Term of Reference (ToR) 1 ('*To develop, consider, monitor and review ## University policies...*').

The Committee **noted** the revised membership and, subject to the amendment to ToR 1, **approved** the revised terms of reference of the SCA.

The SCA had proposed thirteen priority areas of work for 2019/20 including: a review of the structure of the Guide to Assessment; scoping work associated with the implementation of the UKSCQA's Statement of Intent (M19-20/5 refers); a review of information provided to external examiners and Examination Boards (M18-19/126 refers) and a review of repeat study data.

The Committee **approved** the annual priorities identified by SCA.

## CATEGORY II BUSINESS

### M19-20/18 Modifications and Withdrawals

The Committee **received** a report on 3+1 programme variants, programme suspensions and withdrawals of programmes of study approved by Chair's action between 7 June and 12 September (UTC.19-20/15).

### M19-20/19 Validated Provision

The Committee **received** an update, including consideration of reports from the relevant Subject Contact, on validated provision (UTC.19-20/16).

### M19-20/20 UKSCQA's Degree Classification

The Committee **received** the UKSCQA's Degree Classification (transparency, reliability and fairness): A Statement of Intent, and **noted** the arrangements for taking forward the work arising from it (UTC.19-20/17).

### M19-20/21 Degree Apprenticeships: Programme Design Document templates

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved a Programme Design Document template for postgraduate degree apprenticeships and revisions to the Programme Design Document template for undergraduate degree apprenticeships.

### M19-20/22 University Policy on Graduate Teaching Assistants

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved minor revisions, for clarity, to the University Policy on Graduate Teaching Assistants (UTC.19-20/18).

### M19-20/23 Sub-committees

#### *Standing Committee on Assessment*

The Committee **received** reports on the meetings of the Standing Committee on Assessment held on 5 July (UTC.19-20/19a) and 30 September (UTC.19-20/19b).

#### *Co-ordinating Group for Supplementary Programmes*

The Committee **noted** the:

- terms of reference and membership of the Co-ordinating Group for Supplementary Programmes (UTC.19-20/20);
- minutes of the meeting of the Co-ordinating Group for Supplementary Programmes held on 1 July 2019 (UTC.19-20/21).

#### *Online and Distance Learning forum*

The Committee **noted** that the minutes of the meeting of the Online and Distance Learning Forum held on 4 July 2019 were available at:

<https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/develop/distance-learning-forum/>

### M19-20/24 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups

The Committee **received** a report on the meeting of the Social Sciences Faculty Learning and Teaching Group held on 24 May 2019 (UTC.18-19/22).

#### **M19-20/25      Periodic Reviews and Other UTC Visits**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved Dr Sarah Getton (University of Leicester) and Dr Nicky King (University of Exeter) to act as the external assessors for the Periodic Review of Natural Sciences (scheduled for 5 December 2019).

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the deferral of the Periodic Review of the Centre for Lifelong Learning's provision from 2019/20 until 2020/21.

#### **M19-20/26      Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies**

The Committee **received** the summary report of the conjoint Nursing and Midwifery (NMC)/UTC approval event (June 2019) for the BSc Nursing and MNursing in Nursing, the associated NMC report and the confirmatory approval letter from the NMC (UTC.19-20/23).

The Committee **noted** that the confirmatory letter from the NMC included a number of errors with respect to the award (which should be MNursing rather than MNurse) and programme titles (which should be in the format 'Nursing (Field of Practice)'). A revised confirmatory letter had been requested.

*Secretary's post-meeting note: the NMC had now provided the revised confirmatory letter (which would be received by UTC at its November meeting).*

The Committee **received** the summary report of the conjoint NMC/UTC approval event (July 2019) for the FdSc in Health and Social Care: Nursing Associate (UTC.19-20/24).

The Committee **received** the report from Advance HE on the re-accreditation, subject to four conditions, of the University's professional development programmes (UTC.19-20/25).

#### **M19-20/27      Collaborations**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had given approval to the Department of Education for for a new School Direct partnership with the Outwood Grange Academy Trust for delivery of the PGCE from 2020-21 (recruiting from 2019-20).

#### **M19/20/28      Exchange agreements**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved an exchange agreement between the Department of History and The University of Washington, Seattle, USA.

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the following University-wide student exchange agreements between the Centre for Global Programmes and (i) the University of Newcastle, Australia and (ii) the George Mason University, Virginia, USA.

#### **M19-20/29      Dates of 2019/20 meetings**

The Committee **noted** that the dates of future meetings in 2019/20 (all in HG21, 9.30-13.30) were as follows:

- Thursday 14 November 2019
- *Strategy meeting* – Thursday 5 December 2019
- Thursday 12 December 2019
- Thursday 6 February 2020
- Thursday 12 March 2020
- Thursday 14 May 2020
- Thursday 18 June 2020
- *Extraordinary meeting* – Thursday 16 July 2020