

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2017

Present: Professor J Robinson (Chair)
Mr N Dandy
Dr S King
Professor J Buchanan
Professor S Bell
Mr E Braman
Ms C Chamberlain (GSA representative)
Professor J Hudson
Professor A Hunt
Dr B Lee
Professor T Lightfoot
Dr E Major
Professor G Ozkan
Mr J Porch (YUSU representative)
Dr K Selby
Professor D Smith
Professor R Waites

In Attendance: Mrs J Iddon (ASO, Secretary)
Mrs J Brotherton (ASO, Minute Secretary)
Mrs V Cotter (Deputy Academic Registrar)
Dr P Lightfoot (for M17-18/31)

Apologies were received from Mr J Fagan, Mrs K Dodd, Dr G Chitty and Professor B Fulton.

CATEGORY I BUSINESS

M17-18/28 Minutes and Matters Arising

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 5 October 2017 (UTC.17-18/21) subject to the addition of "in July" at the end of sentence "It was reported that the proposal for a pilot introduction of repeat study of Stage 1 had not been approved by Senate" (page 3).

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC. 17-18/21 **Appendix 1**).

- The proposal for the BA TESOL had not yet received planning approval from the FLTG (M16-17/60). The decision continued to be delayed due to uncertainty about resourcing following the move of the Centre for English Language Teaching from the Department of Education to the Academic Support Office. The Chair advised that, in the light of this matter being contingent on Planning, it would be appropriate to replace the 'ongoing' status of this issue with an action on ASO to monitor the Planning decision and update the Committee once a decision had been taken by the FLTG.

Action: ASO

- Programme governance (M16-17/125 & M17-18/2). Further to discussions between the YUSU representative, the Secretary and the Chair, the Committee was asked to consider the recommendation to Senate that:
 - Combined Boards of Studies be discontinued (as originally proposed) from the start of the 2018/19 academic year (thereby ensuring sufficient transition time for departments to implement revised programme governance arrangements);
 - the *Policy for Student Representation in Learning and Teaching Activities in Academic Departments* be amended, for implementation at the start of 2018/19, as follows:
 - Student Representatives for combined programmes be members of the Board of Studies of the ‘lead’ BoS;
 - consideration of each programme (including combined programmes for which the Department was the designated lead) and the opportunity for students to raise programme-level issues, discussion and identification of actions be a standing agenda item on Staff Student Fora agendas;
 - student representatives for combined programmes be invited to attend the ‘lead’ department’s Staff Student Forum;
 - it be made clear that the relevant Staff Student Forum is responsible for formally communicating discussions relating to a combined programme which require action in the partner department(s) and for monitoring the completion of actions.
 - In addition, UTC was asked to approve, for immediate implementation, amendments to the *University Programme Leader Roles and Responsibilities* descriptor to make it clear that responsibilities included maintaining regular contact with course representatives and taking action on issues raised by the student representatives (including those which required action by a department to which the Programme Leader does not belong; in this case the Programme Leader has the authority to request that an action be addressed by a partner department).
 - The YUSU representative endorsed the proposed arrangements. He reported that within Senate student representation there still were reservations about the potential impact on the strength of the student voice following from the discontinuation of Combined Boards. However the YUSU representative’s plans to undertake a review of the effectiveness of communication between course representatives, department representatives and programme teams should identify and address any issues.

The Committee agreed to: (i) **recommend to Senate** that Combined Boards of Studies be discontinued from the start of 2018/19 academic year; (ii) **recommend to Senate** that the *Policy for Student Representation in Learning and Teaching Activities in Academic Departments* be amended in accordance with the proposed revisions, for implementation from the start of 2018/19; (iii) **approve** the proposed amendments to the *University Programme Leaders Roles and Responsibilities* descriptor for immediate implementation; (iv) **endorse** the YUSU Academic Officer’s plans to undertake a review of the efficacy of the channels of communication between course representatives, department representatives and programme teams.

- The Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students advised members that comments had been received from a second external assessor on the MA in Social Research (M16-17/146 refers). It was reported that the assessor was supportive of the proposal and that, whilst a number of suggestions had been made, ESRC training guidelines meant that it would not be possible for the programme team to act on most of them. The external assessor’s report would be sent to the Academic Quality Team

contact for the MA in Social Research along with the final amended programme documentation. The Academic Quality Team contact would then liaise with the two UTC Reviewers (Dr Barry Lee and Professor John Robinson) with respect to the review, and approval, of the updated proposal.

Action: Associate PVC Teaching, Learning and Students / Chair of BoS

- The Committee was advised that Senate had approved its recommendation that an exemption to the maximum time limit for feedback on students work for examinations conducted in the first week of the Common Assessment Period (week 5 of the Summer term) in order that feedback could be returned during week 10. The maximum time limit in such cases would be twenty five working days.
- The Chair had discussed the Committee's request for a paper regarding student growth patterns and targets with Alistair Knock, the Acting Director of Corporate Planning. The Chair explained that this paper would be provided to the Committee at an appropriate time (determined by UEB's decision on revisions to the medium term planning process), which was likely to be during the Spring term.
- Dr Gill Chitty had volunteered to fill one of the UTC vacancies on the selection panel for the Vice-Chancellor's Teaching awards. Members agreed that the Chair could approach a previous winner from the Faculty of Social Sciences to fill the second vacancy.
- The Chair had discussed the proposed actions arising from the Periodic Review of Physics with the Head of Department as part of the follow-up to the Department's NSS results. The Chair advised the Committee that the relevant actions had been appropriately integrated with the Department's NSS action plan. The Department would be undertaking a full review of its activity in December; the Chair would then meet again with the Department to discuss the outcomes of the review and ways to integrate these with actions arising from the NSS 2017 and the Periodic Review. Professor Dave Smith, the Department's UTC contact, noted that at the Physics APR meeting there was a broad discussion around departmental priorities in the light of Periodic Review and NSS, however, with the APR paperwork incomplete at that point it was not completely clear what targeted actions were going to be prioritised. This should emerge in due course with the completed APR documentation. It was agreed that Professor Smith's input at the follow-up meeting with the Department in the New Year would be helpful.
- The Learning and Teaching Strategy Action Plan for 2017/18 had been updated to reflect members comments (UTC.16-17/31)

M17-18/29

Oral Update from the Chair

The Committee **received** an oral update from the Chair with respect to the three projects which would launch Together York (overseen by the Student Life Committee). The focus of the projects, which would be co-sponsored by YUSU and GSA, would be: (i) international students; (ii) pre-arrival information and induction; and (iii) equity for students with respect to resources provided by departments and colleges (for example printer credit, lab coats, books etc.). The exact scope of each project would be agreed within initial meetings of Working Groups established to oversee each project and it was envisaged that respective sections within Professional Services would provide input. Although objectives for each project had not yet been set, during discussion of the equity project members noted that:

- Student Life Committee did not have a budget and that any recommendations from the Working Group with an associated resource implication would need to be worked up in to a fully-costed proposal (taking into account any impact on departments' operating costs) for consideration by Planning Committee;
- in the light of likely resource implications the Working Group should include representation from the Planning Office;

- the provision of core textbooks was a considered commitment made (and funded) by some departments and was a key part of marketing strategies (in differentiating the York 'offer' from courses at competing institutions);
- in crystallizing the objectives the Working Group would need to think carefully about any potential unintended inequity for others.

M17-18/30 Update from the Student Representatives

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

- The YUSU representative updated members on the recruitment of course representatives: 430 representatives had been recruited with 90% of positions filled. This was close to the number recruited by the end of the year in 2016/17. YUSU had been impressed by the quality of course representatives' manifestos. Training was on going and 60% of representatives had already completed training.
- YUSU had been working with the Standing Committee on Assessment on its Academic Integrity week. Each day had a different focus and the week aimed to increase students' awareness about good study practice as well as about academic misconduct and the consequences of this. Departments had been involved in promoting the Academic Integrity week to students.

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

- The GSA's Welcome Survey had indicated that some students had not been aware of the start date for teaching on their programme. The GSA would be following this up with relevant departments.

M17-18/31 Learning and Teaching Forum

Dr Phil Lightfoot, Chair of Learning and Teaching Forum, attended for this item

The Committee **received** a report from the Learning and Teaching Forum on Activities in 2017/18 (UTC.17-18/22). Dr Lightfoot summarised the key areas of activity which included a lunch time seminar series, the Forum magazine, the Learning and Teaching Conference and the online forum.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- the valuable opportunities, provided by the Seminar Series (all of which are recorded), for attendees to create networks, share best practice, discuss pedagogic themes and support the continuing development of enhancement activities identified via the implementation of the York Pedagogy;
- Dr Lightfoot noted that the faculty-based discussion on the common themes arising from the implementation of the York Pedagogy at the end of the 2017 Conference had prompted additional activities with Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups;
- the GSA representative offered to support the promotion of the Seminar Series;
- the Distance Learning Forum could work with the Forum to share good practice in connection with online learning environments;
- the Committee noted the challenge to locate the best date for the Conference and were pleased that the 2018 Conference had been scheduled for week 10 (Friday 22 June) which, in the view of members, would make attendance easier (as marking would be, on the whole, complete).

The Committee acknowledged the valuable role that the Forum played in promoting (and disseminating) best practice in relation to teaching and learning and applauded the activities undertaken. The Chair thanked Dr Lightfoot for presenting the paper.

The Committee considered a paper of the metrics for TEF3 (UTC.17-18/23). The Chair presented the revised metrics for TEF3 which had been renamed the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework. The metrics followed the format which had been used for TEF 2 with 6 key metrics, however, the weightings of the three NSS metrics had been halved and supplementary metrics associated with the Longitudinal Educational Outcomes data and grade inflation had been added. As with TEF 2, a hypothesis would be formed based on an institution's performance against the metrics; positive flags would be awarded when an institution outperformed its benchmark by 2% or more *and* achieved a Z-score of more than 2. An institution with positive flags in core metrics that have a total value of 2.5 or more would achieve an initial hypothesis position of 'gold'. In addition to the flags, stars would be awarded where institutions achieved very high absolute values and if there were no negative flags in any of the associated split metrics. The Department for Education's Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework Specification states that "if the metric is unflagged, and does not have any negative flags in any of its split metrics, a star should be considered in a similar way to a positive flag in determining the final position of the initial hypothesis" (Department for Education, 2017:59).

The Chair advised members that the language used in the guidance document meant that it was not possible to be certain how the University's data would be interpreted, however, it appeared that the University's hypothesis position would be close to a gold. The Chair further reported the Vice-Chancellor's decision that the University would submit for TEF 3.

As with TEF2, the University would prepare a provide submission which, alongside the metrics, would be considered by the TEF Panel to decide the final award rating. As last year the written submission would be prepared by a small writing group including the Head of ASO, YUSU's Academic Officer, the Acting Director of Corporate Planning, the PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students and the Director of Marketing. UTC would receive the draft submission for consideration at its December meeting and it had been decided that an external consultant would be asked to provide feedback on the draft.

Members were reminded that the University's TEF2 written submission had provided an extended dataset which sought to demonstrate the University's comprehensive excellence. The submission for TEF 3 would be more qualitative in nature and focus primarily on the TEF3 metrics, while continuing to emphasise the University's comprehensive excellence.

The Head of the ASO noted that Professor Chris Husbands, TEF Chair, had emphasised the importance of demonstrating in the written submission how institutional policies translated into outcomes; the most persuasive submissions were those which could evidence initiatives, that form part of a coherent strategy for improvement, to practice and then the impact of this practice on outcomes. The Committee noted that there was no specific TEF action plan, as effort to improve performance against the TEF metrics was via number of existing mechanisms including NSS action plans, the retention project and the Employability Strategy.

Members discussed the rationale for submitting to TEF3. It was noted that gold or silver TEF ratings did not appear to have impacted on applicants' decisions about where to study and that the Government decision to freeze tuition fees had removed the immediate financial incentive for participation. In addition, institutions which were satisfied with their TEF2 outcome would be unlikely to submit and therefore the number of institutions participating in TEF 3 was likely to be fairly small. The primary motivation for participating was that the University felt that gold would be a fairer reflection of the quality of its teaching. In addition, it was noted that TEF outcomes could have future financial implications and that gold in TEF3 could provide positive publicity for the University, particularly if only a small number of institutions achieved an improvement in their award. Members agreed that the risks of participating were fairly small as the University's metrics

position was stronger than it had been last year and therefore the outcome of a bronze award was unlikely.

Members discussed the implications of the subject level TEF. The methodology had not yet been selected and it could involve either a detailed review of subject areas deviating from the institution's average (model A) or a review of all subjects to produce an aggregated score (model B). The Committee agreed that an institutional gold would be of more value if model A was selected, although it noted that model B was likely to be of more value to students. Members were advised that the University was developing a new dashboard of indicators (M17-18/13 refers), focussing on a broader suite of measures than the TEF metrics, which would provide departments with an indication of how subject level TEF results might look.

The Dean of the Faculty for Arts and Humanities requested that whatever the outcome of the submission, the University's response should note that the TEF result did not capture the totality of the quality of teaching and learning provided by the University or the all-round student experience.

M17-18/33 Programme Design Parameters for Distance Learning Programmes with Higher Ed Partners UK (previously referred to as Academic Partnerships)

The Committee considered a proposal to amend the programme design parameters for distance learning programmes delivered with Academic Partnerships (UTC.17-18/24). The programme characteristics for the design of new online programmes had previously been recommended for approval to Senate by the Committee in June 2017. The Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students reported that, as the project had evolved and decisions taken with respect to the implementation policies and processes, it had become apparent that an updated document was essential to capture more detailed information, notably in relation to assessment and feedback.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- 4.3 had been updated to note that the maximum duration for students to complete the programme was 6 years taking into account authorised periods of absence. Members were concerned that this could create an inequity for students who were absent for a period due to ill health. It was noted that students who were unable to complete within six years could request a programme extension via Special Cases Committee and therefore students who suffered from ill health or other extenuating circumstances would not be disadvantaged.
- 7.3 referred to "10 days" and members agreed that this should be specific with respect to "working" or "calendar" days. It was suggested that the addition of an example, based on teaching finishing on a Friday, would support the clarity on this expectation.
- 7.4 referred to working days and that this should be changed to "UK" working days to avoid any ambiguity caused by differences in time zones.
- 5.5 stated that all programmes would include PGCert and PGDip exit awards. This allowed flexibility for more generic award titles if the Masters programme title was not appropriate for the exit award (arising from the carousel element).
- It was reported that the Academic Quality Team had provided some feedback (on issues of clarity), in advance of the meeting, to the Associate PVC and that the document would be amended to reflect these. The Associate PVC confirmed to members that these clarifications were not issues of principle for which UTC needed to make a decision.

The Committee **approved** the updated programme characteristics document subject to the agreed amendments and to the clarifications highlighted by the Academic Quality Team.

M17-18/34 The York Management School: distance learning programme proposals

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the York Management School for three new distance learning programmes to launch on 13 April 2018 (UTC17-18/25):

MSc Finance, Leadership and Management (UTC.17-18/25a)

MSc Innovation, Leadership and Management (UTC.17-18/25b)

MSc International Business, Leadership and Management (UTC.17-18/25c)

The programmes shared 6 common modules (15 credits each) and each had five specialist modules (including an Independent Research project for 30 credits). Students would start the programme with the module 'Practising Strategy' and would complete the Research Project at the end of the programme.

The programmes had been reviewed in advance by Professor John Hudson and Dr Gill Chitty. In the light of the delivery mode the proposals had also been reviewed by the Head of E-Learning Development, Dr Richard Walker. It was reported that a pre-meeting had been held between the TYMS programme team, Professor T Lightfoot, Professor Hudson and Dr Walker on 7th November to discuss the proposals and for the nominated UTC Reviewers to provide some initial feedback. Dr Gill Chitty had been also been due to attend the pre-meeting but was unwell and had sent apologies. The proposals had also been reviewed by two external assessors and had their support subject to minor amendments.

Members noted the tight timescales within which TYMS were working, the evolving requirements with respect to programme design characteristics (M17-18/33 refers) and a number of unresolved issues (for example the nature and timing of progression and examination boards) for which a steer from the Implementation Group was required.

Professor Hudson reported that elements of important information were missing from the Programme Design Documents (PDD) for example a named programme leader for each of the programmes, external reference points (section 6), details on examination boards (see above) and details of the carousel model with respect to the six intake points (to show cohort pathways – full and part time – through the programme). Professor Hudson also reported an important point of clarification with respect to the use of Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs); whilst the programme documentation suggested that GTAs might be appointed to deliver some teaching, during the pre-meeting with the UTC Reviewers the TYMS programme team explained that Grade 6 staff would lead seminars and Grade 7 (and above) staff would be module leaders.

Members noted that the carousel model created challenges with respect to named exit awards; much of the content could be studied in any order, it was therefore not possible to guarantee (unless prerequisites were specified) which modules students exiting the programme early would have taken. It was suggested that there could be generic Certificate and Diploma exit awards in 'Management' (which recognise the achievement of 60 and 120 credits respectively) and named exit awards which reflect the programme title of the Masters (which recognise the achievement of module credit covering sufficient specialist content). The rules governing which exit award a student is entitled to would need to be clearly articulated in the relevant section of the PDD. Progression statements would also need to articulate the extent of the achievement of programme learning outcomes for exit awards in terms of what a graduate with a PGCert/PGDip (generic and named titles) was able to do (in addition to prescribing the module diet [if any] for the successful achievement of the exit award).

Professor Hudson highlighted issues around programme design and progression. A number of challenges stemmed from the expectation within the University's contract with Higher Ed Partners UK (previously referred to as Academic Partnerships) that an accelerated route be available and the interpretation that this might mean completion within a calendar year (i.e. the equivalent of full time). The requirement to provide an accelerated route in conjunction with the carousel model (which is more efficient if there is flexibility with respect to the sequencing of modules) had been difficult to align with principle of progression and skills development (without the need to mandate prerequisites which result in the need to deliver specified modules multiple times on the carousel). Members noted that the Open University typically offered two presentations of modules each year. In terms of the University's obligation to offer an accelerated route, it was suggested that the Implementation Group investigate whether that had to be available at each of the six start points for the programme, or whether a single start point for the accelerated route (given the likelihood of very few students for this option) would fulfil this requirement.

It was proposed that the first module for the suite of programmes would be the shared introductory module 'Practising Strategy' and it was reported that TYMS had recently determined that other prerequisites would be: completion of four further taught modules (in addition to the introductory module) before Research Methods; completing Research Methods before the Research Proposal and Project modules.

Skills development was also a concern. As the modules could be studied in any order, it was not clear how skills would be developed sequentially. It was noted that the programme team was considering the inclusion of a portfolio that develops in parallel to the modules, and the use of skills diagnostic tools that signpost students towards supporting resources and personal supervisors.

Professor Hudson noted that the proposed programme learning outcomes successfully captured the broad identity, notably the social and ethical focus, of TYMS' provision; members considered this to be a strength of the programme designs. In the light of the mode of delivery it was suggested that PLO4 would need to be revised as it involved developing oral communication skills which were not assessed.

The Head of E-Learning Development had advised that the Statement of Purpose could more clearly articulate why the programmes were suited to online delivery and the value to students of this mode. The programme documentation could be much stronger in explaining the philosophy for supporting student learning online and the distinctive learning experience provided for students.

The first module had been developed in some detail with tasks broken down by the hour while others only provided broad statements such as "12 hours of online activities for example discussion groups or blogs". It was noted that "lecture slides" had been identified as key material in one module and this was assumed to be an error. The Committee was reminded that the staff developing the modules had limited experience of online programme delivery and that they were designing modules before they had a clear idea of how the platform would work.

Members noted inconsistency in the mapping of assessment against Programme Learning Outcomes. Professor Hudson noted that the mapping of Operations Management had been done well; module mapping elsewhere consisted of broad statements and was not supported by the same level of detail in 'by working on' sections. Furthermore the relationship between formative tasks and summative assessments was not always consistently clear and the maps did not convey a strong sense of the ways in which skills would be built, developed and reinforced throughout the programmes.

Whilst word lengths for assessment tasks appeared to be short relative to other Social Science programmes, Professor Hudson explained that they did reflect discipline conventions and were in line with TYMS' on campus provision. There was concern, however, about the practicalities of the proposed 48-hour open exams, particularly in ensuring that this was equitable for full- and part-time students and for students based across different time zones. The documentation referred to 'open time constrained examination' and 'limited open examination' both of which would need to be defined.

Members noted that the Independent Research Project would require an ethical approval process. Professor Hudson advised that the programme team had suggested that this could be tied to a research proposal but that plans had not yet been confirmed.

The documentation did not include very much detail on induction and orientation. It was noted that retention on distance learning programmes was much lower when compared with on campus programmes. The Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students reported that a centrally-owned, non-credit bearing, induction module was being developed. Notwithstanding the provision of an institutional-level induction module, members emphasised the importance of a focused and personal induction, which was likely to be key to retention.

It was reported that Higher Ed Partners UK would employ Student Success Coordinators to monitor student metrics during the first 90 days of the programme and offer additional support to students falling below a specified threshold of engagement. It was not clear how the Student Success Coordinator would interact with the student's University personal supervisor or what the oversight mechanism, for example a UTC-owned Policy (akin to that for Taught Student Supervision) would be.

Members considered the entry criteria for the programmes and queried whether it was appropriate that "students with a 2.2 degree could compensate for their degree classification if they had 12-24 or months' work experience in a relevant role". Although this reflected the entry criteria for TYMS' on campus programmes it was suggested that consideration be given to replacing "could" with "may be able to" in order to retain discretion with respect to the equivalence.

The work undertaken by everyone, especially the TYMS programme team, involved in supporting the strategic priority to expand the University's distance learning provision was positively endorsed by the Committee. In the light of the number concerns raised by members, the Committee agreed that it would be valuable for further work to be undertaken to develop and strengthen the quality of proposals, in line with members' comments. It was agreed that amended proposals should be resubmitted for consideration by UTC in December.

Issues to be addressed by TYMS:

- Amendments to PDDs to include
 - strengthening the Statements of Purpose
 - clarifying exit award titles and requirements
 - clearly articulating students' progressive development towards the achievement of Programme Learning Outcomes for exit awards (ensuring that statements capture what a student who has achieved a PGCert/PGDip is *able to do* [in addition to the number of credits / specific combination of modules])
 - amending Programme Learning Outcomes in line with UTC Reviewers' comments
 - updating the documentation to reflect the current position with respect to staffing

- including external reference points (section 6)
- amending programme maps in line with UTC Reviewers' comments
- Programme design
 - articulating clearly the ways in which skills are built and developed throughout the programmes
 - clarifying any prerequisites
- Modules
 - updating descriptors to ensure they are as comprehensive as possible at this stage (taking in to account that the design of modules was taking place before module leads, with limited experience of online programme delivery, had a clear idea of how the platform would work) and noting that 'Practising Strategy' was a relatively well developed descriptor
 - clarifying the ethical approval process for the Research Project

Issues to be considered by the Implementation Group:

- Nature and timing of examination boards (to be included in an updated programme characteristics document [M17-18/33 refers])
- Role (and oversight) of the Student Success Coordinators and how this role fits with the role of a University personal supervisor
- Ways to strengthen orientation and induction arrangements
- Mechanisms to build a strong learning community within the carousel flexible model of delivery
- Presentation of the carousel model to stakeholders to maximise clarity (to be included alongside the amended PDDs for consideration by UTC at its December meeting)
- Establish whether a single start point for the accelerated route would fulfil the University's contractual obligations to Higher Ed Partners UK

M17-18/35

NSS and PTES 2018

The Committee **considered** proposals regarding the arrangements for the 2018 National Student Survey (NSS) and the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) (UTC.17-18/26) and **agreed** that the University should participate in both. Members considered proposals relating to the start date, additional questions, incentives and promotion for both surveys:

Start Dates

The NSS would open nationally on 8 January and run until 29 April. It was proposed that the University should open the survey on 5 February (the latest start date allowed by HEFCE) in an attempt to minimise survey fatigue. The PTES would open nationally on 1 February and run until 15 June. It was proposed that the University should open the survey in the week commencing 16 April (at the start of the summer term) and end it on 15 June. It was suggested that a shorter survey window would be beneficial and that students would be better placed to answer the questions later in the year. Members were supportive of the proposed start dates.

Additional Questions

The University had the option of adding up to 6 banks of additional NSS questions and, in addition, could choose to add two institutional free-text questions. The Committee agreed not to include additional institutional questions. In relation to the additional question banks, the Committee agreed to use the careers questions (as it had done in 2017) in order that trends could continue to be monitored. For the PTES the University had the option of adding additional institution-specific questions. The University had not done this previously

and the Committee accepted the recommendation that it should continue not to do so given the length of the survey.

Incentives

Members accepted the recommendation in the paper that the University should continue not to offer institutional incentives for either the NSS or the PTES.

Promotion

Members supported the proposal that the University should continue to promote the NSS via its social media platforms and that YUSU and Marketing should be supported to produce a video highlighting the value of NSS student feedback. A video had been produced in 2017 and it was felt that a shorter video with more student involvement would have more impact. It was noted that the timings of the PTES and the NSS overlapped and that Student and Academic Services would plan how to coordinate promotional activities to make it clear which each survey applied to.

M17-18/36 Periodic Review: Health Sciences

The Committee **considered** an updated action plan arising from the Periodic Review of the Department of Health Sciences (UTC.17-18/27). UTC had considered the report and action plan arising from the Periodic Review of Health Sciences (held June 2016) at its November 2016 meeting. The Committee noted that, at the time, actions relating to assessment and feedback (3.6, 3.8, 3.13 and 3.15) did not address the recommendations in this area, a key issue arising during the review (M16-17/36 refers). UTC thus requested a revised action plan which was submitted in May 2017 (M16-17/131 refers). Although the Committee was supportive of, and approved, the actions articulated in the revised (May) plan, members were concerned that some actions would not be implemented until 2018/19. It was agreed that, in light of the protracted timeframe from the initial review, progress on the action plan would benefit from additional monitoring. This paper (UTC.17-18/27) represented progress made with actions since May.

The Committee congratulated the Department on the progress made and noted that, for the most part, actions had been completed to timescales and further actions initiated. There were however certain areas where the Committee felt that planned actions should be implemented more quickly. It was noted that, whilst the Department had been working with the Learning Enhancement team on the recommendation around assessment tasks and guidelines (3.8), members were concerned about the timeliness of progress in this area in the light of the Periodic Review Panel's request that this be addressed "as a matter of urgency". Likewise, in relation to the recommendation about the quality of feedback (3.15), the revised action plan referred to "on-going" work and it was not clear to members specifically what this would encompass.

The Committee **agreed** to endorse the revised action plan and agreed that no further UTC monitoring was needed on the basis that the Chair's forthcoming meeting with the Department, to follow up on NSS 2017 results, would provide the most effective mechanism to refine actions and timeframes.

Professor Hudson noted that space for students studying in Alcuin-based departments had been raised as an issue during this periodic review (and periodic reviews for Social Policy, Social Work and Economics [M16-17/131 refers]) and it was not clear whether this would be addressed via the Campus Masterplan. In June 2017 the Chair of UTC had contacted the Director of Estates and Campus Services regarding the absence of a communal / informal space for students studying in Departments located near Alcuin and had also fed this into

the Estates current vision development exercise advocating embedded social space (special reference to the Alcuin departments had been made) (M16-17/143 refers). It was noted that the Masterplan may have an indirect impact on space in Alcuin; the Chair agreed to raise this issue once again with Stephen Talboys, Director of Estates and Campus Services.

Action: Chair

CATEGORY II BUSINESS

M17-18/37 Modifications and Withdrawals

The Committee **received** a report on modifications to, and withdrawals of, programmes of study approved by Chair's action between 21 September 2017 and 18 October 2017 (UTC.17-18/28), as follows:

SPSW

Withdrawal of the BA in Social Work for 2018 entry onwards. The BA is being replaced by the new integrated Masters in social work which was approved by UTC earlier in the year. Following a request from the Department, the integrated Masters programme in social work has been renamed – approved by the VC on behalf of Senate. Old name Master of Social Work and Social Science in Social Work (MSWSS). New name Master in Social Work to be abbreviated as MSocW (and in line with other integrated Masters at York this is actually Master in Social Work (Hons) i.e. MSocW (Hons)). For reference, Master of Social Work (MSW) was not permitted as the University previously awarded this qualification as a standalone Masters (it is also very similar to the American/Canadian professional qualification). The 'in' to designate an integrated Masters in commonplace in Scotland and is also used in England (e.g. MSci – master in science – offered by a number of institutions).

Sociology

Approval to introduce year abroad variants of BA in Sociology with Criminology and BA in Sociology with Social Psychology. The former to be introduced retrospectively to cover the 2017/18 academic year and the latter to be available from 2018/19. Both programmes will be additional year and available for transfer into only, with the third year studied abroad before return to complete stage 3 at York.

Law

Approval of the Law School's decision not to introduce the MLaw integrated masters in 2017/18 and to cancel all future intentions to introduce the programme. (This decision was taken in response to changes in students' access to finance for PGT programmes and the introduction of the LLM in Professional Practice (Corporate and Commercial).

M17-18/38 IPC modifications

The Committee **received** a report on modifications to Foundation Certificate programmes within the International Pathway College, approved by Chair's action on 9 October 2017 (UTC.17-18/29).

M17-18/39 Pedagogy Approvals

The Committee **received** a report on the decisions of York Pedagogy Approval Panels approved by Chair's action between 13 and 28 September 2017 (UTC.17-18/30).

- M17-18/40 Learning and Teaching Strategy Action Plan 2017-18**
The Committee **received** an amended Learning and Teaching Strategy Action Plan 2017-18 (UTC.17-18/**31**).
- M17-18/41 PRES**
The Committee **received** a report on the results of the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (UTC.17-18/**32**).
- M17-18/42 Standing Committee on Assessment**
The Committee **received** a report on the minutes of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment held on 27 October 2017 (UTC.17-18/**33**).
- M17-18/43 Distance Learning Forum**
The Committee **noted** the terms of reference and membership of the Distance Learning Forum (UTC.17-18/**34**) and that the minutes of the Distance Learning Forum held on 9 October 2017 were available at <https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/contacts/committees/distance/>
- M17-18/44 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups**
The Committee **received** reports of meetings of the Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups:
 - Arts and Humanities meeting held on 12 October 2017 (UTC.17-18/**35a**)
 - Social Sciences meeting held on 10 October 2017 (UTC.17-18/**35b**)
 - Sciences meetings held on 10 October 2017 (UTC.17-18/**35c**)
- M17-18/45 PSRBs**
The Committee **received** the reports from the British Computing Society and Institute of Engineering and Technology arising from accreditation of degree programmes delivered by the Department of Computer Science (UTC.17-18/**36**)
- M17-18/46 Validation**
The Committee **noted** that note that the Chair had approved:
 - Dr Karen Fielder (University of Portsmouth) as the external assessor for the revalidation visit (30 October) for the Masters’ provision delivered by Weald and Downland Living Museum
 - Dr Louise Cooke as the Subject Contact for the Masters’ provision delivered by Weald and Downland Living Museum
 - Professor Nazira Karodia (University of Wolverhampton) as the external assessor for the revalidation visit (14 February 2018) for provision delivered by the National STEM Learning Centre
 - Dr Kerry Knox as the temporary Subject Contact for the National STEM Learning Centre during the Spring Term 2018, to cover the research leave of Dr Lynda Dunlop (the permanent subject contact).
- M17-18/47 Collaborations**
The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved partnership agreements for 2017-18 between the Department of Education and the Pathfinder Teaching School Alliance (Archbishop Holgate’s School, York) and Yorkshire Teaching School Alliance (St Aidan’s School, Harrogate) for the delivery of the School Direct Initial Teacher Training programmes, and the general partnership agreement to be signed between Education and all school partners hosting trainees in 2017-18.

M17-18/48 Exchange agreements

The Committee noted that **noted** that the Chair had approved the following exchange agreements between the Department of Sociology (including the School of Social and Political Science and the BA in Criminology): Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University Prague, Czech Republic and the Department of Sociology, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden.

M17-18/49 Registers

The Committee **received** the 2017/18 registers for:

- Distance learning programmes (UTC.17-18/**37a**)
- Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (UTC.17-18/**37b**)
- Collaboration (taught programmes) (UTC.17-18/**37c**)

M17-18/50 Repeat Study

The Committee **noted** that the Chair has approved that the Department of Health Sciences be exempt from the new policy permitting students to repeat Stage 1 of undergraduate and integrated masters programmes in the event of failure. This reflects the requirements of the Nursing and Midwifery Council, the accrediting body for the Department.

M17-18/51 Graduate Teaching Assistants

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the use of Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) to support M-level teaching in the following departments:

- Computer Science: to support a range of modules within the Department's integrated masters programmes, MSc programmes and CPD provision (dependent on the subject expertise of the GTA).
- Education: to support the teaching and formative marking of a range of modules covering the MA in TESOL, MA in Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching, MA in Applied Linguistics for English Language Teaching, MA in Education and MSc in Psychology in Education.

M17-18/52 Dates of Future Meetings

The Committee **noted** that the dates of future meetings in 2017/18 were as follows:

- Thursday 7 December 2017, 9.30-13.30
- Thursday 8 February 2018, 9.30-13.30
- **Thursday 15 March 2018, 13.30-17.30**
- Thursday 17 May 2018, 9.30-13.30
- Thursday 21 June 2018, 9.30-13.30