UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2019

Present: John Robinson (Chair)
Michael Bate
Stuart Bell
Mike Bentley
Ed Braman
Wayne Campbell (to M18-19/110)
Charlotte Chamberlain
Gill Chitty
Sabine Clarke
Nigel Dandy
Joe Fagan (to M18-19/110)
James Hare
Claire Hughes (to M18-19/110)
Steve King
Barry Lee
Tracy Lightfoot
Sinéad McCotter
Lisa O'Malley
Gulcin Ozkan
Matthew Perry
Richard Waites
Jez Wells (to M18-19/110)

In Attendance: Jane Iddon (ASO, Secretary), Jenny Brotherton (ASO, Minute Secretary) Jessica Roehricht (ASO, observing the meeting).

Apologies were received from: Jen Gibbons and Dave Smith.

CATEGORY I BUSINESS

M18-19/96   **Welcome**

The Chair welcomed Jessica Roehricht, ASO, who was observing the meeting.

M18-19/97   **Minutes and Matters Arising**

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2019 (UTC.18-19/**68**) subject to the correction of the name of the Director for Access and Participation in M18-19/74 (Millwood replaced with Millward).

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC. 18-19/**68 Appendix 1**).
- A memo had been sent to Chairs of Boards of Studies and Heads of Department outlining the requirements of the Digital Accessibility Regulations and the actions being taken to address them.

1

- The action on the Associate Deans to discuss with the Faculty Deans whether workload models should be raised at Faculty Executive Groups was ongoing. The Science Faculty Dean had noted that workload models had been discussed last year but he had no objection to the matter being raised again.
- There had been discussion about teaching and learning projects to be taken forward at a meeting between the PVC (TLS), Associate PVC (TLS), Associate Deans (TLS), Head of ASO and Faculty Learning Enhancement Project Managers. The Head of the ASO would be sharing a summary of the discussion with that group, after which Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups would be asked to consider the identified themes and possible projects.
- The Chair of Senate had been advised of UTC's decision regarding the proposed Juris Doctor Programme. The Law School was continuing to make the case to the QAA for the award to be accepted as a level 7 qualification.

M18-19/98   **Oral Update from the Chair**

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

- The Postgraduate Research Experience Survey had launched on 4 March and would close on 17 May. The current response rate was 13%.
- As at 14 March the National Student Survey response rate was 41.75% (the response rate at the same time last year had been 45.5%). There had been an increase in responses over the last week and it was hoped the upward trend would continue.
- The outcome of the Augar Review had been delayed.
- The deadline for nominations for the Vice-Chancellor Teaching Awards was Friday 15th March.
- All subject-level TEF submissions had been completed. The Chair noted that it had been a well-managed and successful project and thanked the central team and departmental staff for their work. A celebration event for everyone who had been involved was planned for 21 March. It was noted that the review of institutional reporting processes planned for spring/summer 2019 would incorporate any lessons learned from the project. The specification for the full subject-level TEF would not be released until later in the year.

The Committee **received** an oral report from the Associate PVC with respect to degree apprenticeships:

- UEB had approved proposals relating to the delivery and resourcing of degree apprenticeships. A Steering Group and Implementation Group had been established. Tim Andrew would be the project manager and Brian Culleton had been appointed as Head of Apprenticeships and would be stating on 1st April. Health Sciences were developing a level 5 Nursing Associate Degree Apprenticeship (for delivery from September 2019) and an Advanced Clinical Practice (level 7) Apprenticeship (for delivery from 2020). Once in post, the Head of Apprenticeships would be attending FLTGs and FEGs to discuss degree apprenticeships. If members wished to discuss any ideas before then they were encouraged to speak to the Associate PVC (TLS). Members observed that departments would want to understand the resourcing requirements in order to make decisions about how new degree apprenticeships might fit into their strategies. It was noted that once processes had been established, the University would need to decide whether and how it wished to incentivise the delivery of apprenticeships.

M18-19/99   **Update from the Student Representatives**

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

- The GSA had concerns about the implementation of the 20-day feedback turnaround

policy. It had been advised of cases where feedback was not being provided within the time period. The YUSU representative noted that YUSU had also been made aware of student concerns relating to the tone and quality of feedback. The Committee emphasised that it was highly inappropriate for staff to express their concerns about the Policy in the feedback that was being provided to students. YUSU and the GSA were passing any issues that were raised to the relevant departments so that Heads of Department could respond. The Chair noted that the feedback turnaround policy had recently been raised by UCU at the Joint Negotiating and Consultation Committee (JNCC); a meeting had been arranged with HoDs (HoD designated nominee) to discuss alternative approaches to the consideration of exemptions to the Policy.

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

- NSS response rates were lower than they had been at this time last year, however, the picture across the University was uneven and YUSU was working closely with the departments where response rates were particularly low. YUSU had increased effort to promote the survey in the last couple of weeks and this appeared to be having an effect.

M18-19/100   **University-wide 'Year in Enterprise'**

Andrew Ferguson, Careers and Placements, attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a proposal to establish a new University-wide 'with a year in Enterprise' programme variant for all current and future undergraduate and Integrated Masters degrees from 2019/20 (with the exceptions of students on the Social Work Integrated Masters programme, students in the International Pathway College, Centre for Lifelong Learning and National STEM Learning Centre) (UTC.18-19/**69**). It was reported that discussions with respect the inclusion of MBBS students were taking place. The approval of a 'with a year in Enterprise' programme variant for MBBS students who choose to leave their programme of study after successfully completing year three was the remit of HYMS Joint Senate Committee.

The 'with a year in Enterprise' would be a full-time programme variant and comprised a 120 credit nine-month module, supervised and assessed by Careers and Placements. The module would be assessed on a pass/fail basis through a summatively assessed reflection on the student's experience as an entrepreneur. Students completing the 'with a year in Enterprise' would delay the receipt of their degree until after the additional year had been completed. Fees for the 'with a year in Enterprise' would be set at 20% of the normal fee.

The following clarifications were made during discussion:

- Members questioned how the support differed to that which would be provided to any recent graduate of the University. The support provided to recent alumni is within the scope of the 'Proof of Concept Fund', whereas students on the 'with a year in Enterprise' would have access to workspace, coaching and support. This would include 9 meetings with a Business Coach and monthly contact with the Module Supervisor.
- Due to visa restrictions, it was not possible to offer the 'with a year in Enterprise' to students studying on a Tier IV visa. Careers and Placements would continue to monitor visa regulations so that the 'with a year in Enterprise' variant could be made available if there were any changes to the current restrictions imposed by UKVI.
- The programme would be available to students who had completed a placement or a year abroad.
- Careers and Placements would support students on the 'with a year in Enterprise'. There was no requirement for any involvement from the student's home department.
- Members queried whether the addition of 'with a year in Enterprise' to a degree title

3

would be accepted by accrediting bodies. This had been considered by the Working Group and it had been agreed that the PSRB would be required to review the option (should a situation arise where a student on a programme with a professional accreditation wished to opt for the central scheme) to determine its inclusion under their accreditation. The student would be provided with information on the outcome of this consultation with the PSRB in order to help inform their decision to participate.

- Some HEIF funding would be available for students completing the 'with a year in Enterprise'. Allocation of this funding would include consideration of students' personal circumstances. In addition, it was hoped that funding provided by alumni could also be used to support students from low income backgrounds.
- It was noted that the module did not include any taught material. The Committee was advised that the Business Coach would be able to provide students with relevant support and this had been judged as preferable to providing generic sessions for 'with a year in Enterprise' students. The Committee was advised that there were demanding criteria for acceptance onto the module which involved applicants having developed the business idea and evidence of financial projections.
- The selection process would mean that students who did not meet the entry criteria could be eliminated from the process at an early stage and therefore the amount of time invested in an unsuccessful application would be limited.
- Similar programmes at other universities did not attract large numbers of students and demand was not anticipated to outstrip the number of places available.
- Departments would not be expected to reflect on the 'with a year in Enterprise' in quality assurance processes if they do not have students enrolled on the programme variant.
- The Committee's concerns relating to liabilities (specifically ensuring that the University does not bear financial liability) were addressed in the Student Agreement (appendix 5). It was noted that in this section the reference to the Module Supervisor being responsible for a student's progress should be removed.

The Committee noted that a number of queries had been raised by the Special Cases Team with respect to the appeals process:
- consideration of a student's welfare when determining whether to end the student's involvement in the module (this was out of line with standard University processes and did not happen in any other context except where there are formal fitness to practise procedures);
- the absence of a formal and clearly defined mechanism, aligned with University procedures, by which students (and others) can see if their placement has been terminated fairly;
- the proposal suggested that, if a student strongly disagreed with the assessment made by the Module Supervisor and the Business Coach that the student's involvement in the module should end, the student had the right to appeal to the Board of Studies (this was out of line with standard University processes).

Members also noted that the proposal included a resubmission deadline ('two weeks after they receive notification of failure') that was shorter than the University expectation for undergraduate students (requirement for the notification to be at least 5 weeks prior to the date of resubmission). The Chair of the Standing Committee on Assessment advised the Committee that there were minor details relating to assessment and reassessment which needed to be addressed; it was **agreed** that the Chair of SCA would liaise directly with the proposer outside of the meeting on these points. The Committee **approved the creation of a 'with a year in Enterprise' variant for all current and future undergraduate programmes to commence during the 2019/20 academic year (excluding the exemptions outlined in the paper, paras 15-17) subject to:**

4

- revision, in accordance with members' comments, of the Student Agreement template;
- satisfactory resolution of the issues raised by the Special Cases Team;
- amendments to the proposal to address assessment / reassessment queries raised by the Chair of the Standing Committee on Assessment.

The Committee **agreed** that the proposal should be subject to final sign-off by the Chair of UTC (on the advice of the Special Cases Manager and the Chair of the Standing Committee on Assessment).

The Committee **agreed** that the 'with a year in Enterprise' should be subject to a three-year review visit from UTC and be embedded into the University's regular cycle of Periodic Review.

The Chair thanked Andrew Ferguson for presenting the paper.

*Post meeting note: There was discussion about planning approval for the programme. The 'with a year in Enterprise' programme variant was granted planning approval by all Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups in January (UTC.18-19/**67a-c**).*

M18-19/101   Annual Report on Widening Participation

Liz McNeil, Widening Participation Manager, attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** a report on the University's widening participation activities in 2017-18 (UTC.18-19/**70**). The Chair drew members' attention to a correction in paragraph 1.8 of the report: the University's disclosure rate for students with disabilities was 3.7% above the national average (not 2.7% as stated in the report).

The report highlighted the University's performance in 2017/18 in relation to HESA indicators and in relation to the Russell Group and competitor institutions. The percentage of students attending the University from low participation neighbourhoods and from state schools appeared to be following an upward trajectory. The percentage of mature students at the University had continued to decrease (down 1 percentage point from 2016/17). It was suggested that changes to national funding for nursing courses might partly explain this downward trajectory. The University was looking at ways to encourage more mature students to York, particularly looking at opportunities around MOOCs. The Committee noted that the percentage of BAME students at the University had increased from 8.5% in 2012/3 to 13.4% in 2018/19 but, nonetheless, acknowledged that significant work was required to reduce the underrepresentation of BAME students.

The Office for Students (OfS) had recently published guidance for the completion of the new Access and Participation Plan (APP) for 2020/2021 to 2024/25 (replacing the previous OFFA Access Agreements which were submitted annually). English higher education providers could submit a plan from Monday 20 May 2019. The APP was expected to address the Key Performance Measures set by the OfS: to eliminate the gap in participation at higher-tariff providers between the most and least represented groups, to reduce the gap in non-continuation between the most and least represented groups, to reduce the gap in degree outcomes between white students and black students and to reduce the gap in degree outcomes between disabled students and non-disabled students.

The Widening Participation Forum was highlighted as an opportunity for members of academic staff to engage with matters relating to Access and Participation. The Widening

UTC: March 2019

Participation team was currently working with YUSU's African Caribbean Society as part of its effort to increase the proportion of BAME students.

Members were concerned about the conversion rate of students from underrepresented groups who apply to the University who then enrol at the University. The Committee asked whether there was more that could be done to reduce the number of students lost at that stage in the application process and it was **agreed** that this concern be relayed to the Access and Participation Steering Group.

Action: PVC (TLS)

It was reported that measures were already in place in some departments to increase the number of offers made to underrepresented groups for example in the Department of Chemistry students from low participation areas, who successfully completed the Exploring Everyday Chemistry MOOC, were given an offer one grade lower than the standard offer. It was also reported that the Head of Admissions was preparing a paper for UEB on contextual offers.

The Chair reported that Liz would be leaving the University at the end of March. The Chair thanked Liz for attending UTC to present the report and for her significant contribution to, and leadership of, widening participation initiatives over the years.

M18-19/102   **Annual Report on Timetabling and Space**

Walter Van Opstal, Space Services Manager, attended for this item

The Committee **considered** a report on the utilisation of generalist teaching space during 2018/19 and actions to improve this (UTC.18-19/**71**).

Timetabling had completed the annual audit of teaching space during week 7 of the Autumn term, the busiest week of the term for teaching. Over the week student attendance was at 48% and the average utilisation of teaching space was 24%. The audit found that the frequency of teaching space use varied over the week with space used less on Mondays and Fridays and in late afternoon slots. The number of timetabled hours which were not attended increased during these times. The considerable cost of unused space was noted.

The Committee discussed actions proposed in the report. The proposed actions were based on the results of the audit and projections which indicated that in Spring 2020 there would be insufficient availability of large lecture space to meet demand.

1. The Committee agreed that, once available, attendance monitoring data could be used to monitor space utilisation, providing that this purpose does not compromise the primary aims of the attendance monitoring project which were focused on student wellbeing and Tier 4 visa compliance.
2. The Committee was advised that there was significant variation between departments with respect to the proportion of staff with a HoD-approved local teaching constraint. Members noted that the figures were not accompanied by any qualitative narrative (specifically categories of constraint) and, in isolation, raised questions about the equality of staff treatment. Whilst the University has a Flexible Working Policy there is no University-wide guidance on the approval of teaching constraints to support HoDs' decision-making. The Committee noted that, should it be deemed beneficial to develop such guidance, it must be informed by the Athena SWAN charter and align with the University's Flexible Working Policy. It was noted that for students with caring responsibilities teaching hours between 9.00 and 15.00 were likely to be preferable.

The Committee asked for modelling to show the impact of greater availability on Timetable Key Performance Indicators. The paper had proposed that all staff on full-time contracts should be available between 09.00 and 18.00; therefore this case may be a suitable one to model in comparison to the status quo.

Action: Space Services Manager

If the evidence shows that Key Performance Indicators could be significantly improved by greater availability, the Committee suggested that this issue (including exploration of the criteria currently used to approve a teaching constraint) could be discussed at University Operations Group. Pending the outcome of that discussion it might then be appropriate for a faculty-based discussion to take place at Faculty Executive Groups.

3. The Committee did not support the proposed action of allocating lecture theatres based on expected group size rather than planned group size. Instead it encouraged Timetabling to explore other mechanisms to reduce the demand for lecture theatres; members suggested, for example, increased use of flat spaces. It was noted that, in the recent past, some departments had been advised against timetabling sessions in rooms that accommodated the expected group size (rather than the planned group size) on health and safety grounds. On the other hand members had experience of working with Timetabling to select the most appropriate space based on expected turnout and reported that this had worked well. The Committee discussed the impact of lecture capture and possibilities around flipped teaching. It was anticipated that, in the longer term, attendance monitoring data would support the University to consider how it could allocate space more flexibly.

4. The Committee agreed that departments should be seeking to minimise the volume of timetabled hours not attended and the PVC would remind Heads of Department of the importance of delivering the scheduled contact time.

Action: PVC (TLS)

The Chair thanked Walter Van Opstal for presenting the paper.

M18-19/103   Module Evaluation

The Committee **considered** a progress report from the Module Evaluation Working Group (UTC.18-19/**72**). The Group was looking at the adoption of a University-wide system for module evaluation via a simple online form. It proposed that each form would list the stated module objectives so that students could evaluate how successful the module had been in meeting the objectives. Students would be asked to evaluate their level of agreement on a scale of 1-5 using the NSS format of 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. The form would involve a free text section allowing students to make any other comments. The form would be completed during a taught session in the penultimate week of the module and therefore assessment would not be evaluated by this process.

During discussion the following points were noted:
1. It might be difficult for students to evaluate how well the module learning outcomes had been met before they had completed the assessment.
2. The importance of a system which maintained flexibility for departments and module leaders was emphasized.
3. The issue of team teaching was highlighted. It was noted that currently some departments evaluated team taught modules in segments where as in others students would complete one evaluation to encompass the entire module. The Committee felt that the system should provide the opportunity for students to recognise the effectiveness of individual teachers.

4. Module evaluations allowed teaching staff to evidence excellent teaching. It was important that the questions continued to provide the sort of evidence that would support staff with promotion applications and assist with career development.

Recognising the value of feedback for individuals (points 3 and 4 above) and that the system should reflect the importance and value of teachers, the Committee advised that the system should capture students' feedback on individual members of staff and Graduate Teaching Assistants as well as the learning experience as a whole.

The Chair of the Working Group confirmed that online provision delivered in partnership with Higher Ed Partners UK and apprenticeship provision were not in the scope of the project.

The Committee **agreed** that the Working Group should consult with departments via Faculty Learning and Teaching Group (FLTG) April meetings. Department FLTG representatives should have the opportunity to discuss the recommendations with their Teaching Committee prior to FLTG discussion. Academic units (the Centre for Lifelong Learning and the International Pathway College) without representation on FLTG should be consulted directly.

The Chair thanked the Working Group Chair for presenting the paper and thanked all members of the Working Group for their contributions to date.

M18-19/104   Inclusivity Strategy

The Committee **received** a verbal update from the Chair of the Inclusivity Strategy Working Group. A significant area of work was on ensuring compliance with the new Digital Accessibility Regulations. The first phase of this was underway and interns had been appointed to review the University's VLE sites to ensure that the content was accessible by September 2019. The second phase would involve offering support to departments and working on an online tutorial for staff.

The other area of the Inclusivity Strategy Working Group's work involved developing benchmarks for inclusivity standards. These would be shared shortly with Chairs of Boards of Studies and every department would be asked to review four programmes (two undergraduate and two postgraduate) against the benchmark statement. Departments would be asked to assess whether the programmes meet the benchmark statement's criteria all of the time, some of the time, or never. After this, the Group planned to survey students to establish whether their views aligned with those of departments. The Group would report a proposed set of accessibility standards to UTC at the end of the academic year. The Committee suggested that the Group should ask departments to review four (comprising two UG/PG) programmes *or* 50% of their programmes- whichever was lower.

M18-19/105   Online Project

The Committee **received** a verbal update from the Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor (TLS) on the Online Project. The Steering Group had been considering what ongoing support would be required for online programmes as short term posts supporting the project were coming to an end. Work was being undertaken to review student communication (encompassing the role of the student success coordinator) and to revise the orientation module. The Computer Science programmes would be starting in April and had been recruiting well.

The Committee **agreed** that, as the development and delivery of online programmes was moving to a business as usual phase, the update on the project could be removed as a standing item on UTC's agenda.

M18-19/106   360 Student Voice Review

The Committee **considered** a proposal for a pilot framework for '360 Student Voice Review' (UTC.18-19/**73**).The Student Voice Group was formed following a recommendation in YUSU's review of the Student Representation Policy (UTC.17-18/**78**). The Group included the PVC for Learning Teaching and Students, Associate PVC (TLS), Associate Deans (TLS), Head of the Academic Support Office and staff and Academic Officers from YUSU and GSA.

The Group had developed an indicative 360-student voice review framework which aimed to allow departments to reflect on their approaches to student voice. It was proposed that the framework should be piloted with self-selecting departments in the Summer term 2019.

The Committee considered the proposed framework and suggested it would be good if the reflective questions could capture whether students from different backgrounds were equally involved in student voice activity. The Committee suggested that the 360 student voice review framework should be integrated into the review of Institutional reporting processes (M18-19/81 refers).

The Committee **endorsed** the proposal to pilot the framework in the Summer term 2019.

M18-19/107   Policy for Student Representation in Learning and Teaching

The Committee **considered** a proposed amendment to the Policy on Student Representation (UTC.18-19/**74**). The amendment aimed to strengthen collaboration between departmental staff and student union staff by specifying that there would be an individual or individuals in departments who would act as a department's liaison point for YUSU and the GSA. It was noted that the addition did not require departments to create a new role as the Policy already required departments to designate a member of staff to work with students on representation issues. The Committee **agreed to recommend approval of the amendment to the Policy to Senate**.

The Committee considered whether 'Student Voice Policy' would be a more appropriate name for the Policy. The Committee agreed that student representation was an important element of the 'student voice' but that Student Voice covered other forms of student engagement (which were not within the scope of the Policy for Student Representation in Learning and Teaching).

*Post meeting note: the proposal to amend paragraph 3.b of the Policy did not use the exact wording of the current (approved Policy); the Committee therefore considered the addition of 'This role will include acting as the Department's liaison point for relevant staff members from the YUSU and GSA' only (UTC.18-19/74). Whilst not explicit in the paper the intention had been to request that paragraph 3b [currently: 'Departments will designate a member of staff to work with and support students and other bodies on representation issues and to coordinate student representation within the department. This member of staff should also work closely with relevant staff members from YUSU and the GSA (YUSU and GSA will also each identify a member of their own staff with responsibility for academic representation)'] be replaced by 'Departments will develop a role (or roles) focused on working with and supporting students and other bodies on representation issues - including coordinating student representation within the Department. This role will include acting as the Department's liaison point for relevant staff members from YUSU and the GSA.' The Chair resolved that the proposed amended paragraph did not differ in substance from the current text and therefore agreed **to recommend approval of the additional Policy amendment to Senate**.*

UTC: March 2019

M18-19/108   Policy on Repeat Study

The Committee **considered** a report from the Standing Committee on Assessment (SCA) on the University's Repeat Study Policy (UTC.18-19/**75**).

The Repeat Study Policy was approved by Senate for implementation for a period of two academic years, starting 2017/18, with a review to be undertaken in 2018/9. The Chair of SCA noted that it would not be possible to complete a comprehensive review of the Policy until the outcomes of the repeating students were known. The report proposed that the Policy should remain unchanged in 2019/20, to allow SCA and UTC time to consider the progression data for the repeating students following the 2018/19 summer CAP and resit periods**.** At this point, SCA would consider all the relevant data for repeating students, such as withdrawal rates, leave of absence rates and reassessment data.

SCA had discussed the impact of the Policy with the Departments of Electronic Engineering, Mathematics and Physics and all three reported that some repeating students were continuing to show patterns of poor attendance and engagement. The Department of Philosophy had provided the SCA with a report on its repeating students which noted a similar pattern. The Committee was concerned by the negative nature of the anecdotal evidence. It was suggested that, in light of this, the Policy should be suspended until SCA's analysis of progression data had been completed. The Committee was concerned about the impact on students of two fail years, both in terms of the financial impact and the fact that students would no longer be eligible for student finance, although, the Academic Registrar noted that in exceptional cases Student Finance England would continue to provide funding for students who had failed twice.

Members agreed that it was essential to ensure that students were being provided with good advice before electing to repeat the failed year and that the importance of this should be reemphasised.

The proposal for the Policy to remain unchanged for 2019/20 so that a more complete review could be undertaken in the Autumn term 2019/20 was put to a vote and the Committee **agreed to recommend the proposal to Senate.** *A clear majority of members voted in favour of the proposal with one member dissenting.*

The Committee was advised that there had been ambiguity about whether or not the Policy applied to students on a foundation stage. SCA had discussed the matter with Foundation Year Teams who felt that students on Foundation Years should not be eligible for repeat study. The Committee **agreed to recommend to Senate** that the policy be clarified to specify that it applied to Stage 1, Level C, students, and not students on foundation year Stage 0.

M18-19/109   First Class degrees with distinction

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the SCA to revise the criteria for awarding first-class degrees with distinction with the aim of increasing consistency and transparency (UTC.18-19/**76**). The proposal set a minimum final award mark of at least 75% with three additional optional criteria relating to module level marks. For departments where the proposals did not involve a modification to existing criteria they could be implemented for all students in 2019/20. For departments where application of the proposals involved a modification to existing criteria they would take effect for students beginning their first or second year in 2019/20.

Chairs of Board of Studies had been consulted on the proposed criteria. Eleven departments had responded with one objection raised by the York Management School. The Management School did not currently require a minimum award mark.

The Committee **agreed to recommend the proposal to Senate**. Furthermore it was **agreed** that this recommendation should be considered by Senate as a Category I proposal (at its meeting in May 2019). It suggested that it would be helpful if the SCA could provide Senate, as part of the paper, with data showing the number of distinctions that would be awarded if the only criterion was a minimum award mark of 75%.

M18-19/110   **Periodic Review: Politics, Economics and Philosophy (PEP)**

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessors' report and action plan arising from the periodic review of PEP[1] (UTC.18-19/**77**). Richard Waites had chaired the Review, with Sabine Clarke and James Hare also on the Panel.

The Chair of the Panel highlighted a number of positives including the commitment of the academic team to interdisciplinary study and the number of interdisciplinary modules that were available to PEP students. The report also acknowledged the efforts of the new PEP administrator and the support that had been provided by administrators in the Department of Politics during the transition to PEP's new organisational structure.

The Panel had made recommendations which aimed to support future developments in the School. This included encouraging the School to think carefully about its PhD programme and the development of postgraduate taught provision. The Panel had emphasised the need for this not to detract capacity from addressing issues at undergraduate level. The Panel had also made recommendations to address a number of minor issues including increased support for PEP students with module selection and providing opportunities for students to raise issues in a way that allowed the School to respond quickly.

The Committee **considered** the action plan. There was some concern about the response provided by Economics to 4.11 which did not identify specific actions agreed in response to the recommendations and instead described activity which was ongoing. The Chair agreed to discuss the response with the Review Secretary, and possibly other Panel members, to decide if further action was required. The Committee approved the report and, notwithstanding the query relating to Economics' response (which would be followed up by the Chair of UTC), agreed that appropriate actions in response to the Panel's recommendations had been identified.

Action: Chair of UTC / Review Secretary

The Chair thanked the Panel for their work on the Review.

M18-19/111   **Periodic Review: Philosophy**

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessors' report and action plan arising from the periodic review of Philosophy (UTC.18-19/**78**). Tracy Lightfoot had chaired the Review, with Sabine Clarke and James Hare also on the Panel.

The Panel had been impressed by recent curriculum changes which included the development of innovative modules and embedding transferable skills through varied assessments. The commitment of the Department's teaching staff and professional and support staff was noted.

The Department had highlighted issues around recruitment, student mental health and the experience of students on combined degrees and the Panel's recommendations aimed to

---

[1] School of PEP at the time of the Review; from January 2019 the School of Philosophy, Politics and Economics (PPE)

support the Department in dealing with these issues. The Panel observed that the Department would benefit from a clearer strategy for teaching and learning and recommended that it consider appointing a Director for Learning and Teaching who would have oversight for Teaching and Learning within the Department.

The Committee **considered** the action plan and agreed that appropriate actions had been identified. The Committee noted the action for the University to consider how it could better promote and support students to take electives (para. 2.7). The Committee **agreed** that Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups should be asked to consider ways in which electives could be more effectively promoted.

Action: Associate Deans (TLS)

It was noted that as well as encouraging elective opportunities the University could be exploring opportunities for broader cross-faculty offerings. Barry Lee would prepare a reflective paper on this for consideration by UTC at a future meeting.

Action: Chair of Departmental Teaching Committee, Philosophy

The Committee approved the report and the action plan and thanked the Panel for their work on the Review.

CATEGORY II BUSINESS

M18-19/112   New programmes, modifications and withdrawals

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

1. the withdrawal of the BA in Economics and Sociology (approved by Planning Committee in January 2014);
2. a PGCE Geography subject route to be offered from 2020 with applications to be open in summer 2019, and for each of the Core/University, Pathfinder TSA, Yorkshire TSA, and Diocese of Middlesbrough TSA PGCE routes;
3. modifications to the International Pathway College's Entry to Pre-Masters programme (UTC.18-19/**80**).

M18-19/113   Policy on Combined Degrees

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved updates to the Policy on Combined Degrees (UTC.18-19/**79**) associated with the combined programme governance changes agreed in May 2018 (M17-18/123 refers).

M18-19/114   Criminology Board of Studies

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had **recommended** to Senate that the Criminology Board of Studies be disbanded with immediate effect and that this recommendation had been approved by Senate via a Chair's action (22/02/2019) (UTC.18-19/**81**).

M18-19/115   UKSCQA degree classification consultation

The Committee **received** the Institutional response to the UKSCQA degree classification consultation (UTC.18-19/**82**).

UTC: March 2019

M18-19/116   **Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework**

The Committee **received** the:

1. Institutional response to the independent review of the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (UTC.18-19/**83**);
2. TEF subject-level pilot provider submission (UTC.18-19/**84**). [*confidential – in commercial confidence*]

M18-19/117   **Standing Committee on Assessment**

It was **noted** that the report on the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment on 8 March 2019 would be received at UTC's next meeting (in May).

M18-19/118   **Online and Distance Learning Forum**

The Committee **noted** that the minutes from the meeting of the Online and Distance Learning Forum held on 18 February 2019 were available at:
https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/contacts/committees/distance/

M18-19/119   **Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups**

The Committee **received** a report on the meeting of the Sciences Faculty Learning and Teaching Group held on 11 February (UTC.18-19/**86c**).

It was noted that the reports of the meetings of Faculty Learning Teaching Groups for the Arts and Humanities (held on 13 February 2019) and the Social Sciences (held on 25 February 2019) would be received at UTC's next meeting (in May).

M18-19/120   **Dates of 2018/19 meetings**

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

UTC: March 2019