

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2020

**Present:** John Robinson (Chair)  
Jane Baston  
Michael Bate  
Mike Bentley  
Gill Chitty  
Sabine Clarke  
Nigel Dandy (M19-20/78 to 80; M19-20/85 to 96)  
Jen Gibbons  
Claire Hughes  
Steve King  
Barry Lee (M19-20/85 to 96)  
Tracy Lightfoot (M19-20/78 to 80; M19-20/85 to 96)  
Sinéad McCotter  
Giang Nguyen  
Mark Nicholson  
Lisa O'Malley  
Matthew Perry  
Andrew Pickering  
Dave Smith  
Jill Webb

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

Apologies were received from, Ed Braman, Wayne Campbell, Sam Cobb and Jez Wells.

**CATEGORY I BUSINESS**

**M19-20/78 Minutes and Matters Arising**

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2019 (UTC.19-20/66a) and 10 January 2020 (UTC.19-20/66b).

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC.19-20/66c **Appendix I**).

- The action relating to the MA / MSc Sustainability Proposals (M19-20/37 & 63 refers), to secure a third external assessor report and respond to issues therein, was still outstanding.
- The proposed MA in Analytical Theology (M19-20/62 refers) had been approved through UTC Chair's action. The Programme team had revised the proposal for the full-time version satisfactorily. The Department were not, at this stage, pursuing approval for the part-time version (as the disparity between the modules for the full-time and part-time route could not easily be rectified).

The Chair reported that the Programme proposer, Rev'd Dr David Efird, had sadly passed away unexpectedly on Thursday 9 January 2020. A tribute to David had been published on the University website and a memorial service would be taking place at York Minster on Friday 14 February at 2pm, where colleagues could pay their respects.

- The actions relating to the recommendations to the proposed BEng and MEng in Electronic and Electrical Engineering (19-20/76 refers) had been addressed satisfactorily. The Programme Design Documents had been finalised and the action was now closed. The Committee noted that it was important that the Department continued the practice of proposing a BEng and MEng simultaneously when proposing future programmes, due to the sponsorship funding sometimes being limited to three years.
- The proposal to create a new governance structure for York-HEP online programmes was ongoing (M19-20/60 refers). An initial meeting had been convened (involving the Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students, Chair of SCA, Chair of Special Cases, Deputy Director of Student Services, 2 Special Cases Managers, Executive Officer to the Academic Registrar and the Online Operations and Partnership Manager). The Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students reported that the priority was the student facing infrastructure, which included the Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessment Committee and Leave of Absence process. Progress had been made in respect of Boards of Examiners (meeting dates had been confirmed) and the Project team was working alongside the GSA with respect to a Staff Student Forum. It was reported that the proposal for a single Board of Studies was not a priority at this stage.
- It was reported that the Irregular or Higher Risks Placements Forum had been established (M19-20/55 refers), and that the Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Faculty of Sciences) had been invited to Chair the first Forum meeting (scheduled for 17 March). It was noted that the proposal (UTC.19-20/45) considered by UTC in December had indicated that the Forum would be Chaired by a Faculty Dean.

#### **M19-20/79 Oral Update from the Chair**

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

- The Chair reported that a University of York student had tested positive for coronavirus. The University was continuing to liaise closely with Public Health England (PHE). PHE had confirmed that the student had not been on campus after they were exposed to the virus. The student was a resident in student accommodation in the City of York, and did return to their room on one occasion and stayed overnight after being in contact with the virus. PHE had confirmed that the risk to the University community was negligible. The Chair noted that the safety and well-being of University of York students and the wider community remained a priority, and acknowledged and thanked colleagues who had worked tirelessly (including over the weekend) to ensure that students and staff were supported. It was reported that concern had been raised regarding reports from students and staff of abuse and racism linked to the current situation. On behalf of UTC, the Chair underlined the University community's shared values of respect, as articulated via the Together York Community Declaration. A joint statement, 'Showing respect for each other', issued by the students' unions and the Vice-Chancellor, had been circulated to staff and students to reiterate the importance of behaviour that reflects, at all times, to the principles of respect, fairness and compassion.
- The Chair reported that University and College Union (UCU) had recently announced further strike action (14 days in total) to take place over a period of four weeks starting 20 February. It will take a similar pattern to the industrial action two years ago. The Chair reported that the University Academic Contingency Group had been re-convened and the first meeting would be taking place on 9 February. The aim of the Contingency group

would be to minimize impact on the student experience. Contingency advice would be modified and provided to Heads of Departments. It was noted that the impact would be different across departments and therefore strategies would need to be adapted across departments to ensure that everything possible can be done to mitigate against the impact on students.

- The Chair raised to the attention of the Committee the draft publication of the University Strategic Vision Statement that had been considered by Senate, and provided an update on the development plan and timeline. The Chair noted that the process had two phases, the first to focus on the definition of the strategic vision and the second phase would be the implementation of the plan. Eight Strategic Working Groups would be driving forward the plan. The Working Groups that related most closely to UTC business were Integrated Student Experience, Teaching Organisation, Civic Responsibility, International Commitment and Composition of Student Body (Size). Outcomes from the respective Working Groups would be considered by UTC in due course.
- The Chair reported that the Office for Students (OfS) had recently announced (9 January) that there would not be a Year 5 TEF exercise during 2020 and that during the year a new framework for the TEF would be developed. OfS had stated that the new framework would take account of the recommendations in Dame Shirley Pearce's forthcoming independent review of the TEF, the government's response to it, and the findings of the latest subject-level TEF pilot. Following those publications, the OfS would consult on the new framework.

Key dates in the OfS publication programme included:

- Jan 2020: Findings from the subject-level pilot 2018-19
- April 2020: Consultation: The future TEF framework
- The Chairs of UTC and SCA had agreed that the University develop a Degree Outcomes Statement (M19-20/5 refers) (UTC.19-20/76). A UTC Working Group had been established to oversee the development of the Statement. A draft Statement would be considered by UTC at its June meeting, followed by Senate in July. Council would consider the Statement, for approval, at its meeting on 29 July.
- The Chair reported that applications were now open for the Vice-Chancellor's Teaching Awards 2020. The deadline for nominations was Friday 27 March.

#### **M19-20/80 Update from the Student Representatives**

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

- A YUSU/GSA-led Survey on Transparency of Assessment Information had recently been launched, which had been produced in consultation with SCA. The Chair of SCA reported that the survey had strong support from SCA; it was hoped that the survey results would give valuable insight with respect to the provision of assessment information and the clarity of that information (both matters continued to receive mixed feedback from students). It was reported that there had already been a good response rate and YUSU would continue to promote the survey via its newsletter. Members suggested that the survey could be promoted at forthcoming FLTG meetings; the Academic Officer agreed to send the details to the Associate Deans for Teaching, Learning and Students.

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

- The Spring Term Course Representative Faculty Forum meetings would be taking place over the next few weeks.
- GSA had run two Disability Experience Forums where they had been gathering feedback from students. Any relevant information regarding teaching would be referred to the appropriate channels.

## **M19-20/81 Annual report on E-Learning Services in support of learning and teaching**

*Dr Richard Walker, Head of Programme Design and Learning Technology, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report on E-Learning services in support of learning and teaching (UTC.19-20/67). The Committee discussed the increased use in lecture capture by staff and students. Further progress had been made in supporting lecture implementation and there had been high student usage over the last academic year, it was noted that 189 lectures were captured per week in the Autumn term (which exceeded the number recorded in the previous year). Members noted the scaling up of module delivery on the cloud-hosted Canvas learning management system with the launch of a new portfolio of HEP/ York Computer Science programmes.

The PDLT team had continued to support departments to prepare them to meet the new digital accessibility regulations; this support had included a network of student interns embedded within departments. In respect of compliance with the new digital accessibility regulations a key challenge faced was use of video; the new regulations require all videos to be produced with closed captions. An accurate automated captioning service was not yet available (whilst software solutions did exist they were not fit for purpose). Advice was being sought from the University's legal team to determine whether 'disproportionate burden' could be claimed in fully meeting this requirement for automated lecture recordings by the compliance deadline of September 2020.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- In respect of para. 2.5 (VLE Exam Service) of the report a concern was noted with respect to the delivery (across multiple classrooms) of a first year Chemistry VLE examination. It was reported that a technical issue had resulted in disruption; the Head of PDLT explained that a review into the circumstances of this case was ongoing. In the light of the need to continue to expand online assessment the need for a robust system that could be scaled up was noted. The PDLT team had recommended to the Chair of SCA to establish a steering group to review departmental examinations requirements to inform the wider Digital Assessment and Feedback review, as part of the Enterprise Systems Steering Group (ESSG) project, being led by IT Services.
- Whilst the lecture capture policy had received positive feedback from students, Members reported anecdotal negative feedback from staff, in particular about the impact of lecture capture on student attendance, but also about possible detriment to student performance. Members noted that the primary aim of the Student Engagement project was to identify factors that motivate or inhibit students' engagement with particular emphasis on exploring factors that influence attendance.
- The challenges, to departments, to manage the implementation of new initiatives (for example Lecture Capture) were noted. Members recognized the benefits of long term planning to allow departments to build in time to manage the transition when initiatives were being rolled out.

Priorities for the PDLT in 2020 included contributing (once it was prioritised for development) to the Enterprise Systems Steering Group project, on digital assessment and feedback. The project aimed to improve the digital infrastructure around assessment and feedback by introducing new services for online exams, file submission, marking and feedback. The project also aimed to enable academic departments to support a wider range of assessment submissions and offer online exams on a 'Bring Your Own Device' (BYOD) basis. It was noted that consideration of an online marking / feedback tool could also take place within the ESSG project. It was reported that the timescales and deliverables for this project had been delayed, due to challenges with securing prioritisation, over other University-wide priorities.

The Committee **endorsed** the identified priorities for 2020.

The Chair thanked Richard for presenting the report.

#### **M19-20/82 Annual report on Course Representatives**

*Gabby Morgan, YUSU Student Engagement Development Coordinator and Chris Bovis, GSA Representation and Democracy Coordinator, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report from YUSU and the GSA on the recruitment, training and engagement of course representatives for 2019/20 (UTC.19-20/68). It was reported that 85% of the Course Representative positions were filled, with 424 Course Representatives in place. There had been a significant rise in the number of Postgraduate students in Representative positions (which included Representatives for the online programmes delivered in partnership with Higher Ed Partners UK).

This year there had been an increase in course representatives recruited online, however, there had been a 5% decrease in online nominations and 10% decrease in voter turnout. Members discussed the proposed pilot to combine the two larger elections in the Autumn Term (undergraduate Course Representative and College Committee elections) to ensure maximum visibility across campus, and to improve engagement in the election process at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. Furthermore, the proposal would enable Postgraduate Course Representatives and Department Representatives to attend departmental meetings at the start of the Autumn term to feedback.

The Course Representative training had been a success this year, all respondents found the sessions to be useful. The GSA were looking into developing digital online training components, for students that are unable to attend the training, and ways to improve the feedback response rate, by collecting feedback during the training itself next year. The REPort fortnightly newsletter had been a success this year, with plans to make it more engaging by encouraging more student-led content and takeovers, as well as promotion through social media channels.

UTC **endorsed** the three recommendations contained in the report, that:

- there be greater collaboration between departmental Student Voice contacts and Students' Unions;
- an alignment between the elections of College Committees and Undergraduate Course Representatives be piloted;
- the Students' Unions work in greater partnership to grow engagement with the Academic Representation network.

The Chair thanked Gabby and Chris for presenting the report.

#### **M19-20/83 Student Voice**

The Committee **considered** a report from YUSU and GSA and recommendations for a shared language around student voice, and an approach to support the development of a Student Voice Resource Bank (UTC.19-20/69). The Committee thanked YUSU and GSA for providing greater clarity and distinction between the meaning of student engagement and student voice. The Committee suggested that the paper be shared with members of Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups.

The Committee was supportive of the plans to develop a bank of student voice resources and recommended that YUSU and GSA link in with the work of the Student Engagement Project to ensure that they gain the best value out of what they wish to develop. The Chair noted that staff/student partnership working and co-production were key to successful student voice activities. The Committee suggested that YUSU and GSA prepare a plan for the shared student voice resource bank, be ambitious with their plans, and think holistically about where the student voice needs to be heard.

The Chair reported that the Learning and Teaching Strategy commitment C4.1 to 'ensure that students have an effective voice in staff recruitment' was the only outstanding priority from the current Strategy (UTC.19-20/13). It was noted that this may be revisited as part of the development of the new University Strategy.

The Chair thanked Giang for presenting the report.

#### **M19-20/84 Annual Programme Reviews**

The Committee **considered** a University-level summary report and a report from each faculty on the outcomes from Annual Programme Reviews for (UTC.19-20/70a-d). Members were thanked for having supported the process by attending their departments' APR meetings.

The faculty-level summary reports identified some common themes, which were considered by the Committee:

- *Concerns about student engagement, student community and attendance.*

All Faculties noted that student engagement remained a strong common theme. Departments were addressing issues relating to lack of student engagement, with excellent initiatives being embedded. Whilst the Faculty of Sciences had seen improvements in NSS scores for the Student Voice, there was ongoing work and good practice interventions across all faculties to address concerns relating to student engagement and the student community.

- *Concerns about student mental health.*

Student mental health continued to be a serious concern for UG and PGT within the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, and departments were working to address this issue by recruiting/looking to recruit departmental Student Support and Wellbeing Officers, which were in the transition stage. Related to this concern was the impact on staff workload.

- *Employability.*

The Associate Dean for Sciences reported issues with employability skills and the need for them to be embedded more in the curriculum, and identified a connection with low student engagement. This was also a strong theme within Arts and Humanities, reporting that significant effort had been made to embed skills development and employability initiatives into the curriculum, however it was noted that it was still difficult to see the impact. Further work was planned with Careers and Placements to ensure that employability activities and events were made more appealing to students.

- *Concerns relating to student number growth, impact on student experience and staff workload.*

The Faculty of Sciences reported concerns regarding large cohorts, pressures on teaching space, resources, and a negative impact on the student community. The Associate Dean for Sciences noted that, where investment had been made within departments to improve community space, this had been successful. The Faculty of Social Sciences reported difficulties with student number forecasting, resulting in recruitment challenges, resource

issues, implications for staff welfare and impact on institutional and community initiatives. It was suggested that departments needed more support with planning for student growth. Student recruitment emerged as a mixed picture within Arts and Humanities, with increasing student populations across some departments; declining student numbers were causing concern in other departments.

- *Issues associated with Interdisciplinary and combined programmes.*

The Faculty of Social Sciences reported challenges with delivering programmes across departments and difficulties with University systems that present barriers to multi-departmental working. The Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities identified obstacles to student uptake of LFA and elective modules.

The University-level summary reports identified similar themes, which were considered by the Committee. There was extensive convergence across the faculties in relation to student engagement concerns and challenges associated with combined and interdisciplinary programmes. The Committee noted that the UTC Working Group on Interdepartmental and Cross-Faculty Teaching (UTC.19/20.71) and the ASO-led Student Engagement project (UTC.19/20.77) would take forward work arising from these themes. The GSA student representative reported that the GSA has secured funding to help departments to fund Student Voice events, supported by the course representatives. A number of departments within the Faculty of Arts and Humanities had taken on these opportunities.

The Chair reported that a half Away Day was taking place on the afternoon of the 6 February, involving the PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students, the Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students, the Associate Faculty Deans, the Head of ASO and the Faculty Learning Enhancement Project Managers. The Away Day session would be focusing on student engagement as a priority area. Furthermore, the Chair noted that once the outcomes of the University Strategic Working Groups were published in the summer, the Committee would have a clearer focus on the key themes being addressed.

Careers and Employability had emerged as a strong theme across the Faculty reports, and members noted the successful initiatives within departments to improve engagement. Student number growth was another recurrent theme, and the impact on the student experience, space and staff workload. It was noted that these issues would be taken forward, in the round, by the University Strategic Working Groups on Organisational Structure (Shape) and Composition of Student Body (Size).

There were several key changes with the APR process in 2018/19, which included the addition of a departmental learning and teaching action plan and embedding of the NSS pro forma into the Departmental-level report. The Associate Dean for the Faculty of Sciences noted that since completing the APR for 2018/19, a number of objectives identified on their action plans had been developed and it would be useful to highlight more recent progress within the FLTG summary reports (in the same way that the University-level summary report had).

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

The Committee **agreed** that:

- i. the deadline for 2019/20 departmental-level APR reports be Monday 16 November 2020;
- ii. notwithstanding minor revisions to the report template and guidance (as set out in iii-v), the 2019-20 APR process be unchanged;
- iii. in line with finding 1 of the PwC Internal audit report 2018-19 on the National Student

- Survey (UTC.19-20/33), the APR report template and guidance be revised to support departments to articulate actions that are specific and measurable and that are prioritised on the basis of their potential impact on the student experience;
- iv. the guidance be revised to signpost staff to the Annual Programme Review Tableau Workbooks;
  - v. building on the revised format (Word format to GoogleDoc) of the department-level APR report (approved and implemented last year, M18-19/127 refers), the APR report template be revised to incorporate the response to the APR report (currently the response is a Word format and is circulated to departments / centres at the end of the Spring term).

**Action: Academic Quality Team**

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. It was **agreed** that the UTC contact should still contribute to the process, as an opportunity to share good practice, but it would no longer be an expectation for the UTC departmental contact to attend the APR meeting.

In the light of the nature of the recommended revisions, the Committee **agreed** that the Chair of UTC, acting on behalf of the Committee, approve the 2019/20 APR report template and guidance.

#### **M19-20/85 Interdepartmental and Cross-Faculty Teaching Working Group**

The Committee **considered** an interim report from the Working Group on Interdepartmental and Cross-Faculty Teaching (UTC.19-20/71). The paper presented the Group's working and thinking to date on (i) options for structures in which interdepartmental teaching might be developed (ii) obstacles to the development of interdepartmental teaching.

The report set out that there were opportunities for York to develop full interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary innovations, to keep pace with comparator institutions and potentially provide some highly distinctive options. Furthermore, the Vice-Chancellor had emphasised interdisciplinarity as a key component of the York Strategic vision. The paper explored a number of forms that interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary teaching could take, and also a number of significant obstacles that would need to be overcome to advance these.

The options presented for consideration and comment were:

##### *1. Curated Electives*

This proposal entailed refining the current model by identifying modules suited to elective study and present them to students at a module fair and / or in an online list (under theme headings). It was noted that the current electives webpage was limited in scope and that procedures for maintaining it were unclear; these issues would need to be addressed.

##### *2. Guest Teaching*

The paper noted that, whilst guest teaching already occurs to some extent, it might be cultivated and supported more and used to bring 'out-of-discipline' teaching and content into programmes.

##### *3. Bespoke Targeted Modules*

The paper noted that these would be modules for particular groups of students taught, at least in part by out-of-programme staff.

##### *4. Bespoke Interdisciplinary Modules*

The proposed modules would be interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary modules team-taught by staff from a number of departments, to address significant contemporary challenges, such as climate change and mental health and wellbeing. These modules would be available as electives, and maybe core within some programmes.

5. *3+1 'with a year in interdisciplinary study' Programmes (or 'with a year in interdisciplinary liberal arts and sciences)*

These programmes would be roughly analogous to the '(with a year abroad)' or '(with year in industry)' 3+1 programmes at York. Students would be largely based in York during their interdisciplinary study year. In order to make the additional year attractive, distinctive, and maximally valuable it should involve more than simply studying in a discipline or disciplines beyond those of the home programme. It should develop and test ability in strong interdisciplinary/multi-disciplinary working and include further elements to provide a cohesive package of additional benefits to the student, particularly in terms of employability, life skills, and personal development. This might include intensive LFA, a short exchange with Maastricht or another partner, engagement with local industry and/or community projects.

6. *Global Challenge/Grand Challenge programmes*

The proposed programmes would address significant contemporary issues (aligned with research strengths) such as climate change, artificial intelligence and mental health and wellbeing. These programmes would differ from conventional combined programmes in that students would pursue expertise in only one or two of the contributing disciplines and engage with others with different knowledge-bases and skills in addressing problems in the topic area. It was noted that York's BA in Global Development was close to this model.

The Chair of the working group noted that options 5 and 6 were not found in any other institution at present, so that York might offer something uniquely distinctive in this area.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- The Committee noted that working across disciplinary boundaries was a key theme within the draft Strategic Vision Statement. It was reported that the Chair of the Working Group was a member of the Strategic Working Group on Teaching Organisation.
- Whilst most members were positive about the options presented it was noted that more work would be needed to overcome the challenges. The proposals needed careful consideration, and the establishment of incentives would be key in terms of encouraging departments to be involved in / lead on particular initiatives.
- Members noted that the 3+1 Programme was a good idea, but it could be a 'hard sell' to students (in the context of the additional costs, including the cost of not being in paid employment), and may not be as popular as the existing 3+1 programmes. However, the Chair of the Working Group noted that market research found that there had been a lot of interest from the student body. The Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students reported that the proposal had been discussed at Employment Strategy Group; members had been positive about the initial plans, but noted that further detail (including the fee structure) was needed. It was recommended that a good package would need to be developed in partnership with employers (in respect of the development of 'real-world' problems) to ensure that it would be appealing to prospective students.
- Members noted that the proposed Curated Electives and Grand Challenge / Bespoke Interdisciplinary Modules would be less ambitious than the 3+1 idea, however timetabling was likely to be a significant obstacle. The Chair of the Working Group noted that the 3+1 proposal would in several ways be easier to implement than a Curated Electives scheme, as it would not require any

adjustments to existing UG programmes. The Committee suggested that the Group undertake exploratory work in respect of availability of space and, as per the provisional recommendations in the paper, consider further the development of action research / pilot projects (designed to test the feasibility and to develop processes to overcome the barriers).

- It was noted that small cohorts within the joint/combined programmes, sometimes impacted negatively on the student experience for those on the core offering (the single honours programme). In this context it would be important that the structural barriers (notably those associated with timetabling) be addressed before consideration to modify current programmes to accommodate Bespoke Interdisciplinary Modules.

In respect of the request (para. 49b) to identify potential obstacles that might have been overlooked or undervalued, members were asked to send comments by email to the Chair of the Working Group.

The Committee commended the Working Group for the paper which was thorough, thoughtful and inclusive of many creative ideas. The Committee **agreed** that the Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups should be consulted regarding the proposals in advance of the development of the new Strategy. It was **noted** that the Group's final report would be considered by UTC at its June meeting.

#### **M19-20/86 The Department of Archaeology**

The Committee **considered** proposals from the Department of Archaeology for two new postgraduate taught programmes:

- MA in Iron Age and Celtic Archaeology (UTC.19-20/**72**)
- MA in Roman Archaeology (UTC.19-20/**73**)

Both proposals were for full-time routes (one year) or part-time (over two or three years) on campus proposals to be introduced in 2020/21. Possible exit awards for the MA in Iron Age and Celtic Archaeology were PG Diploma and PG Certificate in Iron Age and Celtic Archaeology. Possible exit awards for the MA in Roman Archaeology were PG Diploma and PG Certificate in Roman Archaeology. The proposals had planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Arts and Humanities (November 2019). FLTG had approved the planning case for both proposals with the recommendation that the Department work closely with Planning and take into account issues raised with regards to staffing and succession planning (UTC.19-20/63a refers).

The proposals followed a similar module structure to the structures within the existing suite of Archaeology master's provision. The programmes comprised two specialist core modules (in either Roman or Iron Age Archaeology), a large variety of optional/skills modules and an 80 credit Independent Study Module (ISM). The Committee noted that the proposed structure included four 5-credit optional modules; the Postgraduate Taught framework for programme design permitted the inclusion of a maximum of two 5-credit modules. It was reported that approved exemptions (to include four 5-credit modules) for Archaeology's current postgraduate taught provision were in place.

Each proposal had been considered by two external assessors who had recommended that the proposals should proceed subject to the consideration of minor queries; the Department's response to Dr Moore (UTC.19-20/73i-ii refers) [Iron Age proposal] and the response to Prof. Gowland (UTC.19-20/73i-ii refers) [Roman proposal] had satisfactorily

addressed the queries raised. The programmes had been reviewed in advance by Jen Gibbons and Dave Smith and, subject to minor considerations, had the reviewers' support.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- The structure of the 3-year part-time version of the proposals was unbalanced (with 50 credits in years 1 and 2 and 80 credits in year 3). It was reported that the proposed 3-year structure was identical to the Department's other taught masters programmes and that, whilst students formally registered for the ISM in year 3, some preparatory work is undertaken during years 1 and 2.
- The reviewers had raised a concern regarding the impact of small student numbers (predicted for the programmes) on the ability to develop a sense of community. The reviewers noted that this concern was mitigated, to an extent, by the fact that the proposals drew heavily on optional modules that were available to all masters-level students.
- MA Iron Age and Celtic Archaeology. The reviewers noted the focus on European Iron Age Archeology in the Statement of Purpose whereas the two specialist modules appeared to focus primarily on Celtic Britain. It was noted that the two external assessors had not raised concern about the title(s) or content of the programme and core modules.
- Along with two of the external assessors (Dr Moore and Prof. Gowland) the reviewers had queried the diversity of summative assessment methods. Whilst summative assessment points were well distributed throughout the programmes, the proposed core modules were assessed by essay format only. It was noted that there was greater diversity of assessment methods in the 5-credit Skills modules (comprising professional style reports, logbooks, lab books, online portfolios, group wikis, project proposals etc.) and that the Independent Study Module (ISM) included a summatively assessed lecture whereby students presented on their research in the Summer term. That said, the reviewers suggested that, in the light of the array of vocational activities and that graduates of the programmes might well be aiming for a careers in commercial or curatorial archaeology, it would be valuable for the respective programme teams to give further consideration to greater assessment variety, for example the incorporation of industry focused assessments and/or reflective exercises within the new core modules. It was suggested that the development of a local industry project provided an opportunity to align with the University's strategic vision of greater engagement with the City of York.
- The UTC reviewers noted that there was a good variety of optional choices, and queried whether the Department should consider incorporating more specific Roman and Iron Age content into some of the optional modules in the future. It was noted that Dr Graham (UTC.19-20/73iii refers) [Roman proposal] had suggested that students may express a desire for more specific Roman content within the existing suite of optional modules in the future.
- 20-credit Long Essay (Diploma dissertation replacement) ARC00089M. Members queried the rationale for the designation, as an ISM, of the Long Essay module. The designation as an ISM meant that (i) the module could not be compensated and (ii) if failure of the module with a mark of below 40, there was no reassessment opportunity.

The Committee **agreed to approve** the programmes (including the exemption to the modular framework to permit four 5-credit modules) subject to the following three recommendations, that:

1. further consideration be given to the assessment diversity of the core modules and the

- scope for more innovative (industry-facing) summative assessments within the programmes;
2. to consider incorporating more Roman and Iron Age content within the optional modules in the future;
  3. further thought be given to the rationale for the designation, as an ISM, of the Long Essay (Diploma dissertation replacement) module ARC00089M.

## CATEGORY II BUSINESS

### **M19-20/86 Higher and Degree Apprenticeship**

The committee **noted** that the Chair had approved an external assessor comment form for Higher and Degree Apprenticeship proposals (UTC.19-20/74).

### **M19-20/87 Study Abroad Policy statement**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved revisions to the Study Abroad Policy statement (UTC.19-20/75).

### **M19-20/88 Degree Outcomes Statement**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair of UTC and the Chair of SCA had agreed that the University develop a Degree Outcomes Statement (M19-20/5 refers) and that a University Teaching Committee Working Group be established to oversee the development of the Statement (for consideration and approval by Council in July) (UTC.19-20/76).

### **M19-20/89 Annual report on formal complaints**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had considered the annual report on formal complaints received by the Registrar and Secretary in 2018/19 and (i) resolved that there were no matters, patterns or trends that need further attention by Teaching Committee or other University-level body and (ii) endorsed the recommendations therein that:

- Heads of Department, and administrators (with responsibility for complaints), attend an 'informal complaints' workshop;
- Online training and guidance focused on best practice in handling informal complaints be developed;
- Investigative work on trends across the sector in complaints involving industrial action be undertaken.

### **M19-20/90 Student Engagement project**

The Committee **received** an update on the Student Engagement project (UTC.19-20/77).

### **M19-20/91 Sub-committees**

*Standing Committee on Assessment*

The Committee received a report on the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment on 24 January 2020 (UTC.19-20/78).

*Co-ordinating Group for Supplementary Programmes*

The Committee **received** the minutes from the meeting of the Co-ordinating Group for Supplementary Programmes held on 9 December 2019 (UTC.19-20/79).

*Access and Participation Steering Group*

The Committee **noted** that the minutes of the meeting of the Access and Participation Steering Group held on 21 January 2020 (UTC.19-20/80) had been deferred to the March 2020 meeting.

**M19-20/92 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups**

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

- Sciences meeting held on 20 January 2020 (UTC.19-20/81a)
- Arts and Humanities meeting held on 21 January 2020 (UTC.19-20/81b)
- Social Sciences meetings held on 20 November 2019 (UTC.19-20/81c)

The Committee would receive the report of the Social Sciences meeting, held 23 January 2020 (UTC.18-19/81d), at its March 2020 meeting.

**M19-20/93 Periodic Reviews**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the deferral of the Periodic Review of Social and Political Sciences from 2019/20 until the Spring term of 2020/21.

**M19-20/94 Dates of 2019/20 meetings**

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

- Thursday 12 March 2020
- Thursday 14 May 2020
- Thursday 18 June 2020
- *Extraordinary meeting* – Thursday 16 July 2020