UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2018

Present: John Robinson (Chair)
Stuart Bell
Mike Bentley
Ed Braman (to M18-19/41)
Charlotte Chamberlain
Gill Chitty (to M18-19/38)
Valerie Cotter
Nigel Dandy (from M18-19/32)
Ambrose Field
Jenny Gibbons
James Hare
Claire Hughes
Steve King
Barry Lee
Sinéad McCotter
Gulcin Ozkan
Matthew Perry
Dave Smith
Richard Waites
Jez Wells

In Attendance: Jane Iddon (ASO, Secretary), Jenny Brotherton (ASO, Minute Secretary), Angela Ranson (ASO).

Apologies were received from Brian Fulton, Tracy Lightfoot, Michael Bate, Sabine Clarke, Joe Fagan and Maggie O'Neill.

CATEGORY I BUSINESS

M18-19/30   Welcome and Valedictions

The Chair welcomed members attending for the first time and thanked Maggie O'Neill, who was leaving the University in November, for her contribution to the Committee.

M18-19/31   Minutes and Matters Arising

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 4 October 2018 (UTC.18-19/**23**).

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC. 17-18/**23 Appendix 1**).
- The Planning Office had provided a paper showing 2018/19 enrolments against Medium Term Plan (MTP) targets. UTC's request for data on student numbers related to its consideration of APR reports in February 2018, through which concerns were raised

1

about the impact of student number growth on the student experience. The Chair had been in touch with the Director of Planning, as the paper did not provide the information which UTC had hoped for. The Chair had emphasised that UTC was keen to engage with Planning on how the student experience was considered in the MTP cycle and during the confirmation, clearing and adjustment period. He reported that the MTP process was being revised this year (numbers would be re-set based on actuals) and there were a series of related projects involving UEB and Planning Office including a review of student numbers, which the Faculty Dean for Sciences was leading, and an initiative to increase overseas student numbers. The Chair intended to continue engagement with the Director of Planning during the projects and would invite her to UTC (probably February) to discuss how student number allocations were informed by consideration of teaching quality.

Action: Secretary

- The Committee's comments arising from discussion of the Periodic Reviews of Biology and Law had been passed to the departments.
- The PVC and Associate PVC had agreed to consider ways in which the HEP Student Success Coordinator model could be shared more widely; the outcome of that discussion would be reported to UTC in due course.

M18-19/32   **Oral Update from the Chair**

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

- Council had authorised the Acting Vice-Chancellor to sign the University's annual assurance return to the Office for Students (see also M18-19/46).
- The report arising from the Review of Post-18 Education and Funding was due early in 2019. There was speculation in the sector about the possible outcome of this. One possible scenario was a reduction in fees to £6.5k. The University was modelling the impact of potential changes which would be highly significant financially.
- UCU and Unison had balloted their members on industrial action in relation to the 2018 pay settlement. The participation threshold had not been met by either Union. Industrial action relating to pay was therefore not expected in 2018/19. Developments on USS were subject to decisions of the Trustee and Regulator, so it was not known whether this might again be an area of dispute leading to Industrial Action.
- The 2018/19 Together York Project (a joint project for YUSU the GSA and the University) would be on the International Student Experience. It would be led by the Academic Support Office (ASO).
- The Chair thanked members who had volunteered to be on the Working Group on the University's approach to Module Evaluation. The Group would be as follows: Ed Braman (Chair), Adrian Lee (Secretary), Joe Fagan, Sinéad McCotter, Michael Bate, Charlotte Chamberlain and James Hare.
- Further to discussions at Faculty Executive Groups and Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups about a consultation on restructuring the University's academic year (M17-18/143 refers) the matter had been discussed at Heads of Department (HoDs) Forum. As intended, both positive and negative views were shared, though the case for change was not expressed as forcibly as the FEG/FLTG feedback indicated. There were a number of related comments made and UEB would discuss these at a future strategy meeting.

M18-19/33   **Update from the Student Representatives**

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

- Course representative elections had now been completed, although some positions remained unfilled. Faculty representatives had been elected on Monday 5 November.

2

- Some part-time students had reported that additional compulsory sessions were being added to their timetables on days in which they were not due to be at the University (and had scheduled work commitments). The GSA was investigating these issues directly with the departments concerned.

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

- 82% of course representative positions had been filled (with 376 representatives in total and over 2000 votes).
- Study Smart week (29 October to 2 November), organised jointly by YUSU and the ASO, had provided students with a programme of events to support the development of key academic skills.
- YUSU's open morning event to provide an introduction to the Sabbatical Officers' plans and YUSU's priorities for the year ahead (M18-19/6 refers) had been rescheduled from 17 October (due to the water supply problem on Campus West) to 4 December (8.30-10am). Members were encouraged to attend.

M18-19/34   **Periodic Review: History of Art**

Phil Lightfoot attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessors' reports and action plan arising from the Periodic Review of History of Art (UTC.18-19/**24**). Phil Lightfoot had chaired the review, Ed Braman was the second UTC member on the Panel, Charlotte Chamberlain was the student representative, Gill Chitty (incoming Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities at the time of the Periodic Review) had observed, and Jenny Brotherton was the secretary to the Review.

The Panel was impressed by passionate nature of the Department's academic staff and the constant refreshing of module content, with modules closely linked to the research specialisms. Staff and students both had a strong sense of Departmental identity and the Department was well supported by an experienced administrative team.

Workload was one of the Department's main concerns. Being a small department it found the number of 'officer' roles difficult to manage and the Panel noted that several members of staff held multiple officer positions. The size of the Department's undergraduate student population had reduced significantly since its last Periodic Review. Reduced undergraduate applications followed a national trend in History of Art but the impact of lower entry tariffs was a concern.

The Panel suggested that there was potential for more to be gained from the Department's network of partnerships and for further collaborations to be established. It had encouraged the Department to extract maximum value from partnerships. The placement opportunities in the MA in Stained Glass and the BA Curating and Art History were seen as examples of good practice. Subsequent to the Periodic Review further collaborations were being explored as part of the Faculty's School of Arts Project.

Contact hours had emerged as a significant theme (paragraph 3.8). The Chair of the Panel emphasised the opportunity to increase contact hours and embed the development of transferable skills into programmes.

Students in the Department had appreciated the move to online assessment submission. The Panel had recommended that the Department should engage with the E-Learning Team to explore how online feedback could be improved and to discuss the development of digital

3

skills and innovative assessment design (paragraph 4.1 refers). The Committee noted the E-Learning Team's wider remit (now the Programme Design and Learning Technology [PDLT] Team) and agreed that a broader discussion with the PDLT Team (as part of the Department's follow-up to the recommendation in paragraph 4.1), including on the Department's use of double marking, would be beneficial. This would be highlighted in a note from the UTC Secretary to the Department reporting UTC's discussion. Members from departments which were only double marking dissertations (and moderating other forms of summative assessment) reported that this was an effective and robust process.

Action: Secretary

The Committee agreed that paragraph 4.10 regarding the training of Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA) should be circulated to the Academic Practice Team for information.

Action: Secretary

The Committee noted the Panel's concerns about the workload of the Department's GTAs which included the reported expectation amongst GTAs that progress on their research would slow down significantly during the term in which they were teaching (paragraph 4.7). The Committee considered this expectation to be unacceptable and asked the Department, as part of the work to align Departmental practices with the University Policy on GTAs (reported as complete), to respond specifically to the concern raised regarding the impact of GTA workload on study.

Action: Secretary

The Committee considered the three University-level recommendations at 3.2, 7.2 and 8.2. It was noted that the recommendation at 8.2 (regarding SkillsForge and PhD progression policy) was the remit of York Graduate Research School's Programmes and Policies Sub-Committee (PPSC) and that the Review Secretary had circulated this recommendation to PPSC for consideration at its November meeting. The Committee noted that the concern about the workload arising from centrally imposed initiatives (recommendation at paragraph 7.2) was relevant to both the preparations for the subject-level TEF and the development of the Programme Module Catalogue which were substantive items later in the meeting. The Committee agreed to be cognisant of the concerns raised. The Committee noted the concerns in relation to teaching space and timetabling (recommendation at 3.2). It was noted that the centralisation of space was core to the University's Space Policy. It was agreed that the Department's concern about early timetabling deadlines for programme information was an issue suitable for consideration by the Learning Spaces Working Group. The concern would be passed to the Group for consideration.

Action: Secretary

The Committee endorsed the report and agreed that the actions identified by the Department were appropriate. The Chair thanked the Panel for its work on the Periodic Review and thanked Phil Lightfoot for attending the meeting to present the report.

M18-19/35   Degree Outcomes

Karen Payne, Business Intelligence Unit, attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** an initial analysis of undergraduate degree classifications for 2017/18 (UTC.18-19/**25**). The data was available to view on tableau (https://tableau.york.ac.uk/#/views/UGDegreeResultsExplorer/Home)

The overall percentage of good degrees awarded had increased by 0.8 percentage points to 81.4 %. The percentage of first class degrees had increased slightly (by 0.1 %) and the number of 2.1s had increased by 0.7%. There was significant variation in the percentage of

4

good degrees across the three faculties: Arts and Humanities 90.7%, Sciences 80% and Social Sciences 74.6%. Members noted that within faculties there was also considerable variation between departments.

The Committee noted that it would be helpful to see the data benchmarked against entry grades to get a better understanding of what it meant. This would be provided in the Degree Entry and Attainment Profiles (DEAP) analysis. A further analysis report (including competitor data and postgraduate taught degree outcomes) would be brought to UTC in May.

Members noted the sharp increase in the award of Ordinary and Aegrotat degrees. It was agreed that the Business Intelligence Unit would explore this further and that the Standing Committee on Assessment would follow-up.

Action: BIU

Members felt it would be interesting to see if the way in which assessments and marking were conducted had any impact on outcomes (for example the use of 'stepped marking'). It was noted that Annual Programme Review reports from departments which had introduced stepped marking (for example Philosophy) might provide some indication of impact. The Committee noted the difficulties of trying to analyse the impact of stepped marking on degree outcomes given the number of complex variables.

The Chair thanked Karen Payne for the analysis and tableau workbooks and for attending the meeting to present the report.

M18-19/36   **Special Cases Policy on communications in relation to academic appeals and formal complaints**

Robert Simpson, Special Cases Manager, attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a report on the Special Cases Policy on communications in relation to academic appeals and formal complaints (UTC.18-19/**26**). UTC had received a report on the implementation of the Policy in December 2017 and requested a further review at the end of the academic session 2017/18.

The Committee was informed that the provisions to restrict communications had not been used; that Special Cases continued to use its discretion to liaise with third parties (with consent) to assist students; and that during 17/18 Special Cases had liaised more frequently with YUSU and GSA advice service on student cases.

Members were advised that the Policy had been useful in explaining why students were expected to liaise directly with the Special Cases team and that the provisions to limit communications remained a useful option.

The Committee agreed that the Policy appeared to be working well and that no future report on its implementation was required.

The Chair thanked Robert Simpson for presenting the report.

M18-19/37   **Learning and Teaching Forum**

Glenn Hurst, newly-appointed Chair of Learning and Teaching Forum, attended for this item

The Committee **received** a report from the Learning and Teaching Forum on planned activities in 2018/19 (UTC.17-18/**22**). The Chair of Forum thanked the previous Chair (Phil Lightfoot) for all of the work undertaken in capacity as Chair over the course of his tenure. The Chair of Forum summarised the key areas of activity which included a lunch time seminar

5

series, the Forum magazine, the online forum, and the Learning and Teaching Conference, the theme for which would be 'creating valuable learning partnerships in the contemporary University'.

Lillian Soon and Carmen Alvarez-Mayo would be facilitating a training workshop on the use of Padlet during workshops to encourage participation from attendees. After the training, all seminar sessions would be making use of this. It was noted that it was difficult for some staff to attend the seminar series due to teaching (and other) commitments. The Chair reported that Forum sessions were recorded (apart from the discussion sections) and uploaded to an online blog alongside a summary from the Chair. It was confirmed that Postgraduate students were welcome to attend the sessions.

Members noted the importance of ensuring that good practice was made known to Forum. It was reported that Forum received the PVC's report on the NSS and it was noted that Annual Programme Review (APR) was another academic quality process which sought to identify innovative practice. Members **agreed** that innovative practice in relation to learning and teaching identified in APR reports should be shared with Forum.

Action: Academic Quality Team

Members noted that the Annual Learning and Teaching Conference 2018 had been scheduled for Friday in Week 10 of the Summer Term. It was noted that this was a likely to be a particularly busy day for members of Examination Boards. It was noted that Student Services held a list of the dates of all Departmental Examination Boards (this information could be useful in the consideration of the date of the Conference in 2020 and beyond).

The Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities noted that the seminar series was a very exciting programme and observed that, discussion of Forum's activities at the Arts and Humanities FLTG, indicated that some staff were unaware of the programme. The Chair of Forum advised that any promotion of Forum's activities by departments would be appreciated; Forum had a social media presence and it would be helpful if departmental twitter pages could retweet its posts.

The Committee acknowledged the valuable role that the Forum played in championing learning and teaching and in the dissemination of good practice. The Chair thanked Glenn Hurst for presenting the paper.

M18-19/38   Programme Module Catalogue

Tim Andrew, PMC Project Manager, and David Gent, Academic Quality Team, attended for this item.

(a) Progress report

The Committee **received** an oral progress report from the Programme Module Catalogue (PMC) Project Manager.

The PMC Project Manager reminded the Committee of the objectives of the project which included: supporting the workflow for approval of new programmes and major modifications; creating the definitive source of information about programmes; and providing a tool to support good programme design (in accordance with Pedagogy principles).

The first phase of the project had been the development of the Module Catalogue. Due to resource issues there had been a small hiatus in the project which had restarted in October 2017; the focus until March 2018 had been improvements to the Module Catalogue. In April

6

the focus had switched to the development of the programme element of the PMC; the primary focus until August had been to provide a digitised view of departments' Programme Design Documents (PDDs).

The PMC Project Manager demonstrated the build of the PMC so far. Members were advised that the programme structure had been the most difficult section to build. Programmes which included pathways (for instance the ab initio routes for language programmes) had been a particular challenge.

Members were shown a visualisation of the programme map. The data could be presented in different ways (by Programme Learning Outcome or by module). Members were advised that the process for adding, removing and editing modules would have implications for the maintenance of the programme maps. This was addressed in the options paper.

The Committee emphasised the importance of integration between the PMC, the Module Catalogue and SITS. It was noted that the current roll over process in SITS meant that in-year changes in the Module Catalogue were not rolled forward to the following year if they were entered after October. The PMC team was working to address any instances where there was potential for the Module Catalogue and SITS to get out of step and was looking to ensure that the systems were tightly coupled to avoid the need for double data entry.

Members asked whether the current layout of the PMC would be easy to view on a mobile device. It was reported that the project team was working closely with the Digital Marketing Team on the web design and would seek advice on this in due course.

Members were thanked for their comments.

(b) Options paper: the Programme Map

The Committee **considered** an options paper (UTC.18-19/**28**), presented by David Gent, relating to the way in which the PMC should be integrated with the programme map. Four options were presented in the paper:

>   Option 1 - maintain the maps in their current format
>   Option 2 - rebuild the maps from text embedded in the module catalogue
>   Option 3 - replace the textual map with tick-box indicators
>   Option 4 - use the programme map as a design rather than a communication tool

The paper evaluated each option, using a 'Red Amber Green' risk analysis system against eight criteria; the burden on academic staff, functionality, whether pedagogically useful information was shown, curriculum alignment, the accuracy of information, time delay to the PMC project, whether maps were published, and transition costs. The options presented had been the product of consultation with Enterprise Systems and the Academic Support Office; there had not yet been consultation with academic staff in departments or FLTGs. Option 4 was the recommended option, however it was acknowledged that there was no optimal solution.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- a visualisation of option 2 would be helpful. The initial workload involved in moving to this model was a significant concern;
- it was suggested that 'green' for accuracy for option 2 was optimistic, as there was a danger that the function of a module that contributed to more than one programme might get confused;
- conversations about assessment and student work were often based on information

7

contained in module descriptors rather than maps. Maps were considered to be useful for designing programmes or considering major changes to programmes;

- the map is an effective tool to evidence curriculum alignment. It was noted that, whilst curriculum alignment was also within the scope of a Periodic Review, in practice this was not an element that Periodic Review Panels considered in detail. David Gent advised that if option 4 was pursued a process would be developed to ensure that modules continued to serve the PLOs and that this process need not involve the map in its current format;

- the Secretary to UTC read a statement from the Head of Learning Enhancement who had concerns that adoption of option 4 might render the concepts associated with programme design obsolete because the concepts (as a shared language and understanding) would be used less frequently (as a result of the map not being continuously maintained);

- the cost of the PMC project was considerable. It was noted that the allocated budget included developing a system to present the map;

- FLTGs should be consulted on the proposals. The paper had not yet been shared with the FLTGs, however, during discussion about the development of the PMC, key concerns focused on establishing a system that was usable and flexible and that would not inhibit innovation and change;

- the student view on the maps as presented in the PMC should be sought;

- it was suggested that consultation with Marketing might be helpful. The Chair advised it had already been decided not to use map as a marketing tool and that Marketing had provided input on the use of Programme Learning Outcomes and Statements of Purpose in marketing materials;

- Members asked the PMC Project Manager if discussion about the integration of the Maps would delay the project. The Project Manager explained that the team would be able to continue to develop the programme information side of the catalogue until a decision was taken. It was noted that there may be implications for the process for the routine annual update of programme information next year as, if the PMC system was not ready, the updates would need to be recorded on the GoogleSheet format of the PDD.

The Committee **agreed** that:
- there should be some form of student consultation;
  Action: YUSU's Academic Officer

- the paper should be revised in light of the Committee's comments;
  Action: Academic Support Office

- FLTGs should consider the revised paper (at January 2019 meetings), agree a preference from the options presented and provide UTC with feedback.
  Action: Chairs of FLTG

M18-19/39   Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Assessment

The Committee **received** a verbal update from the Chair of the Inclusivity Strategy Working Group. The Working Group had submitted a successful bid to the Strategic Learning and Teaching Fund for resource to engage a consultant to support work on inclusivity. The four Pathfinder departments had been identified and a full meeting of the Working Group (which would include YUSU and GSA representation) had been planned for December. The Group would be considering what inclusive learning teaching and assessment meant and the Pathfinder departments would be testing out the guidelines on the implementation of the Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy Statement.

It was reported that the Head of the Programme Design and Learning Technology Team, was undertaking some work which related to the Inclusivity Strategy, following an EU Directive on the accessibility of public sector websites. The Chair of the Inclusivity Strategy Working Group, the Chair of UTC, and the Head of Programme Design and Learning Technology would be meeting to discuss this work further. The EU Directive imposed some hard deadlines on this aspect of the Inclusivity Strategy. The work would need to ensure that anyone submitting material to the web was aware of the requirements. There was already guidance on the accessibility of webpages on the University website but there was recognition that these resources were not currently well signposted.

M18-19/40   **Subject-Level Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework**

The Committee **considered** a paper on the preparations for the introduction of the Subject-level Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (UTC.18-19/**29**). The University would be participating in the OfS's final pilot exercise for the subject-level TEF. The methodology had been published by the OfS on 22 October and the deadline for the institution-level provider submission and subject-level submissions was 25 February. Datasets were due to be released later in the week. Key requirements would be a five page submission for each subject, alongside a two page provider summary statement for each subject. The University's existing Gold would stand for three years, after which its institutional award would be determined as part of the subject-level TEF process. It was expected that there would be 23 subject submissions at York (based on the anticipated subject groupings).

The process would be supported by a central team (primarily drawn from the ASO and Careers) and templates would be used to gather and present information in a consistent format. It was envisaged that initial drafting could be supported through two half-day workshops in December and January. Departments had been asked to nominate individuals to participate in the workshops. The Head of ASO advised that successful submissions to last year's pilot appeared to involve templates and a coordinated approach.

It was envisaged that submissions would be reviewed by Boards of Studies and signed-off by Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups. UTC would have oversight of the process via a steering group which included the Chair and Associate Deans.

Departments would be asked to integrate actions arising from the subject-level TEF pilot with Pedagogy implementation plans and actions relating to the NSS. Proposals would be developed, for UTC's consideration, to incorporate subject-level TEF metrics into the APR process.

M18-19/41   **Learning and Teaching Strategy Action plan**

The Committee **considered** progress on the action plan arising from the Learning and Teaching Strategy 2015-20 and the main areas of work for 2018-19 (UTC.18-19/**30**).

The strategic priorities for 2018/19 included maintaining the momentum in respect of the implementation of the York Pedagogy through enhancement initiatives, the consolidation of core principles such as the role of the programme leader and the development of the PMC (M18-19/38 refers). Alongside this, there were actions to progress other priority areas including the growth of online learning provision in conjunction with an external partner.

It was noted that other issues had arisen, since the development of the Strategy in 2014-15, including the subject-level TEF (M18-19/40 refers) which would be a significant priority this year.

Members endorsed the updated action plan.

9

M18-19/42   **National Student Survey 2019**

The Committee **considered** proposals regarding the arrangements for the 2019 National Student Survey (NSS) (UTC.18-19/**31**). Participation in the survey would be a requirement of continued registration as a provider with the OfS from August 2019. Members considered proposals relating to the start date, additional questions, incentives and promotion.

Start Dates
The NSS would open nationally on 7 January and run until 30 April. It was proposed that the University should open the survey on 4 February (the latest start date allowed by the OfS) in an attempt to minimise survey fatigue. Members were supportive of the proposed start date.

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 institution specific questions. The Committee agreed not to include additional institutional questions. In relation to the additional question banks, the Committee agreed to continue to use the careers questions (B3) in order that trends could continue to be monitored. The Assistant Registrar: Conduct and Respect had requested that questions on student safety (B17) also be included. The YUSU's Academic Officer endorsed the request that questions on safety be included and proposed that the question banks on social opportunities (B6) and welfare resources and facilities (B9) also be included.

It was reported that students were only asked to respond to the additional questions once the main survey had been completed. Therefore additional questions (and consequent lengthening of the survey) would not impact on the main NSS response rate. The typical response rate for the additional question banks was around 35%. Members noted that this might drop if the section was longer but nonetheless felt it was worth trialling the use of additional questions. The Committee agreed that question banks: B3. Careers, B6. Social Opportunities, B9. Welfare Resources and Facilities and B17 Student Safety would be included.

Incentives
Members considered the recommendation in the paper that the University should continue not to offer institutional incentives for the NSS. Members were advised that the Dean of the Graduate Research School had expressed a preference that an incentive for the 2019 Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) be offered. The Committee agreed that, notwithstanding the decision (yet to be taken) on the provision of an incentive for the PRES, incentives would not be offered for completion of the NSS.

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.

UTC: November 2018

CATEGORY II BUSINESS

M18-19/43   **Modifications and Withdrawals**

The Committee **received** a report on modifications to, and withdrawals of, programmes of study approved by Chair's action between 10 October 2018 and 11 October 2018 (UTC.18-19/**32**).

M18-19/44   **Pre-sessional programmes**

The Committee **received** a report on the approval, by Chair's action, of a number of new pre-sessional programmes within the International Pathway College and on the withdrawal of a number of pre-sessional programmes (UTC.18-19/**33**).

M18-19/45   **Academic Quality Assurance Arrangements**

The Committee **received** the report arising from the Internal Audit (conducted by PwC) of Academic Quality Assurance Arrangements (UTC.18-19/**34**).

M18-19/46   **Annual assurance report**

The Committee received the PVC's executive report to Council which also serves as the annual assurance report on the quality of the student academic experience (UTC.18-19/**35**).

M18-19/47   **Collaborative Provision**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair of UTC and the Chair of YGRS PPSC had jointly approved revisions to the procedure for the approval of collaborative provision (UTC.18-19/**36**).

M18-19/48   **Graduate Teaching Assistants**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved revisions to the Policy on Graduate Teaching Assistants (UTC.18-19/**37**).

M18-19/49   **Periodic Reviews**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved Dr Keith Pond (University of Loughborough) and Professor Sue Tempest (University of Nottingham) to act as external assessors for the Periodic Review of Management (scheduled for 4 March 2018).

M18-19/50   **Feedback Turnaround Time**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the following exemptions to the policy on assessment feedback turnaround time:

(a) in the Department of History with respect to the undergraduate dissertation (feedback will be returned on Monday week 8 of the Summer Term – 38 working days);

(b) in the Department of English with respect to the undergraduate dissertation (feedback will be returned in week 10 – 28 working days);

(c) in the Department of Physics with respect to feedback for laboratory formal reports (PHY00012C, PHY00013C, PHY00014C, PHY00018C, PHY00019C, PHY00023C, PHY00024C, PHY00009I, PHY00010I, PHY00020I, PHY00023I, PHY00011I and PHY00019I, PHY00029H). This is to align feedback return with the first laboratory session of the subsequent term.

M18-19/51   **Sub-committees**

Standing Committee on Assessment
The Committee **received** a report on the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment held on 26 October 2018 (UTC.18-19/**38**).

Online and Distance Learning Forum
The Committee **noted** the:
- terms of reference and membership of the Online and Distance Learning Forum (UTC.18-19/**39**);
- that the minutes of the Online and Distance Learning Forum held on 8 October 2018 were available at:
  https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/contacts/committees/distance/

M18-19/52   **Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups**

The Committee **received** reports on the meeting of the FLTGS:

- Arts and Humanities held on 10 October 2018 (UTC.18-19/**40a**)
- Social Sciences held on 11 October 2018 (UTC.18-19/**40b**
- Sciences held on 8 October 2018 (UTC.18-19/**40c**)

M18-19/53   **Dates of 2018/19 meetings**

The Committee **noted** that the dates of future meetings in 2018/19 were as follows:
- Thursday 6 December 2018, 9.30-13.30
- *Strategy meeting –* **Wednesday 12 December 13.00-15.00**
- Thursday 7 February 2019, 9.30-13.30
- Thursday 14 March 2019, 09.30-13.30
- Thursday 16 May 2019, 9.30-13.30
- Thursday 20 June 2019, 9.30-13.30
- *Extraordinary meeting –* **Thursday 18 July 2019, 9.30-13.30**

Secretary's post meeting note: subsequent to the meeting it had been agreed to cancel the Strategy meeting scheduled for 12 December.

UTC: November 2018