



SENATE

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2015

Present: Professor J Robinson (Chair), Ms L Booth, Mr N Dandy, Ms C Dantec, Mrs K Dodd, Professor C Fewster, Dr J Hardman, Dr S King, Dr T Lightfoot, Professor M Matravers, Mr G Offer (YUSU representative), Dr M Roodhouse, Dr K Selby, Dr Á Shiel, Dr R Vann, Dr R Waites, Professor A Young, Dr C van Wyhe.

In attendance: Professor S Bell (Dean, Social Sciences), Mr D Clarke (ASO), Mrs J Fox (ASO, Secretary), Mr T Franklin (Planning Office, for M14-15/143), Dr D Gent (ASO, for M14-15/141), Mr K Leach (GSA General Manager), Ms A Loftfield (Academic Registry Communications Officer, for M14-15/144), Mr P Ratcliff (Operations Manager, Arts and Humanities, for M14-15/143), Professor T Stoneham (Dean, Graduate Research School for M14-15/141), Dr R Walker (ASO, for M14-15/142).

Apologies: Professor J Thijssen, Ms J Horvatic (GSA representative), Professor B Fulton (Dean, Sciences), Professor M Ormrod (Dean, Arts and Humanities), Dr J Grenville (PVC for Students).

CATEGORY I BUSINESS

M14-15/133 Welcome

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting.

M14-15/134 Minutes of the March Meeting

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2015 (UTC.14-15/80).

M14-15/135 Matters Arising from the Minutes

The Committee **considered** the matters arising from the March minutes (UTC.14-15/80 **Appendix 1**). It was **noted** that:

- in relation to M14-15/117, it was expected that the policies on Study Abroad and Placements would be completed and circulated to departments later in May/June, following comments from the Centre for Global Programmes;
- in relation to M14-15/118, the modifications to the MSc in International Humanitarian Affairs had been approved;

- in relation to M14-15/120, the report on degree attainment and entry profiles for undergraduates who had completed their programme in 2012/13 and 2013/14 (UTC.14-15/74) had been considered by Senate at its meeting on 5 May 2015. Senate had agreed that the data should be made available to departments on the Management Information Gateway but with no specific actions or recommendations attached. If departments wished to undertake further analysis they were able to do so in consultation with the Business Intelligence Unit. It was also noted that the University now had the mechanism in place by which to undertake more longitudinal analysis of degree outcomes in future;
- in relation to M14-15/122, a response to the review of Health Economics for Healthcare Professionals and MSc in Economic Evaluation for HTA had been received and was being considered.

M14-15/136 Oral Update from the Chair

The Committee **received** an oral update as follows:

- Members were reminded to sign up for the Annual Learning and Teaching Conference: “One size does not fit all: ensuring all students reach their potential” on Wednesday 10 June 2015, 9.15-5pm in the Exhibition Centre;
- An Equality and Diversity Committee sub-group had been established to consider the changes to the Disabled Students’ Allowance. Any issues relating to teaching and learning policy would come to UTC;
- The 2015 National Student Survey had closed, with a final response rate of 71%. It was noted that HEFCE’s minimum publication threshold had changed to 10 respondents (reduced from 23) and 50% of the sample population;
- The Postgraduate Research Experience Survey was due to close later on 14 May 2015. The current response rate was 47%;
- The UK Engagement Survey was due to close on 15 May 2015. The current response rate was 15%;
- Guidance on the process for Annual Programme Review of 2014/15 had been sent out to departments. The main changes to the process were allowing action plans to be appended, a forward-looking question about the top three learning and teaching priorities for the next 12 months, and a separate section on postgraduate research;
- All Boards of Studies would be expected to have a student-facing statement on module evaluation processes from 2015/16. A memo and exemplar had been sent to departments;
- A meeting would take place on 11 June to consider approval of the research integrity tutorial. Representatives of UTC, University Research Committee, Graduate Research School, Ethics Committee and the Graduate Students Association would be in attendance;

- An additional meeting of UTC was scheduled for 25 June 2015 to discuss the International Pathway College. It would take place in HG15, 11am – 1pm, with lunch provided.

M14-15/137 Oral Update from the Student Representatives

YUSU

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

- Members were thanked for their support of YUSU's Excellence in Teaching and Supervision Awards. Nominations for the 2015 awards were now closed. A record number had been received;
- Development of a YUSU Strategy document was in its final stages, and would be considered by Student Experience Committee before UTC;
- Richard Quayle, YUSU's Student Engagement Development Coordinator was leaving YUSU later in May. His successor would be appointed shortly.

GSA

The Committee **received** an oral report from the GSA General Manager, representing the GSA President, as follows:

- Elections were underway for a new GSA President, with an appointment expected for 1 September 2015;
- The position of GSA General Manager would be renamed Chief Executive Officer;
- The GSA was running sessions for postgraduate course representatives to highlight common issues that were being raised in departments;
- The GSA continued to facilitate meetings between postgraduate research representatives and the Dean of the Graduate Research School.

M14-15/138 International Pathway College

The Committee **received** an update on the progression agreement with Kaplan International College (KIC) London (UTC.14-15/81) and an oral update on the development of the programme from the Academic Lead.

Phase 1

The Academic Lead reported that due diligence had been completed, and a progression agreement signed with KIC that would provide students on Foundation Certificate and Graduate Diploma (pre-masters) courses at KIC London with guaranteed entry to University undergraduate and masters programmes, subject to certain entry requirements being met. It was expected that up to 50 students that were studying at KIC London in 2015/16 would progress to University programmes in 2016/17.

During the discussion it was **noted** that a number of University departments required interviews for entry. However, under the agreement with KIC, with the exception of Law (due to PBL requirements), it had been agreed that interviews would not take place. It was reported that it was also unlikely that interviews would be used as a progression requirement in future, as further plans for the International Pathway College were developed (phase 2). It was suggested that it must be clear to departments if and how they could interview/meet with potential students and the purpose of such meetings (e.g., if they could not be used as a progression hurdle).

Phase 2

The University's international pathway programmes were being developed for 2016/17. A UTC sub-group was meeting and would bring approval recommendations to UTC on 25 June 2015. Work was ongoing to resolve issues around programme structures, levels (particularly modules on academic skills and language), award rules, entry requirements and programme titles.

M14-15/139 SPSW: MA in Social and Public Policy

The Committee **considered** proposals from the Department of Social Policy and Social Work for an MA in Social and Public Policy (UTC.14-15/82) to start in October 2016. The programme had been reviewed in advance of the meeting by Mark Roodhouse and Cordula van Wyhe, and had their support and that of the external assessors.

The programme would be delivered online. Given the departmental expertise in delivering this type of programme, it had been agreed that the additional distance learning paperwork would not be required as part of the proposal. It was **noted** that the proposal contained only one new module, which the Department had requested be pass/fail.

During the course of discussion, the Committee **noted** some minor points for the programme team to consider, as follows:

- Reassessment timings should be added into the programme specification, in discussion with the ASO QA contact;
- The variety of feedback mechanisms used should be clear in documentation and in marketing. The proposal paperwork focused mainly on written feedback, though the reviewers noted the many other good mechanisms that would be used;
- The team should ensure that all documentation was up to date and reflected the Department's wider discussions about the modules;
- A member noted that none of the module titles reflected the programme title, and commented that this might be something the team wished to consider.

The Committee **decided** to approve the programme, including the Graduate Workshop as a pass/fail module. It was also **decided** that the programme would not be subject to a three-

year review (given the team's experience with distance learning programmes), but the Department should monitor student workload and completion and withdrawal via Annual Programme Review.

[**Secretary's note:** having received both Planning Committee and UTC approval, the programme may now be advertised].

In discussion it was also **noted** that recent Masters programme proposals (including this one) had a 2.1 admissions requirement. A member noted that where such programme proposals were submitted the department should be reminded that the University minimum requirement is a 2:2 and there was no obligation for a higher requirement.

ACTION: Secretary to forward this observation to SRA for consideration

M14-15/140 Learning and Teaching Strategy

The Committee **considered** a draft of the new Learning and Teaching Strategy (UTC.14-15/83). The Strategy had been written by the Chair and the Head of the ASO, taking into account views expressed at the UTC away day in December 2014, and informed by the input of the UTC Learning and Teaching Strategy Working Group and members of the project team working on piloting the York pedagogy.

During the discussion it was **noted** that:

- section C5.1 was potentially very wide-reaching, and could provide an opportunity to formalise the University Ordinances and Regulations and make boundaries of departmental committees clear;
- section C6 could refer more explicitly to initiatives including the virtual feedback hub and online module choice;
- clearer reference could be made to how the University would continue to provide appropriate resource and support for excellent teaching;
- there was a suggestion that the document was too mechanistic in tone;
- section B5 could refer to internationalisation and a commitment to a global approach to teaching. It was also noted that the phrase 'distinctiveness' was time-dependent and what was distinctive now might not be in 5-10 years;
- the Strategy should reflect an awareness of, and responsiveness to, sector developments/issues;
- the development of a 'student compact' or similar had the support of YUSU and the NUS. Rather than be a type of 'contract', members suggested that it should provide a framework for continuing discussion between students and academic staff in partnership (e.g., the suggestion was made of a 'York Deal');
- the University's understanding of its learning community was changing due to the increasing use of technology. It was suggested that the Strategy should refer to this

more explicitly, and there was a concern that by reducing it to transactions (lectures, seminars, etc.) the sense of community could be diminished.

It was **decided** that the Chair and the Head of the ASO would make amendments to the document in the light of the discussion. The revised draft would be circulated for consultation across the University. Further consideration would be given to how students would be included in the consultation. It was envisaged that UTC and Senate would consider the Strategy for approval in October 2015.

Members should send any further comments on the draft to the Chair and the Head of the ASO.

ACTION: Chair and Head of ASO

M14-15/141 Distance Learning PhDs

Tom Stoneham (Dean, Graduate Research School) and David Gent (ASO) attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a paper on distance learning PhDs (UTC.14-15/84). The Department of Computer Science had recently submitted a proposal, with Planning Committee approval, for a PhD delivered primarily at a distance. The University did not currently offer PhD programmes of this type. As the proposal was precedent-setting there was a need to establish general policy, guidance and principles in relation to distance learning PhD programmes in advance of consideration of programme proposals. The Committee was therefore asked to consider the key issues to inform policy development.

In introducing the item, the Dean of the Graduate Research School **noted** that:

- this type of programme was attractive for international students who were prevented, by UKVI regulations, from coming to the UK to study on a part-time programme but would be able to study at a distance with limited visits to the UK on a student visitor visa. The programmes could also be attractive to other markets such as CPD;
- relevant support offices, including Student Recruitment and Admissions and the Research Student Administration Team, would need to be consulted further before a policy document was approved;
- the key areas for consideration were: developing a set of norms for attendance at York, whether to require physical presence for formal meetings (i.e., TAPS, confirmation and viva), and integration into training and research culture.

During the discussion the following points were **noted**:

- that members felt that programme titles should not differentiate between distance learning and on-campus PhDs. However, UKVI requirements needed to be considered and advice was being sought from Registry Services;
- the new distance learning college offered opportunities for further support;
- that training and professional development needs would, as was the case with existing PhDs, depend on an individual's background and what skills they possessed. However, it was noted that distance learners would potentially miss out on Researcher Development Team events and other support and training opportunities on campus. It would be important in the admissions process to be explicit that some things would not be available unless extra campus visits were made.

The Committee was supportive of proposals that:

- separate student handbooks should be produced for distance learning PhDs;
- confirmation and vivas should normally be conducted face-to-face, but TAP and supervision meetings could be done remotely (e.g., via Google Hangouts or Skype) with visits used to prepare for these events;
- an initial two week visit during enrolment should be compulsory for each student.

The Committee **decided** that a policy framework should be developed and considered alongside the Computer Science programme proposal at the next meeting.

[**Secretary's note:** following the meeting, and in discussion with Computer Science, it was agreed that their PhD proposal would be considered in the Autumn term by the policy and programmes sub-committee of the York Graduate Research School Board].

ACTION: Tom Stoneham and David Gent

During the course of discussion it was also suggested that the York Graduate Research School Board should give consideration to programme durations (minimum and maximum) for research degrees and associated fees issues.

M14-15/142 Student Feedback Hub

Richard Walker (ELDT) attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a report on the development of a student feedback hub (UTC.14-15/85). The report summarised the work of the E-Learning Development Team (ELDT) and IT Services in scoping how an online hub might present marks and feedback for an individual student across a programme of study.

In introducing the item it was **noted** that:

- there was no off-the-shelf solution for a feedback hub;

- the current focus was on developing a proof of concept. The hub was currently a pilot and further development would need to be considered in the context of other priorities.

During the discussion it was **noted** that:

- it was not anticipated that use of a hub would be mandatory for departments but the risks with regard to student experience/expectation of inconsistencies in combined/interdisciplinary programmes were noted;
- YUSU was in support and it was suggested that eventual rollout across all departments would be led by student expectation, if not UTC;
- only feedback provided in an electronic format would be available through the hub. It would be possible to scan annotated scripts although it was recognised that this would be costly in terms of staff time. The risk of the hub becoming seen as the only way to give feedback was also noted, and it would be important to ensure that other forms of feedback (e.g., oral) continued to be used;
- consideration needed to be given to costs of storage of the feedback especially if the hub was scaled up to include, for example, scanned handwritten comments on theses;
- the feedback hub would promote transparency. Where feedback was done well, the hub would be very effective, although it was noted that poor feedback would also be made obvious.

The Committee **decided** to approve the recommendations in the paper that the scoping progresses towards the development of a working prototype, with the work to be completed before the end of July 2015. A technical review of the prototype solution would then be conducted to judge its suitability for the University's needs, and a further consultation phase would also be undertaken with a wider set of departments invited to contribute, before a decision was taken on whether to progress to the full development of the hub.

M14-15/143 Attendance Monitoring and Response Policy

Philip Ratcliff (Operations Manager) and Tim Franklin (Planning Office) attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a paper on attendance monitoring and response (UTC.14-15./87).

In introducing the paper Philip Ratcliff and Tim Franklin **noted** that:

- all but one academic department already monitored assessment in some way (beyond the statutory monitoring required for Tier 4 visa holding students). A range of departmental policies and practices were in place;

- the development of a more uniform approach could bring benefits in terms of student retention, a reduction in the number of special cases, and more efficient processes.

The Chair **noted** the links between the proposed student compact in the paper and the earlier Learning and Teaching Strategy discussion about student contracts/compacts and working in partnership with students (M14-15/140 refers).

During the discussion members expressed mixed views about the paper and made a number of points and suggestions as follows:

- that difference in practices should not be assumed to be inefficiency;
- that variation in practice could be perceived negatively by students;
- that engagement did not necessarily correlate with attendance, and members urged caution on making this link;
- the potential risks associated with enhancement to attendance monitoring requirements of Tier 4 visa holding students in Appendix C of the paper were noted;
- that more consideration was needed of what was expected and required of students in terms of engagement and attendance. Members suggested that a central policy could help departments to identify and intervene with disaffected students. The link with the York pedagogy/Learning and Teaching Strategy was again noted. In development of any policy, the University would need to be clear of its aims from the start, and be aware of the various departmental requirements and attitudes to attendance monitoring. While a central mechanism for data collection could be useful, departments would want to use the data in different ways;
- that the policy development process should involve departmental managers and postgraduates who teach, and keep Heads of Department informed;
- that the Distance Learning Forum should be consulted about the particular issues for distance learners.

The Committee **decided** that a sub-group should be established to develop a University wide Attendance Monitoring and Response policy for all students. In parallel a “Student Compact” (or similar) should be developed (see M14-15/140). The policy would be brought back to UTC for approval.

ACTION: Chair

M14-15/144 ‘You Said, We Did’ Campaign

Allison Loftfield (Academic Registry, Communications Officer) attended for this item.

The Committee **received** a report on the University-wide ‘You Said, We Did’ campaign. Work was underway to improve how student feedback and responses to it were publicised across the University. It was recognised that while many departments were already striving to close the feedback loop, approaches were not coherent across the University. The ‘You

Said, We Did' campaign was planned to start in October 2015 in partnership with departments, with the aim of drip-feeding messages to students at both University-level and department-level. Preliminary work on design had been undertaken in consultation with students.

During the discussion it was **noted** that:

- visual identity would be important as there was a danger that students would stop reading posters if the designs all looked the same. A challenge would be to design a template that provided a coherent identity but also allowed for flexibility and variety of content;
- there would be a need to quantify information disseminated through the campaign (e.g., the percentage of students providing feedback on a certain issue). It was noted that while there would be a poster campaign, more detailed information would be provided on a website. However members felt that it would be important to publicise quantitative data to back up the messages where possible;
- there was a risk that students would be critical if 'You Said, We Did' became seen as an advertisement campaign on behalf of the University.

M14-15/145 Excellence in Teaching and Supervision Awards

The Committee **received** a report from YUSU on the nominations for the 2014 Excellence in Teaching and Supervision awards (UTC.14-15/88). It was hoped that analysis of the reasons students gave for nominating staff members would inform future discussions between YUSU, the GSA, and the University on sharing best practice and enhancing the student experience.

During the discussion it was **noted** that the data was owned by YUSU but departments were welcome to use it. Members suggested that the data could potentially be useful for student recruitment and marketing purposes and for PGCAP and PFA.

It was also **noted** that YUSU must ensure that students were aware their nomination comments might be used for these purposes.

The Committee thanked YUSU for the report and **endorsed** the production of an annual report on nominations for the Excellence in Teaching and Supervision awards.

M14-15/146 PGT External Examiners Reports 2013/14

The Committee **considered** a report on postgraduate taught external examiners reports for the academic year 2013/14 (UTC.14-15/89).

It was **noted** that overall, the external examiners' reports were positive about the standard and quality of provision, and all externals confirmed that standards were being met. The high quality of teaching and the calibre of the University's students were praised in many reports. Issues raised by external examiners were, in the main, specific to departments and

programmes and there were not many substantive University-level issues or themes across the reports.

It was **noted** that the Standing Committee on Assessment was considering the report in parallel with UTC and would report back to UTC on its consideration of the report, via its report on its Minutes, and also provide an update on any actions planned or taken. It was **decided** to ask SCA to give particular consideration to the strength of the reminder to departments about responding to external examiners.

ACTION: SCA

During the discussion a member highlighted that a number of externals had commented on the criteria for merits or distinctions. It was **noted** that the rules for merits had since changed, but had not taken effect in 2013/14 so were not reflected in these reports. The Chair of SCA confirmed that in 2013/14 there had been a lengthy discussion at SCA about the criteria for merits and distinctions, and that there was no sector-wide view on the criteria. It was suggested that UTC could revisit the issue at a future meeting, although it was **noted** that the issue had recently been considered in detail.

M14-15/147 Periodic Review: Centre for Applied Human Rights

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessor's report and action plan arising from the periodic review of the Centre for Applied Human Rights (CAHR) (UTC.14-15/90).

This was the first periodic review of the Centre. The Centre had previously been reviewed as part of the periodic reviews of the Department of Politics and the York Law School. UTC (with the Centre and departments) had agreed that a separate periodic review would take place to ensure that its programmes had received sufficient consideration and to consider if the quality assurance structures through the two Boards of Studies were working efficiently.

Members of the review panel **reported** that the review had been productive, and CAHR was praised for its open and reflective approach to the review.

With regard to the comments and actions in the report relating to the ReCSS, it was **noted** that the Operations Managers had since undertaken work to assess use of desk space in ReCSS.

It was **noted** that a number of the issues and recommendations arising from the review were in relation to the organisation and management of CAHR and its relationships with its partner departments. The Dean for the Social Sciences had expressed the view that the CAHR Steering Group could have been engaged in the review to provide a balance on some of the issues in the report.

The Committee **decided** that the report and action plan should be considered by the CAHR Steering Group, particularly in relation to the actions relating to governance and financial

models. The Group should also take a view on the recommendation that the Centre submits its own Annual Programme Review and has separate periodic review in future. The QA Team contact in the ASO should be kept informed of this discussion.

In future, the faculty Deans will be contacted prior to periodic reviews to provide comment/input to the process.

CATEGORY II BUSINESS

M14-15/148 Standing Committee on Assessment

The Committee **received** a report on the minutes of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment on 17 April 2015 (UTC.14-15/91).

M14-15/149 Annual Programme Review 2013/14

The Committee **received** an update on actions and issues arising from Annual Programme Review 2013/14 (UTC.14-15/92). At its February 2015 meeting the Committee considered and approved an overview report of issues arising from the Annual Programme Review of academic year 2013/14 (M14-15/97 refers). Actions and issues arising from that report were forwarded to the relevant committees, individuals and offices with a request for an update by April 2015. Updates from the Standing Committee on Assessment and Examinations Office would be reported to the Committee in June.

M14-15/150 Modifications and Withdrawals

The Committee **received** a report on modifications to, and withdrawals of, programmes of study approved by Chair's action between February and April 2015 (UTC.14-15/93) as follows:

Archaeology: Approval to suspend the MA in Landscape Archaeology for one year in 2015/16. The programme would resume again in 2016/17.

Computer Science: Approval to split the Stage 2 core module Systems Software and Compilers (30 credits) into two modules (Systems, 20 credits; Implementation of Programming Languages, 10 credits), with effect from 2015/16 (learning outcomes were unaffected).

Electronics: Approval for students in Stage 4 of all MEng programmes to be allowed to take 50 credits rather than the standard 40 credits at their own risk, as a one-off for 2015/16 to mitigate the effect of withdrawal of module options.

Approval of 'BSc Music Technology and Applied Electronics' as an alternative title to the BSc Music Technology programme with identical structure (with effect from 2014/15 for students on the BSc Music Technology to transfer into, and as soon as practicable as a distinct entry route to run alongside the BSc Music Technology).

Health Sciences: Approval of a postponement in the submission date for the Stage 4 Co-operative Learning Group 8 module, to move this to July 2015 (and the same date for future years), with effect from 2014/15.

History of Art: Approval of a new pathway within the MA in History of Art: MA in History of Art (Modern and Contemporary Art), with effect from 2016/17.

Music: Approval of a Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate in Music Education: Vocal and Instrumental Teaching, to be available as entry routes from 2015/16

Physics: Replacement of Stage 2 20-credit core module 'Applications of Optics and High Energy Physics' (on BSc / MPhys Physics) with the 20-credit core module 'Applications of Optics and Experimental Techniques', with effect from 2015/16.

Introduction of 60-credit industrial projects (as alternative to existing 60-credit projects) and 80-credit industrial projects in Stage 4 of the MPhys Physics, Theoretical Physics and Physics with Astrophysics programmes, with effect from 2015/16. Students taking the 80-credit project will take 40 credits of options / core modules in the Autumn Term.

Politics: Approval to suspend the introduction of the MA in Political and Legal Theory for 2015 and with subsequent availability to be confirmed.

PEP: Approval of a change to progression rules from stage 1 to stage 2 that will allow students to transfer from PPE at the end of stage 1 to alternative programmes in PEP, Politics or Philosophy following fail marks for Economics module Maths 1. This arrangement has been agreed to mitigate problems arising from a change in entry requirements/ A-level prerequisite for Economic modules. The modification is to apply to the current stage 1 students and those entering the programme in 2015. A long-term solution will be explored as a matter of urgency.

M14-15/151 Distance Learning Forum

The Committee **noted** that the minutes from the meeting of the Distance Learning Forum held on 24 February 2015 were available at:

<https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/groups/distance/#tab-4>

M14-15/152 National Science Learning Centre

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had taken Chair's action to extend the validation for Postgraduate Certificate in Primary Science and Education programme at the National Science Learning Centre (NSLC) without review to allow the current cohorts on the programme to complete (this was expected by March 2016). This decision was undertaken following the NSLC's decision not to seek revalidation for the programme beyond the end of the current agreement within the University in August 2015 in light of an internal review of

the programme, and on the basis of the positive outcome of the health-check of the programme undertaken in June 2014 (M14-15/22 refers). Progress would be monitored through University representation on the NSLC Professional Recognition and Accreditation Board (equivalent to a Board of Studies), alongside the monitoring of the other NSLC validated programmes. The NSLC would continue to admit students to a version of the programme from September 2015, and such future cohorts would operate on a non-validated basis, independent of the University and leading only to the NSLC's certificate of attendance. If it emerged in future that the NSLC wished to revalidate the programme, this would be subject to a validation review in line with the University's established procedures for validation.

M14-15/153 Department of Mathematics and the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC)

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had given Stage 1 approval to the development of a proposed collaboration between the Department of Mathematics and the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC). The proposal was that undergraduate Mathematics students from UESTC would undertake the final year of their undergraduate study at York as visiting students and thereafter (subject to satisfactory performance and other criteria) obtain guaranteed entry to the MSc in Mathematical Finance or Statistics and Computational Finance.

M14-15/154 QAA Subject Benchmark Statements

The Committee **noted** responses from departments regarding revised QAA subject benchmark statements, as follows:

Politics: The Chair Board of Studies had reviewed the revised statement and believed that no changes were needed to teaching programmes as a result.

Geography: The relevant programme staff in the Environment Department had considered the revised statement and provided a response (UTC.14-15/94). The perceived 'gaps' in the programmes were being addressed by the introduction of new modules or would be addressed as the Human Geography programme was developed (it would run for the first time from October 2015).

Chemistry: The Chair of Board of Studies had reviewed the revised statement and believed that no changes were needed to the teaching programmes as a result. He welcomed the enhanced focus on student/employability skills, which the Department felt it had developed to an excellent level, with the degree currently in a position of national leadership in this area.

The Committee also **noted** that the QAA was consulting on the subject benchmarks for Languages, Linguistics and Law. The relevant departments had been alerted to the consultations.

M14-15/155 Exchange agreements

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

- between Language and Linguistic Science and University of Graz, Austria
- between the University and Universidad de las Americas Puebla, Mexico
- an extension of the agreement between Morningside College of the Chinese University of Hong Kong and James College. The extension had been amended to include Derwent College.

M14-15/156 Periodic reviews and other visits

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the following external assessor:

- for the Periodic Review of the Department of Electronics, Professor John Illingworth of the University of Surrey.

M14-15/157 Dates of next meetings

The Committee **noted** that the date of the next meeting was Thursday 18 June, 1.00pm in HG21, Heslington Hall.

The dates of the 2015/16 meetings (all at 1.00pm in HG21, Heslington Hall) were as follows:

- Thursday 8 October 2015
- Thursday 12 November 2015
- Thursday 10 December 2015
- Thursday 4 February 2016
- Thursday 10 March 2016
- Thursday 12 May 2016
- Thursday 16 June 2016.