

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2019

Present: John Robinson (Chair)
Jane Baston
Mike Bentley
Ed Braman
Gill Chitty
Sabine Clarke
Sam Cobb
Nigel Dandy
Jen Gibbons
Claire Hughes
Steve King
Barry Lee
Tracy Lightfoot
Giang Nguyen
Mark Nicholson
Lisa O'Malley
Matthew Perry
Andrew Pickering
Dave Smith
Jill Webb
Jez Wells

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

Apologies were received from Michael Bate, Wayne Campbell and Sinéad McCotter.

CATEGORY I BUSINESS

M19-20/52 Minutes and Matters Arising

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2019 (UTC.19-20/44).

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC. 19-20/44 **Appendix 1**).

- The YUSU Representative had liaised with the Director of Employability and Careers regarding YUSU's Fears for Careers Project and had updated the Academic Registrar (M19-20/32 refers). The YUSU Representative would be providing feedback on behalf of students, to Careers and Placements in due course, regarding careers support within departments.
- The actions relating to the MA / MSc Sustainability Proposals (M19-20/37 refers) were

to be considered as a separate Category I item (M19-20/63 refers).

- At the last meeting the Chair had referred to research undertaken by Marketing in respect of a possible correlation between a departmental 'You Said We Did' campaign and NSS scores for the Student Voice (M19-20/36 refers). The Chair clarified that the paper had been reflected on by the PVC and Head of ASO; the paper had not been considered by UTC.

M19-20/53 Oral Update from the Chair

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

- The Chair raised to the attention of the Committee the Category II paper: minutes of the Access & Participation Steering Group, November meeting (UTC.19-20/61). The Chair reported that the group had considered and approved a number of Access and Participation Initiative Fund bids.
- The Chair reported that the QAA were currently undertaking an exercise to refresh Subject Benchmark Statements, to ensure that they reflected the revised Quality Code (2018). The changes being made did not constitute changes of substance with respect to the content of each Statement; it was therefore expected that the University's provision would remain aligned. Updates to Subject Benchmark Statements in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics subjects were published at the end of October. Over the coming months revisions to other subjects would be made. It was reported that once the Subject Benchmark Statements were revised and published, the Academic Quality Team would contact the relevant Chair of BoS to highlight the revisions and request that it be shared with relevant Programme Leaders.
- The Chair reported that the Annual Learning and Teaching Conference was taking place on Friday 13 March and applications to contribute were now open. The Chair encouraged colleagues to apply and noted that the deadline for applications was Monday 3 February.
- The Chair reported that nominations for the 2020 Teaching Excellence Awards were now open. These included nominations for the individual National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS) and the Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence (CATE) run by AdvanceHE. The Chair noted that expressions of interest should be sent to Julia Hampshire, Academic Support Office, by noon on Wednesday 8 January.
- The Chair reported that the first meeting of the Teaching, Learning and Student Sustainability Working Group had taken place on 5 December. Discussions had taken place and information was exchanged in relation to sustainability teaching and teaching methods, student involvement in sustainability teaching and sustainability within the curriculum.
- The Chair confirmed that a decision had been taken to convene the one-agendum UTC meeting on Friday 10 January, 15.00-16.00 (Room 008, Berrick Saul Building) to consider proposals for a BEng in Electronic and Electrical Engineering and a MEng in Electronic and Electrical Engineering. The Chair thanked members for accommodating this additional meeting. The nominated UTC reviewers (Claire Hughes and Mark Nicholson) had already begun the work to review the proposals (which had included a constructive meeting with the programme team on 11 December).

M19-20/54 Update from the Student Representatives

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

- The November meeting of the Student Voice Group had included a review of three student voice resources (M19-20/30 refers).
- The Student Voice Group had also discussed definitions of 'student voice' and 'student

representation' and it was clear that these terms were used differently across the Institution. In order to develop proposals for Institution-wide definitions the Group had agreed to conduct further research.

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

- The GSA Vice President Academic and the GSA Representation and Democracy Coordinator were both members of the Student Voice Group and had been involved in the exploratory work outlined by YUSU representative.

M19-20/55 Procedures for approval of irregular or high-risk placements

Andrew Ferguson, Strategic Project Manager (Careers and Placements), attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a proposal for new procedures for approving irregular or high-risk placements (UTC.19-20/45). The paper proposed two new procedures to improve consistency and quality in the approval of placement year opportunities as part of an accredited year either in industry, on placement or abroad. It was reported that the number of students taking a placement year as part of their degree studies was increasing, and it was anticipated that requests for placements, mostly overseas, without the appropriate insurances in place would also increase. The emerging increase in requests for irregular or potentially high-risk placements had implications for the criteria and processes that guide the University's duty of care to its students on placement. Whilst there were currently management procedures in place to evaluate and approve such opportunities, there was also the increased risk of inconsistency across the Institution.

The following two new procedures were recommended for introduction, initially to cover the Careers-hosted placement module and the Year in Industry modules for the departments of Biology, Politics, Sociology and Environment & Geography in 2020-21 (with the intention of widening this scope the following academic year once their effectiveness had been assessed):

1. Where a placement did not have the appropriate insurances in place the proposing student would be asked to sign a declaration that makes clear that the student was undertaking the placement at their own risk.
2. To establish an Irregular or Higher Risks Placements Forum (Chaired by a Faculty Dean and administered by Careers & Placements) which will make a recommendation with respect to the final sign-off of the risk assessment.

The proposal had been informed by a range of stakeholders and was endorsed by the Student Life Committee on 7 November 2019. It was noted that the new procedures would ensure a consistent approach to risk and would introduce a shared responsibility for approving an irregular or high-risk placement.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- The Committee suggested that the procedure document should include a clear definition of the type of placement (including the restriction to 9-month to year-long placements) covered by the procedure, and asked that consideration be given in the future to extending the scope to cover placements of a shorter duration.
- It was noted that the title ('irregular and high-risk') of the proposed procedure suggested a wider scope than was actually the case. The Committee suggested that consideration be given to revising the title to more accurately capture the scope (which was concerned with placements that were high risk due to the absence of

appropriate insurance).

- Risk factors may be student dependent (for example risks for LGBT students arising in some countries). It was noted that these factors were considered as part of the standard (health and safety) process for risk-assessing the placement in respect of health and safety on placements.
- The Committee suggested that consideration be given as to how country-specific 'on-the-ground' knowledge (arising from research and teaching collaborations) might be drawn on, for example through identifying contacts via reports to International Committee.
- The Strategic Project Manager noted that there were common features of risk, however requests for irregular or high-risks placements would still be considered on a case-by-case basis. It was also expected that trends would emerge through a more consistent approach to the approval process.
- The Committee noted that current guidance for students would need to be reviewed and updated in respect of the new procedures.

With a request that the Strategic Project Manager take note of the above and where necessary take action, Teaching Committee **endorsed** the proposed new procedures for approving irregular or high-risk placements.

The Chair thanked Andrew for presenting the paper.

M19-20/56 York Experience Survey

Dr Zoë Devlin, Executive Officer to the Academic Registrar, and Dr David Gent, Faculty Learning Enhancement Project Manager (Academic Support Office), attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a report arising from the York Experience Survey results (UTC.19-20/46a).

The York Experience Survey (YES) had been running annually since 2015-16, as an internal-only survey with aggregated data available from 2016-17. Its purpose was to provide better insight in to how undergraduate students felt they have been supported to engage with their programme and with the wider development opportunities at the University. In addition the survey provided an opportunity to attempt to predict responses to the National Student Survey (NSS); it was reported that project requirements had now been specified as a result of the findings and work was underway to map those questions asked in both the YES and the NSS. This further analysis would be reported to UTC in due course. In order to increase the response rate the survey had been run at different times of the year and, as a result, the target population had varied. Analysis of the response rate by demographic group revealed an imbalance towards respondents being white, female students aged 18-21.

The low response rate (13% for the 2018-19 survey) had made it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from the results, however aggregating data over the last three years had revealed some patterns:

- Female students appeared less confident than males in the development of their academic skills.
- Mature students showed higher levels of academic engagement, but were more likely to say they needed help with developing their skills.
- BAME students and students with Specific Learning Difficulties were more likely to say they needed help with skills development.

It was reported that the Office for Students were considering a pilot to extend the NSS to all undergraduate students over the next two years. **The Committee agreed that, if the NSS were extended to all undergraduate students, the University should cease to run the YES.**

The Committee noted that YES sample sizes had been much smaller than NSS response rates and, due to the NSS being anonymised, it had not been possible to identify if the same students had completed both surveys, to allow a full comparison of data.

The Committee noted that the Freshers' survey had provided more worthwhile data than the YES data. Although data from the YES survey had been useful over the last few years, it was noted that revisions to the NSS (for example in respect of learning community and student voice) now covered the YES dimensions.

The Committee **considered** an additional analysis of York Experience Survey results on student engagement (UTC.19-20/**46b**).

It was reported that the YES included a number of questions pertinent to students' engagement in learning. In connection with the Student Engagement project an additional analysis of YES results for 2017 and 2018 had been carried out.

The key findings were as follows:

- Time spent in independent study was an important predictor of (i) coming to sessions prepared (ii) contributing within sessions.
- The ability of staff to make the subject interesting was important in terms of whether respondents felt stimulated by their course.
- Undertaking paid work had a detrimental impact on students finding the subject interesting.
- With the exception of 'course is intellectually stimulating' the analyses did not prove to be particularly powerful predictors of answers to questions.

The Committee noted that, as with the main report arising from the YES results (UTC.19-20/**46a**), the low response rate made it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from the results. Furthermore it was reported that the data did not take into account demographic factors or individual departments. The main YES report (UTC.19-20/**46a**) had revealed some significant differences between demographic groups, but this could not be explored further within the additional analysis (UTC.19-20/**46b**). Key factors tested in YES, including the influence of staff and learning community, were being explored further through qualitative research in the Student Engagement project and would be reported to UTC later in the academic year.

The Chair thanked Zoë and David for presenting the papers.

M19-20/57 Impact of the industrial action

The Chair provided an oral update on the impact of the industrial action. It was reported that the University Academic Contingency Group, chaired by the PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students, had met daily during the eight days of strike action (Monday 25 November to Wednesday 4 December).

The Chair raised to the attention of the Committee a confidential Category II paper: Contingency Advice (UTC.19-20/**60**); this provided guidance to Departmental Management teams on ways to minimise the disruption to student learning. Members were cognisant of the particular pressures that Heads of Department were under, as they were responsible for mitigating the impact on students. Likewise, members noted that staff may have felt conflicted and therefore regular meetings and communications had taken place to mitigate the risks to the student learning experience and community.

The UCU would be re-balloting 37 Universities in January seeking to extend the reach of the industrial action. It was possible that further strike action would take place in mid-February,

however there was a concern that this would be scattered throughout the term and could affect entire modules. The Vice-Chancellor was engaged in discussions at a national and local level.

The impact across departments had been varied; due to the structure of IPC provision the teaching lost for these programmes was particularly severe.

The YUSU representative reported that approximately 1000 students had signed a change.org petition, which had focused on monetary reimbursements for teaching missed due to the strike action. It was also noted that there had been fewer student complaints (compared with the Spring 2018 strike action). It was suggested that good communication, prior to and throughout the period of industrial action, had been a reason for fewer complaints.

M19-20/58 Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Assessment Project

Jan Ball, Faculty Learning Enhancement Project Manager (Academic Support Office), attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** an update on the Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Assessment Project from the Inclusivity Strategy Working Group (UTC.19-20/47). The project was initially established in 2018 for two years, however additional funding had been received through the Access and Participation Initiative Fund, to enable further development of the project over the next three years. The project would require project management support from the Academic Support Office and the work would be taken forward via an Inclusive Learning Adviser (to be recruited) and student interns.

The project plan aims included the development of practical resources, workshops and toolkits to facilitate inclusive practice(s) within the learning and teaching environment, and the establishment of an Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Assessment Special Interest Group. The intention was for students to be partners in the design and development of the resources. It was reported that the inaugural meeting of the Special Interest Group had taken place at the end of November.

Initially the project was being piloted through four pathway departments (SPSW, Computer Science, Language and Linguistic Science and Music), with the view to building up to twelve pathway departments (four per faculty). Furthermore, an Inclusivity Champion would be appointed for each department to support the dissemination of good practice; it was reported that this could be any member of staff that had an interest in this area.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- The Committee welcomed the idea of a departmental Inclusivity Champion and it was suggested that consideration be given to the appointment of student inclusivity champions too.
- Members noted that there were a large number of University projects using a pathfinder approach and that a number of departments were participating as pathfinder departments in multiple projects, whilst some departments were less engaged. It was noted that the pathfinder approach for this project was designed to enable participating departments to pilot tailored and subject-specific practices (which was likely to encourage uptake).
- Members noted that one of the main barriers to inclusive teaching were campus buildings and access to lecture theatres. The Committee suggested including a member from Space Management on the Inclusivity Strategy Group.

- Members noted that accessibility of software also needed to be considered. It was reported that work was being undertaken to ensure compliance with the EU Directive on the Accessibility of Public Sector Websites and Mobile Applications. However further work outside of this was needed, for example the procurement of systems and support for assessments. It was reported that a student focus group planned for the Spring term would explore issues with accessibility and software.
- It was noted that Disability Services were involved in the development of resources and tools, and would be sharing good practice where solutions have been made.

The Chair thanked Jan for presenting the report.

M19-20/59 Programme Module Catalogue (PMC)

Tim Andrew, PMC Project Manager, attended for this item

The Programme Module Catalogue Project Manager provided an oral progress report. A pathfinder approach had been adopted. Pathfinder departments were Politics, Environment and Geography, TFTI and Natural Sciences. To date, sixty three Programme Design Documents (PDDs) from the pathfinder departments had been uploaded to the live Programme Catalogue covering 2018/19 and 2019/20. The live PMC was available to staff and was accessible through a single login system using University credentials. Pathfinder departments would create their 2020/21 PDDs (in advance of the annual August deadline) within the PMC.

The majority of 2018/19 PDDs for undergraduate programmes had been migrated to a 'staging template' (a necessary preparatory step prior to migration to the live PMC) and work was ongoing for 2019/20 PDDs. It was noted that the tools incorporated within the system simplified the migration of future years, therefore the process for 2019/20 PDDs would be much quicker. Work was yet to begin on postgraduate taught PDDs programmes; additional resource was planned to support this process.

The Chair noted that this was a substantial and complex project and it was pleasing to see the progress that had been made.

The Chair thanked Tim for providing the update.

M19-20/60 Online Project

The Committee **considered** an update from the Online Project Implementation Group (UTC.19-20/48).

The first suite of HigherEd Partners UK (HEP)-York online Masters programmes were launched in 2017. There had been rapid growth of student numbers with a total of 800 students enrolling since the launch of the first suite of programmes (in Management). Student numbers were predicted to double in the next twelve months.

It was reported that the policy framework developed for York-HEP provision was now in need of review to more effectively align with the model of delivery and mode of study (and thereby support the best possible student experience). The Committee **endorsed** the proposed review of the policy framework (including, but not limited to, Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessment, Leave of Absence, Repeat study and Recognition of Prior Learning).

In addition to the proposal to conduct a review of the policy framework the Committee **considered** a proposal to create a new Board of Studies (BoS) (and associated committees) to provide governance and oversight of York-HEP provision. It was proposed that the academic lead for the York-HEP provision (currently the Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for

Teaching, Learning and Students) be a member of the BoS and that HEP's Academic Director (or their nominee) be 'in attendance'.

During the discussion the following points were made:

- Members noted that the current governance arrangement (oversight of HEP-online provision *within* departmental BoS) facilitated the exchange of good practice with respect to programme design and delivery. A challenge with the proposal was that it may foster a silo mentality (and create a feeling of isolation for departmental staff teaching on the programmes). In order to mitigate the impact of this risk it was suggested that department Chairs of BoS (or their nominee) should be members of the York-HEP BoS. Members noted that it might be challenging for the Chair of BoS from departments delivering York-HEP provision (currently Management and Computer Science) to be involved in every BoS meeting.
- The importance of clarity of staff roles and responsibilities (central and departmental) to ensure effective decision-making and sharing of good practice was emphasized.
- Members queried the impact of the proposed arrangement on the Annual Programme Review (APR) process (specifically the locus of responsibility); the Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students explained that the Online Project Implementation Group would develop detailed procedures and processes.

The Committee **endorsed, in principle**, the creation of a single BoS for York-HEP online provision. It was **noted** that the Online Project Implementation Group would develop a detailed proposal, for consideration by UTC and approval by Senate, to include membership, remit and meeting frequency. The proposal would also include a recommendation to create a number associated bodies (Student-Staff Forum, Board of Examiners and an Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessment Committee). The detailed proposal would be considered by UTC in the Spring term.

M19-20/61 External Examiners

The Committee **considered** a summary report of the undergraduate external examiners' reports for 2018/19 (UTC.19-20/49). It was reported that, since the circulation of papers, the outstanding External Examiner report for the Centre for Lifelong Learning had been received. All externals had confirmed that standards were appropriate, that student performance was comparable with similar programmes in other UK institutions, and that processes for assessment and the determination of awards were fair.

Members **considered** the summary report, which highlighted common themes:

- *Board of Examiners meetings:* As in previous years, the report highlighted the need for more contextual data to be provided prior to the examination boards, to help identify trends. The Committee noted that information provided to Boards of Examiners was a priority area for SCA in 2019/20.
- *Moderation practices:* As in previous years, there were a number of reports of moderation practices not being transparent. Departments had all responded that they were addressing the issues raised, for example, by reviewing processes/moderation forms; ensuring clearer audit trails; providing further training or revising their marking criteria and guidance.
- *Assessment criteria:* A number of departments were commended for the quality, clarity and robustness of the assessment criteria.
- *Standards.* Whilst the increased proportion of first class degrees awarded was highlighted by a small number of externals, it was reported that the increase was

comparable to peer institutions or reflected high achievement, high quality teaching and / or admission tariff. A number of externals had noted instances of pockets of overmarking and undermarking reported. Departments' responses included plans to improve guidance and / or training for markers and moderators.

- *Feedback*: Numerous externals identified areas of good practice across departments. That said, a number of reports highlighted issues of inconsistencies in relation to: the quality and volume of feedback provided; and being more explicit alignment to assessment criteria.
- *Assessment*: A number of departments were commended for the quality of assessment design and variety of assessment methods. As in previous years a number of externals had suggested a greater diversity of assessments be considered.
- *Workload and marking deadlines*: Pressures on staff workload (marking turnaround, administrative demands relating to Boards of Examiners) were highlighted by a number of externals.

The paper was also considered by SCA at its meeting on 6 December. The Chair of SCA reported that SCA had discussed the issues highlighted in the report. The Chair of SCA confirmed that all these issues were already being considered by SCA, through various mechanisms, this year. A YUSU-led project on assessment transparency (including what information is provided to students and the clarity of that information) would hopefully enable SCA to gain some further insight too. SCA welcomed the structure of the report (particularly the section concerned with standards) and requested that future reports more clearly identify the extent of the concern for example by including information on the number of externals (and the provision for which the external had oversight).

M19-20/62 The Department of Philosophy: MA in Analytic Theology

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the Department of Philosophy for a new MA in Analytic Theology (UTC.19-20/50).

The proposal was for a full time (over one year) or part time (over two years) on campus programme to be introduced in September 2020. Possible exit awards were PG Diploma in Analytic Theology and PG Certificate in Analytic Theology. The proposals had planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Arts and Humanities (October 2019). The proposal followed a similar modular structure to the MA in Philosophy. The programme comprised core modules only; two new (20-credit) modules had been developed and the remaining core modules would be drawn from existing modules.

The proposal had been considered by two external assessors who had both recommended that the proposal should proceed. One external suggested recommendations which had either been addressed or clarified by the department, and the second external did not make any recommendations. The programme had been reviewed in advance by Sabine Clarke and Andrew Pickering and had their support.

The reviewers reported that the programme offered content in a cutting edge and expanding field of scholarly enquiry, differing to similar MAs elsewhere in its comparative approach to faith, considering theological issues using analytic philosophy. The field of analytic theology was currently attracting a large proportion of the PhD students who work within the department and therefore an MA in this area was likely to be popular. It was noted that the proposal consisted of a range of assessments that would equip students with skills useful in the world of work.

One of the external assessors raised that there were no optional modules on the programme and recommended that this be kept under review. Furthermore, they recommended that

the compulsory nature of the students' being asked to undertake a spiritual practice of their choice for one week in the 'Philosophy of the Spiritual Life' module should be carefully considered. It was reported that the programme team had subsequently revised this in line with the recommendation and had amended the activity to 'study and observe a practice for one week'. It was also suggested that the two compulsory field trips to houses of worship (one field trip for each new core module), should be kept under review. It was reported that the reason for having a field trip for both modules was because the modules would also be made available as an elective. It was noted that students may feel that one field trip could cover all aspects, and may not be keen to return to the same place (or to branch out into a different religion). It was therefore suggested that the programme team differentiate the separate field trips encouraging the opportunity to attend different houses of worship to develop their understanding of different religions.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- Members highlighted a disparity between the modules structure for the full and part-time route; whereby the 20-credit module 'Topics in Practical Philosophy' PHI00019M occurred for the full time route, but had been replaced by the 20-credit module 'project essay' PHI00031M, for the part time route.
- Members perceived that the programme documentation suggested that the programme was heavily research focused (akin to the first year of an integrated PhD).
- A concern was raised in relation to student workload for the new 'Philosophy of Abrahamic Faiths' module, in respect of the short turnaround time between the submission of the formative assessment (essay plan, week 10) and the summative assessment (essay, week 2).

The Committee **agreed to approve** the programme subject to the following two conditions and consideration of three recommendations:

Conditions, that:

1. The disparity between the modules for the full and part-time route be rectified.
2. In order to address the concern about student workload for 'Philosophy of Abrahamic Faiths', the assessment submission dates be revised to allow more time for students to act upon the feedback from the formative assessment.

The Committee recommended that:

1. The Statement of Purpose be revised to more clearly articulate the wider purpose of the programme. The Statement of Purpose should articulate that, whilst the programme offered research opportunities and the opportunity to prepare for a PhD, other career paths were options too (for example secondary school teaching).
2. The absence of optional modules on the programme be kept under review.
3. The requirement for two compulsory field trips (one for each new core module) be kept under review.

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.

M19-20/63 The Department of Archaeology and the Department of Environment and Geography: Sustainability Programmes

The Committee **considered** the external assessor report from Dr Davies (and the programme team's response to the report) for the proposed MA Sustainability Studies and MSc

Sustainability Science (UTC.19-20/51). The Chair reported that the main issues raised in the external assessor report had been responded to appropriately by the programme team, and the programme team had confirmed that a number of issues had already been addressed or were planning to be addressed. The external assessor had subsequently responded that he was fully satisfied with the response from the programme team.

The outstanding actions (M19-20/37 refers) were as follows, (i) to secure a third external assessor report and respond to issues therein, (ii) to address outstanding issues raised by the UTC reviewers and to amend the programme design documents (PDDs) accordingly, (iii) to accurately present the ISM on the PDD. It was reported that a third external assessor had been contacted, however, confirmation to carry out the role and subsequent completion of the report was still awaited.

The UTC reviewers, Jez Wells and Ed Braman, confirmed that all the revisions required for the PDDs (UTC.19-20/52a,b), including the accurate presentation of the ISM, had been completed and all the issues raised had been addressed satisfactorily (M19-20/64 refers).

The Committee **agreed to approve** the programmes subject to the receipt of a third external assessor (who had experience of the UK HE sector) report and response to issues therein.

The Committee **agreed** that the external assessor report (and response) should be reviewed by the UTC reviewers and be subject to final sign-off by the Chair of UTC.

CATEGORY II BUSINESS

M19-20/64 The Department of Archaeology and the Department of Environment and Geography Sustainability Programmes

The Committee **received** the revised Programme Design Documents for the proposed:

- (a) MA in Sustainability Studies (UTC.19-20/52a);
- (b) MSc in Sustainability Science (UTC.19-20/52b).

M19-20/65 Programme Design Undergraduate Framework

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved amendments to the Programme Design Undergraduate Framework (UTC.19-20/53).

M19-20/66 Higher Education Classification of Subjects

The Committee **received** a paper on the Higher Education Classification of Subjects coding system (UTC.19-20/54).

M19-20/67 Apprenticeship provision

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved:

- (a) Statement of Approach: Higher and degree apprenticeship subcontracting arrangements (UTC.19-20/55a);
- (b) Apprenticeship provision: collaborative provision pro forma for initial consideration (UTC.19-20/55b);
- (c) Apprenticeship provision: collaborative provision due diligence pro forma (UTC.19-20/55c);

(d) Apprenticeship provision: due diligence comment form (UTC.19-20/55d).

M19-20/68 Policy Statement on Study Abroad

This item was deferred.

M19-20/69 Sub-committees / fora

Standing Committee on Assessment

The Committee **received** a report on the minutes of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment held on 6 December 2019 (UTC.19-20/57).

Online and Distance Learning Special Interest Group

The Committee **noted** the terms of reference and membership of the Online and Distance Learning Special Interest Group (formerly the Online and Distance Learning Forum) (UTC.19-20/58), and received the minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2019 (UTC.19-20/59).

Access and Participation Steering Group

The Committee **received** the minutes of the meeting of the Access and Participation Steering Group held on 22 November 2019 (UTC.19-20/61).

M19-20/70 Industrial Action

The Committee **received** the Contingency Advice for Heads of Department and Departmental Officers and Managers (UTC.19-20/60) [confidential].

M19-20/71 Revised UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Advice and Guidance

The Committee **received** an update on the cross-university mapping exercise with respect to the revised UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Advice and Guidance (UTC.19-20/62).

M19-20/72 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups

The Committee **received** reports of the meetings of the Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups:

- Arts and Humanities meeting held on 13 November 2019 (UTC.19-20/63a)
- Sciences meetings held on 13 November 2019 (UTC.19-20/63c)

The Committee would receive the report of the Social Sciences meeting, held on 20 November 2019, at its February 2020 meeting.

M19-20/73 Periodic Reviews

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved Professor Gina Wisker (University of Brighton) and Dr Suzanne Clisby (Goldsmiths, University of London) to act as external assessors for the periodic review of Women's Studies (Spring Term).

M19-20/74 Registers

The Committee **received** the 2019/20 registers for:

- Distance learning programmes (UTC.19-20/64a)
- Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (UTC.19-20/64b)
- Collaboration (UTC.19-20/64c)

M19-20/75 **Dates of 2019/20 meetings**

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

- *One-agendum meeting* - Friday 10 January 2020 (Room 008, Berrick Saul Building, 15.00-16.00) [M19-20/53 refers]
- Thursday 6 February 2020
- Thursday 12 March 2020
- Thursday 14 May 2020
- Thursday 18 June 2020
- *Extraordinary meeting* – Thursday 16 July 2020