

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2019

Present: John Robinson (Chair)
Michael Bate
Stuart Bell
Mike Bentley
Ed Braman (to M18-19/81)
Wayne Campbell
Charlotte Chamberlain
Gill Chitty
Sabine Clarke
Nigel Dandy
Joe Fagan (to M18-19/80)
Jen Gibbons
James Hare
Claire Hughes
Steve King
Barry Lee
Tracy Lightfoot
Sinéad McCotter
Matthew Perry
Richard Waites
Jez Wells (to M18-19/77)

In Attendance: Jane Iddon (ASO, Secretary), Jenny Brotherton (ASO, Minute Secretary) Sally O'Connor (ASO, observing the meeting).

Apologies were received from: Lisa O'Malley, Gulcin Ozkan and Dave Smith.

CATEGORY I BUSINESS

M18-19/72 Welcome

The Chair welcomed Wayne Campbell, Academic Registrar, to the Committee and welcomed Sally O'Conner, ASO, who was observing the meeting.

M18-19/73 Minutes and Matters Arising

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2018 (UTC.18-19/54) subject to the addition of '(breaks of study)' in the first paragraph of M18-19/60.

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC. 18-19/54 **Appendix 1**).

- The Business Intelligence Unit had confirmed that the number of Ordinary Degrees awarded in 2017/18 was in line with the number awarded in previous years. The sharp

increase shown in the Tableau Workbook had been caused by a change to the way in which the data was reported. This action (M18-19/35 refers) was now closed.

- FLTGs had considered the options paper on the Programme Module Catalogue in January and the paper had been revised to include the outcome of YUSU and the GSA's student consultation.
- Programme documentation for the Computer Science online MSc Programmes and the BA in Global Development had been updated in accordance with UTC's conditions of approval and the programmes had been approved.

M18-19/74 Oral Update from the Chair

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

- Members were encouraged to submit nominations for the 2019 Vice-Chancellor's Teaching Awards. The deadline was Friday 15 March.
- The expression of interest deadline for the NTFS & CATE Awards was Friday 8 February.
- Rapid Response funding was still available.
- Senate had considered University Policy on 'lost credit' and had asked that a management reconfiguration model, similar to the approach used by the University of Liverpool, should be explored further by the PVC for Learning, Teaching and Students (TLS) and the Chair of SCA.
- The Associate Deans (TLS), Associate PVC (TLS), PVC (TLS), Head of the Academic Support Office and the newly-appointed Faculty Learning Enhancement Project Managers were meeting at the beginning of March to discuss strategic projects for learning and teaching enhancement.
- The Chair and YUSU's Academic Officer had met with Chris Millward, Director of Fair Access and Participation at the OfS, in January. Chris had emphasised the importance of a data-driven approach through which impact was analysed. An Evaluation and Evidence (Access, Success and Progression) team in the Registrar's and Planning Office was being created to support the monitoring, evaluation and impact strand of University of York's Access and Participation Plan. Chris reported that he had stressed the importance of protecting access and participation funding to the Augar Review Group. It was not known whether the outcome of the Augar Review would mean cuts to the funding that was available.
- The University would be submitting a response to the independent review of the TEF. The response was being drafted by the TEF Steering Group and would be considered by UEB and signed-off by Council.
- In response to a question regarding NSS response rates, the Chair confirmed that, as far as he was aware, the process for advising departments of response rates would be unchanged from previous years.

Post-meeting note: it was confirmed that the process for advising departments of their response rates would be unchanged.

M18-19/75 Update from the Student Representatives

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

- The GSA was preparing for the annual postgraduate student conference, an event for all postgraduate officers in the country, which York was hosting in the Summer term.
- The GSA was working on its course representative system. This included a newsletter and tailored communications for postgraduate course representatives.

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

- YUSU was working with the Chair of SCA on issues which had been raised during the January examination period.

- YUSU was surveying students on satisfaction with the Students' Union. The response rate for this had increased in comparison with previous surveys however higher levels of dissatisfaction were being reported.

M18-19/76 Digital Accessibility Regulations

Richard Walker, Head of the Programme Design and Learning Technology (PDLT) Team, attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a report on the University's response to the EU Directive on the Accessibility of Public Sector Websites and Mobile Applications (UTC.18-19/55). The report provided an update on the new digital accessibility regulations, which came into force on 23 September 2018, and proposed actions to ensure that the University was compliant with the new regulations by the deadline of September 2019. The new regulations required the University to ensure that content was accessible proactively rather than responding to the needs of individual students. The regulations applied to all digital content (not just teaching and learning material) and would have a wide impact including on procurement, as content provided to the University by external companies, would also need to be accessible. A cross-services Working Group, Chaired by Steve King, had been established to coordinate accessibility developments.

The Head of PDLT noted that there was already information about good practice on the University website but that all staff would now need to engage with this, and ensure that new content was accessible.

There was discussion about the requirement for textual alternatives where online teaching materials included graphs and charts. The Head of PDLT advised that a textual alternative should be made available. It was also reported that webpages would need to include a statement to make clear who to contact in cases where the content was not accessible.

Members questioned whether lecture capture content would need to be made available in an alternative format. The Head of PDLT had raised this with JISC and had been advised that it would be sufficient to make software available to students which would enable them to create a textual transcript.

The Committee noted that communication of the new regulations and training materials would be key to ensuring that staff engaged with the new requirements. Members advised that communication should include a memo to Heads of Department, Faculty Boards and Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups and a briefing at HoDs forum. The Working Group had proposed the development of a tutorial for all staff with further bespoke tutorials for different groups of staff with specific needs. Members suggested that the Group could establish templates for teaching materials. The Head of PDLT did not wish to impose anything overly prescriptive on departments but agreed that training materials should include example templates. The Committee **approved** the actions identified by the Working Group (pages 4-5, UTC.18-19/55) and **recommended** that a memo, outlining the requirements and the actions being taken to address them, be sent to Chairs of Boards of Studies and Heads of Department.

Action: Head of PDLT/PVC (TLS)

The Chair thanked Richard Walker for presenting the report.

M18-19/77 Annual Report on E-Learning

Richard Walker, Head of the Programme Design and Learning Technology (PDLT) Team, attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** the annual report on E-Learning services in support of learning and teaching (UTC.18-19/56). The Committee was pleased to note the continued increase in use of the VLE. Use of lecture capture had also increased significantly since the introduction of the Lecture Capture Policy at the start of the academic year. The number of lectures captured in the Autumn term had exceeded the number recorded in 2017/18. The University's supplier of lecture capture had reported that levels of student engagement with the captured material were high in comparison with its other HEI clients.

The Committee discussed the increase in lecture capture usage and noted that there was still concern in parts of the University about impact on student attendance. The PDLT Team was continuing to evaluate student experience in relation to the use of lecture capture and was running focus groups on this with YUSU. The Team had delivered a session in History of Art on study skills, supporting students to engage positively with lecture capture, and would be happy to work with other departments if there were opportunities to support effective use of lecture capture.

Members discussed whether the availability of lecture capture could be a reason for less engaged students not to attend. It was suggested that students who used lecture capture well were likely to be motivated students who were also attending lectures (although it was recognised that this observation was anecdotal). The Committee recognised that the absence of a University-wide attendance monitoring system meant that it was not currently possible to explore possible correlations.

The Committee noted the proposed Blackboard upgrade dates (likely to be 9-10 July 2019 and 10-11 December 2019) and were asked to inform the Head of PDLT if these were problematic.

Other priorities for the Team in 2019 included contributing to the Enterprise Systems Steering Group (ESSG) project, being led by IT Services, on digital assessment and feedback. The project aimed to improve digital infrastructure around assessment and feedback by introducing new services for online exams, file submission, marking and feedback. Timescales and deliverables for this project were yet to be confirmed; it was hoped that the project would begin in May and result in a business case, for major system renewal, being presented in the Autumn term. The Committee noted that securing prioritisation and funding for projects was a challenge due to the large number of projects put forward for consideration by the ESSG; members observed that projects like this (and attendance monitoring) should be viewed as capital projects. The project amalgamated all issues around digital assessment and feedback and it was hoped that the holistic approach would support its prioritisation for funding.

The Committee **endorsed** the identified priorities for 2019.

The Chair thanked Richard Walker for presenting the report.

M18-19/78 Peer Assisted Learning Scheme

Tamlyn Ryan, Academic Skills Coordinator, attended for this item

The Committee **considered** an evaluation of the pilot of the Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) Scheme which had run in 2017/18 (UTC.18-19/57). The evaluation noted positive feedback

from students who had attended PAL sessions, from PAL leaders and from PAL coordinators (most of whom were Graduate Teaching Assistants). The Academic Officer for YUSU noted his support for the scheme. He hoped that YUSU could contribute to its further development and provide support to increase participation.

Members discussed the take-up of the scheme. The number of students attending PAL sessions was growing but remained fairly low. The Committee felt that the scheme should be given time to become fully established and was optimistic that numbers would continue to increase. The Committee emphasised the importance of promoting the opportunity to students and suggested that, where possible, PAL sessions should be included in student timetables. The PAL team agreed to look into the feasibility of this. Currently the scheme was promoted at introductory sessions in week one, via leaflets, and through the VLE.

The Committee agreed that the estimated annual (direct) cost of the scheme (£10,000) seemed relatively small given its benefits. It **endorsed** PAL as an integral part of the University's approach to teaching and learning and **approved** the Framework as the most appropriate method for ensuring robust, focussed and enduring PAL schemes.

The report recommended that funding was released to cover the costs of implementing the Framework. It was noted that UTC was not a budget-holder and therefore could not provide this. The Committee noted that it was supportive of the PAL Team's request for funding. (For implementation of the pilot had been secured from Strategic Learning and Teaching funds).

The Chair thanked Tamlyn Ryan for presenting the report.

M18-19/79 Annual Report on Course Representatives

The Committee **considered** a report from YUSU and the GSA on the election and training of course representatives for 2018/19 (UTC.18-19/58). Members **received** a tabled paper of appendix 1 to replace the version circulated in advance of the meeting; the revised table included corrections to the figures (Biology, Education, Health Sciences, IPC, Politics, SPSW, TYMS, TFTV) in the 'Total Reps' column.

It was reported that 343 Course Representatives (239 undergraduate and 104 postgraduate) had been recruited, covering 82% of the available positions. There had been some IT issues with the nomination process and the Student Voice Team was working with YUSU IT staff to ensure that these issues would not be repeated in future years.

YUSU was planning to trial course representative elections towards the end of the Summer term for continuing students. The trial would be running in the Department of Health Sciences. YUSU hoped to find another department to take part and was looking for a department where students were not on placement in the Summer term. The Committee agreed that recruiting representatives in the summer could be beneficial.

The GSA had introduced a postgraduate representative specific workshop so that more focussed training could be delivered to postgraduate representatives. YUSU and the GSA had also agreed that there would be separate mailing lists for UG and PG representatives to target communications and a separate newsletter would be issued to postgraduate representatives. The Committee noted that there may also be different communication requirements for online programme course reps. It was suggested that the role descriptors might need to be tailored so that the advantages of the role were made clear to a different group of students.

The YUSU Academic Officer confirmed that departments were free to determine their number of course representatives although noted that departments had been asked to consider specific representatives for international students.

YUSU and the GSA asked UTC to consider the following recommendations for future elections, that:

- in future, course representative elections would be aligned (including PG and IPC) to enable better promotion and marketing across the University;
- YUSU would ask departments to assign dedicated student voice leads so that there was a clear point of contact for communication regarding the elections;
- YUSU would undertake research with Academic Reps and departments to identify reasons for low student engagement and to understand how the role could be made more appealing to students.

The Committee noted that the standardised timing of course representative elections would not be appropriate for the IPC due to different start dates, including a January intake for some programmes, but agreed that elections should be aligned where appropriate. UTC supported the other recommended actions and thanked YUSU and the GSA for the training provided which it felt had become more effective in recent years.

M18-19/80 Programme Map and the Programme Module Catalogue

Tim Andrew, PMC Project Manager, and David Gent, ASO, attended for this item.

The Committee **received** a paper (previously considered in November, M18-19/38 refers) which presented four options relating to the integration of the Programme Map within the Programme Module Catalogue. The options paper (which had been updated to reflect feedback from YUSU / GSA consultation with students) had been considered by Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups in January. UTC **considered** feedback from the FLTGs alongside the options paper (UTC.18-19/59).

All faculties had identified option four (to use the map as a design tool only) as the preferred option. UTC therefore **agreed** that option four should be implemented.

The Committee discussed recommendations in the paper which related to operationalising option four:

- It was noted that, for academic areas which were not aligned to a faculty, the Academic Quality Team, liaising with the (Associate) PVC (TLS) as necessary, would determine whether a proposed restructure was 'significant' and therefore required a new programme map to be produced.
- The Committee considered the recommendation that departments must submit a log prior to its Periodic Review of all major and minor modifications to programmes. It was noted that current departmental practice in relation to recording modifications varied. Members suggested that a template for logging modifications might be helpful and considered whether this should include a field which related to how the modification impacted on the Programme Learning Outcomes. The complexity of doing this for modules which contributed to multiple programmes was noted.
- It was suggested that a report of all modifications could be pulled directly from the module catalogue, however this would not (within current functionality) discriminate between modifications and minor editorial changes and so was unlikely to be fit for the purpose.
- The Committee noted that the operationalisation involved the PMC being designed to include a mapping function for new programme proposals and for 'significant'

restructures to existing provision. The Committee queried the implications of this for the project, as the map had previously been identified as a challenging part of the development of a PMC. The PMC Project Manager confirmed that developing a mapping design tool would be significantly less complex than developing a 'live' programme map (which would have had to be integrated with the module catalogue).

- It was agreed that the additional exercise, to mitigate the risk of misalignment of the curriculum with PLOs, undertaken prior to a Periodic Review, should also be undertaken for Three Year Review.

The Committee **approved** the recommendations which provided an outline of how option four would be implemented. Further work on this would be undertaken by the ASO.

The Chair thanked Tim Andrew and David Gent for attending.

M18-19/81 Annual Programme Review

The Committee **considered** a University-level summary report and a report from each faculty on the outcomes from Annual Programme Reviews for 2017/18 (UTC.18-19/60a-d). Members were thanked for having supported the process by attending their departments' APR meetings.

Themes identified in the University summary report were considered by the Committee:

- *Issues associated with combined and interdisciplinary programmes.*
The Committee noted that challenges associated with the delivery of combined courses had been tackled last year through governance changes and that, in most cases, departments had reported that the challenges were being managed.
- *Student number growth and the impact of this on the student experience.*
The Committee noted that the Dean of the Faculty of Science was Chairing a Working Group which was considering unplanned student growth and the process for decision-making during the confirmation, clearing and adjustment period.
- *Concerns relating to workload and managing change.*
The report recommended that the issue was discussed by Heads of Department at Faculty Executive Groups (FEG), where workload models could be shared to identify effective practice. It was noted that the Associate Deans attend FEG and therefore it was **agreed** that this recommendation be taken forward by the Associate Deans through discussion with the respective Faculty Dean. It was noted that workload models related to research as well as learning and teaching; it was therefore appropriate for the Faculty Deans to decide if a discussion at FEG would be helpful.

Action: Associate Deans (TLS)

- *Concerns about student engagement and attendance.*
Departments who had noted concerns about poor attendance would be encouraged to explore the reasons for this, in the first instance, with their contact in the Programme Design and Learning Technology Team. The Committee also noted that an Attendance Monitoring project to support the Attendance Monitoring Policy (approved by Senate in July 2017) had recently been approved for initiation by the Enterprise Systems Strategy Group.
- *Challenges associated with electronic marking.*
The Committee noted that several departments had commented on this and that the Digital Learning Resources Co-ordinator (ASO) was working with the respective

departments to understand the specific issues and to provide guidance to help address them. As discussed earlier in the meeting (M18-19/77 refers) the Committee noted that a Digital Assessment and Feedback project had recently been approved by ESSG, the scope of which was to improve the digital infrastructure around assessment and feedback.

- *Successful initiatives to support careers and employability.*

The Committee was pleased to note the successful initiatives in this area and that the Faculty Employability Managers had engaged with the APR process and had produced a summary of key findings for consideration by the Employability Operations Group.

Similar themes had been identified in the faculty-level summary reports. The Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities noted that innovation in relation to assessment and feedback and embedding employability were prominent themes in reports and significant effort was being made in the Faculty to encourage student engagement and strengthen the student voice. Workload and staff welfare had emerged as concerns. Increasing postgraduate populations against falling undergraduate numbers were adding to workload pressures but the Faculty acknowledged that PGT numbers was core to sustainability.

Increasing students' sense of community had emerged as a theme in Science reports and good practice was identified in connection with employability initiatives. Concerns had been raised about the impact of high student numbers, particularly unplanned numbers. The need for data in relation to how IPC students were performing was also emphasised, given concerns raised by Chemistry and Biology about the readiness of IPC students for their programmes.

The Acting Associate Dean for Social Sciences noted that the reports had uncovered a number of examples of good practice in relation to student support. Student number growth was the primary concern in the Faculty. Student engagement and attendance had been identified as another concern and it was thought that cohort size might have an impact on this. The Associate Dean observed that increased institutional insight with respect to effective processes and structures to support the delivery of programmes to large cohorts would be beneficial. The Associate Dean suggested that a strategic project considering the way in which the University delivers programmes to large cohorts, to include the establishment of 'norms' and advice for departments, might be useful.

The Committee **agreed** that (i) the proposal for a strategic project to consider how the University delivers programmes to large cohorts and (ii) the four major themes (combined/interdisciplinary provision, student number growth, workload/managing change, student engagement/attendance) identified in the University-level summary report, should be explored further at the March meeting between the PVC, Associate PVC, Associate Deans, Head of ASO and Faculty Learning Enhancement Project Managers.

Action: PVC (TLS) / Head of ASO

Members **considered** recommendations in the University-level summary report regarding the APR process.

The Committee **agreed** that:

- the deadline for 2018/19 departmental-level APR reports be Wednesday 13 November 2019;
- notwithstanding minor revisions to signpost staff to the Tableau Workbooks (currently in development by BIU), the APR report templates and guidance be unchanged;

- a review of Institutional reporting processes (including, but not limited to, APR) which focused on the enhancement of the student experience be conducted during Spring /Summer 2019;

Action: ASO

- a final decision about the 2019 APR process would be informed by early input from the review and be taken at the May UTC.

Members noted that the role of the UTC contact at the departmental APR meeting was less clear now that reports were reviewed by FLTG members rather than being reviewed directly by UTC. It was **agreed** that the review of reporting processes should include consideration of the role of the UTC contact.

M18-19/82 Online Project

The Committee **received** a verbal update from the Associate Pro-Vice Chancellor for Teaching Learning and Students on the Online Project. Marketing of the new Computer Science online programmes had started and they appeared to be recruiting well.

It had been decided that the generic 15 credit study skills module should be replaced with a department-specific study skills module to support the development of discipline-specific study skills. Higher Ed Partners (HEP) and the Head of Learning Enhancement were supporting the development of this. For the Computer Science programmes this would support the Algorithms and Data Structures module (a module for which UTC had expressed concern in relation to the amount of content covered, M18-19/61 refers).

It was reported that the Implementation Group would be considering a paper on programme start dates to ensure that they did not coincide with other busy times for the University.

The Group was reviewing student communications with HEP and the Student Success Team so that, wherever possible, the Student Success Coordinators could make use of University resources and existing networks around the University.

M18-19/83 The York Law School: Juris Doctor

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the York Law School for a new Juris Doctor programme, a 3 year taught, full-time, taught postgraduate law conversion programme starting with the UG Senior Status programme in years one and two and progressing to content from the LLM Professional Practice in year 3 (UTC.18-19/62). The programme would be taught on campus and would start in start in September 2020. It had received planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Social Sciences.

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Sabine Clark and Tracy Lightfoot and it had been considered by two external assessors (UTC.18-19/62ii-iii). The reviewers were supportive of the programme structure and its content. They noted that the module content, Programme Learning Outcomes and programme map had already been approved for the undergraduate Senior Status programme and for the LLM in Professional Practice. The only addition was the new ISM module which they felt seemed appropriate.

Members were advised that the Juris Doctor was a well-established qualification internationally but that it did not exist as a Level 7 qualification in the UK. It was reported that the Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) (QAA, 2014) reserved the use of 'doctor' for qualifications that meet the descriptor for Level 8 in full; there were currently no exemptions or exceptions written in to the Framework. The programme was intended for international students, and was expected to attract students from Canada and

America. There was one existing UK Juris Doctor programme (at Queen's University Belfast) and this was a Level 8 qualification. Law Schools had been lobbying the QAA to accept the Juris Doctor as a Level 7 qualification and, although it was expected that the QAA would change its position in the near future, it had not done so yet.

The Committee considered the documentation and noted that stage 3 comprised a total of 160 credits. In the absence of a University expectation on the credit volume for the qualification (which, if the programme and award title were approved, would need to be reflected in the University Framework for Postgraduate Taught Programme Design) it was **agreed** that the Law School should confirm whether this was correct. The Committee also **agreed** that the section on 'interim awards available' should detail the specific requirements for each of the different exit awards.

Whilst the Committee was supportive of the programme structure and content (subject to the above minor clarifications), it did **not approve the programme** because it did not comply with the FHEQ. Members noted that compliance with the FHEQ was a condition of the University's registration with the OfS.

The Committee **agreed** that subject to clarification on the queries regarding interim awards and credit volume at stage 3, the proposal would be acceptable except for the programme title. Should the FHEQ be amended to permit a Level 7 Juris Doctor, the reviewers and Chair would be authorised to confirm its approval. The Chair **agreed** to advise the Chair of Senate of the discussion at UTC and the Committee's decision. The Committee encouraged the Law School to continue making the case for permitting a level 7 Juris Doctor to the QAA.

Action: Chair of UTC

The Committee noted that the documentation received for consideration did not include a response to one of the external reviewers (Professor Yates). Professor Yates had advised that the Law School should ask for potential employers and the Bar's view on the programme. The Committee **agreed** that the Law School should seek potential employers' and the Bar's views on the programme as had been suggested.

M18-19/84 Teaching Excellence Framework

The Committee **considered** the draft institutional submission for the subject-level TEF pilot, a summary of the TEF methodology and the work being undertaken to prepare subject submissions (UTC.18-19/63).

The Committee noted that 'TEF Subjects' were defined by the OfS using the Common Aggregation Hierarchy Level 2 and did not map directly to York's Departmental structure. Subject submissions would be signed off on behalf of UTC by the project Steering Group. The OfS had adjusted its original deadlines following the release of corrected datasets in December. For three subjects (Computing, Business and Management, Economics) the deadline was 25 February. For the remaining 20 subjects the deadline was 18 March. Departments and the central team were working hard on the submissions and progress was on track.

Alongside the subject submissions, the University was required to submit to the pilot an institution-level provider submission. The University's hypothesis based on the metrics was between a gold and a silver. The Committee **endorsed** the draft provider submission, although noted that references to Together York should recognise the involvement of both YUSU and the GSA.

M18-19/85 Centre for Lifelong Learning: Three year programme reviews

The Committee **considered** a report and action plan arising from the three year review of the Centre for Lifelong Learning's PGDip in Creative Writing and the PGDip in Railway Studies. The Panel for the review was as follows: Tracy Lightfoot (Chair), Matthew Perry (the Centre's UTC contact), Charlotte Chamberlain (Student Representative) and Jenny Brotherton (Secretary). The Centre's provision was scheduled for a Periodic Review in 2019/20 and therefore it had been agreed that if the documentation did not raise any concerns the review would be completed as a desk-based exercise (M18-19/25 refers). The Panel had reviewed the documentation and agreed that a desk-based review would be appropriate.

The Panel identified several points of good practice including: the use of a variety of engaging assessment methods; that CLL was strengthening its relationship with other departments in the University; and its engagement with the Online and Distance Learning Forum. The Panel made recommendations to strengthen mechanisms to minimise errors in online material and to further explore ways to encourage all students to play an active role in online discussions. The Committee agreed that the Centre had identified appropriate actions in response to the Panel's recommendations.

The Panel highlighted its recommendation to the University which was that, as part of ongoing discussions about CLL, UEB and Planning Committee should address the significant risk of having a single point of failure (in terms of programme leadership) for the delivery of its programmes. The Chair of UTC would ensure that this was fed into the ongoing discussions about CLL's portfolio and support for complementary programmes.

The Committee **approved** the report and action plan.

Post-meeting note: There was discussion about whether the sustainability of the PGDip in Railway Studies (arising from reliance on a single tutor) was an issue for consideration by the School of Management. The PGDip resides entirely in CLL (and is governed by CLL's Board of Studies); Management does not contribute to the delivery of this programme. The recently approved MA in Railway Studies, delivered jointly by CLL (taught component) and the School of Management (research component), is also led by CLL (M17-18/77 refers).

CATEGORY II BUSINESS

M18-19/86 Faculty Learning and Teaching Group membership

The Committee **received** revised membership for Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups (UTC.18-19/65).

M18-19/87 Framework exemptions

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved an exemption to the framework for the following Natural Sciences programmes, permitting them to exceed the normal maximum number of modules that can be studied simultaneously:

Mathematical Bioscience (stage 2)

Biological Modelling (stage 3)

Nanoscience (stage 3)

Natural Science with a specialisation in Chemistry (stage 3)

Natural Science with a specialisation in Environment (stage 3)

Natural Science with a specialisation in Mathematics (stage 3)

Natural Science with a specialisation in Physics (stage 3)

Biological Modelling (stage 4)

Natural Science with a specialisation in Maths (stage 4)

M18-19/88 Feedback Turnaround Time

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved an exemption to the policy on assessment feedback turnaround time in the Department of Biology with respect to the structured scientific report assessment task (worth 45%) in '*Laboratory & Professional Skills for Bioscientists II*' (BIO000581). In respect of this assessment the feedback turnaround time would be a maximum of 40 days for the first strand followed by 35 days (second strand), 30 days (third strand) 25 days (fourth strand) and 20 days (fifth and sixth strands).

M18-19/89 Standing Committee on Assessment

The Committee **received** a report on the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment on 1 February 2019 (UTC.18-19/66).

M18-19/90 Coordinating Group for Supplementary Programmes

The Committee **noted** that the minutes from the meeting of the Coordinating Group for Supplementary Programmes held on 10 December 2018 were available at <https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/contacts/committees/supplementary-programmes/>

M18-19/91 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups

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

- Arts and Humanities held on 9 January 2019 (UTC.18-19/67a)
- Social Sciences held on 10 January 2019 (UTC.18-19/67b)
- Sciences held on 8 January (UTC.18-19/67c)

M18-19/92 Periodic Reviews

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the following external assessors for Periodic Review:

- Professor Alice Deignan (University of Leeds) and Professor Andrew Peterson (University of Birmingham) for the periodic review of Education.
- Professor Sue Pryce (University of Nottingham) for the periodic review of Politics.
- Professor Andrew Reynolds (University College London) and Professor Amy Bogaard (University of Oxford) for the periodic review of Archaeology.

M18-19/93 New Programmes

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved year abroad variants for undergraduate programmes in TYMS as follows:

- BA Business and Management (with a year abroad)
- BSc Business and Management (with a year abroad)
- BSc Accounting, Business Finance and Management (with a year abroad)
- BSc Marketing (with a year abroad)
- BSc Actuarial Science (with a year abroad)
- BSc in Finance, Operational Research, Management and Statistics (with a year abroad)

The programmes would be available for transfer only and would be available to current first year students (i.e. the first students will study abroad from October 2020).

M18-19/94 Exchange Agreements

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the following exchange agreements:

- An agreement between the Centre for Women's Studies and Università di Bologna, Bologna in Italy.
- An agreement between the Department of Language and Linguistic Science and the University of Vienna.

M18-19/95 Dates of 2018/19 meetings

The Committee **noted** that the dates of future meetings in 2018/19 were as follows:

- 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 if required*– Thursday 18 July 2019, 9.30-13.30