

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2020

**Present:** John Robinson (Chair)  
Jane Baston  
Mike Bentley  
Ed Braman  
Wayne Campbell  
Gill Chitty  
Sam Cobb  
Nigel Dandy  
Claire Hughes  
Steve King  
Barry Lee  
Tracy Lightfoot  
Giang Nguyen  
Lisa O'Malley  
Matthew Perry  
Jill Webb

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

Apologies were received from Michael Bate, Sabine Clarke, Jen Gibbons, Sinéad McCotter, Mark Nicholson, Andrew Pickering, Dave Smith and Jez Wells.

**CATEGORY I BUSINESS**

**M19-20/95 Minutes and Matters Arising**

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2020 (UTC.19-20/82).

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC.19-20/82 **Appendix I**). The action relating to the MA / MSc Sustainability Proposals (M19-20/37 & 63 refers), to secure a third external assessor report and to respond to issues therein, was still outstanding. Members noted that the programmes were planned to commence in 2020. It was reported that the Department of Geography and Environment had been in contact with the programme proposer with suggestions for possible reviewers; Claire Hughes agreed to make further contact with the programme proposer and to offer further assistance to help secure a third external.

**M19-20/96 Oral Update from the Chair**

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

- The University's (re)application to the Register of Apprenticeship Training Providers for Degree Apprenticeship provision had been successful. It was further reported that the

draft application for the University to be an End Point Assessment Organisation for the Advanced Clinical Practitioner Degree Apprenticeship programme was currently being completed, and would be discussed and signed-off at the Project Board in due course; the deadline for submission was 27 March. The proposal for the Advanced Clinical Practitioner Degree Apprenticeship would be considered by UTC at its May meeting.

- As at 12 March the National Student Survey response rate was 45.5% (the response rate at the same time last year had been 42%).
- The Teaching, Learning and Students Sustainability Working Group had discussed ideas related to implementing sustainability and digital methodology initiatives, for example, through electronic handling of assessments, virtual meetings, and external assessment of electronically submitted PhD theses. Further ideas included: promoting sustainability within the wider student experience (for example through promoting volunteering opportunities); integrating sustainability within programme learning outcomes and encouraging programme teams to provide space within their curriculum for staff and students to explore interests in sustainability (supported through research)
- The Chair reported that the original consultation schedule and timeline for University Strategy Development may be delayed because of Covid-19 contingencies. The Chair noted that the Strategy would be encompassing a 10-year period, and the eight Strategic Working Groups had concluded the first stage of the plans, and four objectives per Working Group had been agreed. The two Working Groups which were of particular interest to UTC were Teaching Organisation and the Integrated Student Experience. Consultation with senior Committees (including UTC) and with Departmental staff and students would take place during the next stage of the process
- The Chair reported that the current period of University and College Union (UCU) industrial action was due to finish on 13<sup>th</sup> March. The Chair noted that 169 HE institutions were involved in the strike action nationally. Progress had been made at a local level; the University Management and trade union representatives at York had issued a joint statement that articulated the commitment of all parties to work together to resolve the issues relating to pay and conditions. The University Academic Contingency Group had continued to meet regularly and it was noted that staff had worked to mitigate the impact on the student experience. The withheld pay during both periods of industrial action would go towards funding additional learning opportunities for those students most affected by the strike and for other initiatives that benefit all students.
- The Chair reported that a Contingency Planning Group had been convened to deal with the fast changing pace of Covid-19. The Group was focused on core contingency planning around teaching and assessment, and considering how forthcoming examinations could be delivered online. It was noted that other institutions across the UK had already announced their intention to move all their examinations to be online. Guidance had been circulated to departments, and they had been asked to review how their planned teaching and assessments could be converted to online delivery. The GSA representative expressed concern about all assessments being delivered online, as not all students would have the same access to PCs and other resources.

#### **M19-20/97 Update from the Student Representatives**

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

- Nominations for the YUSU Excellence Awards had opened (and would close on 17 April). The YUSU Excellence Awards event would be take place on 7 May. Members were asked to promote the awards to students and to encourage nominations.
- The YUSU/GSA-led Survey on Transparency of Assessment Information had been running for a few weeks and had received 257 responses so far (the target number of responses was 500).

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

- Postgraduate Taught students had raised concerns regarding the loss of supervision time (arising from industrial action) to prepare for dissertation. It was reported that online resources (being produced as part of the Together York Project, M18-19/152 refers) to provide support during the 'fourth term' (the Summer vacation) would soon be available.
- The GSA had provided sessions on peer-to-peer support and on identifying early signs of mental ill-health; feedback had been positive.

#### **M19-20/98 Progress report on the Degree Outcomes Statistical Analysis report**

*Karen Payne, Business Intelligence Unit, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a progress report on the Degree Outcomes Statistical Analysis report (UTC.19-20/**83**). The purpose of the Degree Outcomes Statistical Analysis was to analyse the relationship between outcomes and student entry profile characteristics; the progress report provided UTC with an update on the work being undertaken to develop this analysis [(previously presented to UTC in May 2019 (M18-19/125 refers))].

Previous reports had used a Binomial Regression and Linear Regression to analyse the relationships between outcomes and student entry profiles, and the work involved a large amount of manual coding and modifications. For the 2020 analysis, the team had re-programmed the method in Python, a powerful tool, which allowed statistical analysis of new metrics and modelling techniques. It was reported that the initial findings aligned overall with the findings of previous analyses; that said, triangulation of Office for Students datasets was not yet complete. It was reported that the 2020 analysis would be extended to include a new series of variables (page 3, UTC.19-20/**83**) including additional variables that had been requested by UTC in May 2019 (M18-19/125 refers).

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- It would be valuable to have more granular data in respect of ethnicity and disability variables. In terms of disability variables it was noted that concentrating on one or two meaningful variables, such as mental health, was possible. It was agreed this would be discussed further with the Academic Registrar prior to deciding on which variables to be used.

**Action: Business Intelligence Unit / Academic Registrar**

- It would be useful to include BTEC as part of the qualification variables. It was agreed that this would be included.
- It was suggested that a comparative analysis of student outcomes from single and joint/combined honours programme would be useful. It was noted that it would be difficult to provide this specific data at this stage, but it would be considered in the future.
- The data would be valuable in the identification of early support mechanisms / interventions (since many of the variables are known before students arrive).

Members queried whether:

- A similar postgraduate analysis could also be provided. It was reported that there were no current plans to provide such an analysis but that it could be considered in the future.
- Data could be benchmarked against TEF results. It was noted that this would be an extensive piece of work and, if required in the future, it could be outsourced.

Members were positive about the progress made to date and endorsed the extension of the analysis to include the addition of new sets of variables.

The Chair thanked Karen for the progress report and for attending the meeting to present the paper.

#### **M19-20/99 Annual report on Timetabling and Space**

*Alastair Reekie (Head of Space and Accommodation) and David Gent (Student Engagement Project Manager, Academic Support Office) attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** the 2019/20 annual report on timetabling and space (UTC.19-20/**84**). The report was considered in conjunction with a report (UTC.19-20/**94**) from the Student Engagement project on the influence of timetabling on engagement (M19-20/100 refers).

Timetabling had completed the annual audit of teaching space during week 7 of the Autumn term, the busiest week of the term for teaching. The audit focused on the efficient use of teaching space. It was noted that student attendance over the week had been low and the average utilisation rate was found to be low (22.33%). Lower frequencies (and therefore poorer utilisation) were reported for 09.00 starts, 17.00 finishes, Mondays and Fridays. The report also noted a tendency to curtail teaching sessions on the days and times perceived as less popular. It was reported that the University's survey utilisation rate of 22.33% was 5.89% below the HE sector median and that better utilisation (through increasing frequency and occupancy rates) could enable more effective timetabling planning.

Members noted that the audit took place in a one week period, which was a short snapshot in time; therefore more real time information and departmental and programme variables, such as staff availability and combination of teaching options, were also needed to provide a bigger picture.

The Committee discussed the two recommendations proposed in the report:

1. To challenge departments regarding hours booked and not used. The Committee **endorsed** this recommendation and noted that, in the context of the University's sustainability strategic vision, it should be a priority. Members queried the extent to which this was existing practice; it was noted that practice appeared to be variable across departments.
2. To spread room usage across the week and across the day, to make efficient use of available capacity, and to review the practice whereby Heads of Departments approve informal teaching constraints. Members noted that the absence of key performance indicators (focused on the student experience) meant that it was not possible for the Committee to understand the impact that a change of practice (with respect to the approval of informal teaching constraints) would have on the student experience; it was therefore not possible for the Committee to support this recommendation. It was noted that, in considering the 2019 annual report (M18-19/102 refers) in March 2019, the Committee had requested modelling to show the impact of greater staff availability on key performance indicators.

Members noted that the report provided a business and management perspective (in terms of efficiency) and did not provide the student perspective of a good timetabling experience. It was noted that previous reports (2015/16, 2016/17) had been student-oriented and had

been supported by a series of detailed student-focused key performance indicators. The Committee **agreed** that future annual reports to Teaching Committee should be re-focused to the student point of view and be supported by student experience-focused key performance indicators.

**Action: Space Services**

The Chair thanked Alastair for attending the meeting to present the paper.

*Secretary's Post meeting note: Subsequent to the meeting, a typo was highlighted on page 2 of the report. The bottom of the fraction for Occupancy stated 'Spare capacity'; this should state 'Total capacity'.*

## **M19-20/100 Student Engagement Project**

*Alastair Reekie (Head of Space and Accommodation) and David Gent (Student Engagement Project Manager, Academic Support Office) attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report from the Student Engagement Project on the influence of timetabling on engagement (UTC.19-20/94). The report was considered in conjunction with the 2019/20 annual report on timetabling and space (M19-20/99 refers). The project team had conducted research with approximately 250 students; in addition, the project received comments from 140 members of academic staff from participating departments.

The report suggested that timetabling appeared to be significant factor on student engagement:

- The time of day was a significant factor. A significant proportion of students had indicated that they were less likely to attend sessions timetabled at the 'ends' of the day (that is early and late finishes). Members noted the tension between this finding and the desire, articulated in the annual report on timetabling and space, for greater utilisation of space at these times.
- A high volume of activities and back-to-back sessions were also significant factors. Students indicated that they felt overloaded; students may therefore choose not to attend a timetabled session in order to take a break or to consolidate learning. It may also be the case, where teaching sessions are spread across campus, that it is difficult for students to arrive on time (in this instance students may choose not to attend rather than be late). This factor seemed to be more of an issue in the Sciences (due to more scheduled contact hours). Members noted that this finding complemented the suggestion, within the annual timetabling and space report, that the University should spread teaching out more.
- The stability of the timetable was also a factor (particularly in the Sciences). An unstable timetable made it difficult for students to form effective study routines.
- Student views on the impact of the distribution of classes on engagement were mixed. Some student preferred a long break whilst others preferred a short break (and indicated that if the break between timetabled sessions was too long they may not attend – preferring to return to residence).

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- Members noted that the findings from the Student Engagement Project on the influence of timetabling on engagement underlined the importance that UTC should receive student experience-focused timetabling key performance indicators as part of the (routine) annual report on timetabling and space (M19-20/99 refers).
- Members noted that if the stability of the timetable was a significant issue then this should be investigated further since this was likely to impact on plans to develop

greater interdisciplinarity (a key component of the York Strategic vision). [*the interim report, UTC.19-20/71, from the Working Group on Interdepartmental and Cross-Faculty Teaching was considered by UTC at its March meeting, M19-20/85 refers*]

The Chair thanked David for attending the meeting to present the paper.

#### **M19-20/101 Academic Misconduct Policy**

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the Standing Committee on Assessment to amend the Academic Misconduct Policy (UTC.19-20/85).

The proposed amendments comprised the following:

- The plagiarism penalty tables had been updated to provide better clarity to panels. The extent of a fail had been revised, to be dependent on the individual case.
- The definition of cheating had been widened to include ethical breaches and dishonest presentation of word counts.
- The incorporation of an approach to Whistleblowing (which was congruent with the existing policy on anonymous reporting of complaints). Incidents reported by a third party would only be followed up if the person was identifiable and contactable, and if sufficient evidence had been provided. In order to ensure the protection of students against potential malicious behaviour, anonymous whistleblowing reports would only be followed up in exceptional circumstances.

The Committee **agreed to recommend the proposal to Senate.**

#### **M19-20/102 University Policy on Repeat Study**

The Committee **considered** a report from the Standing Committee on Assessment on the University's Repeat Study Policy (UTC.19-20/86). The Repeat Study Policy was now in its third year of operation. The policy was approved by Senate (October 2017) for implementation for a period of two academic years (2017/18 and 2018/19). After an initial evaluation, considered by SCA and UTC in the Spring term 2018/19, it was agreed that the Policy should remain unchanged for 2019/20 to allow a more comprehensive review to be undertaken at the end of 2018/19; this report represented that review.

The Chair of SCA reported that the take-up rate of 2018/19 students repeating year 1 (in 2019/20) had been the same percentage as the previous year. The majority of repeating students (two-thirds) were from within the Faculty of Sciences. Furthermore, it was noted that a number of students repeating from the Faculty of Social Sciences were studying programmes with significant mathematical and statistical content. Whilst approximately 50% of repeating students had successfully progressed, more than half of these students had required August resits in order to progress. Demographic data highlighted that BME [black and minority ethnic] students, those with a registered disability and overseas students appeared more likely to repeat the year.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- Half of the repeating student cohort progressed successfully; for these students the repeat study policy had been positive.
- It was too early to evaluate the effectiveness of 'Back on Track' support measures (introduced in 2019, to support repeating students, M18-19/156 refers).

The Committee **agreed to recommend approval of the proposal**, made by the Standing

Committee on Assessment, **to Senate** that: the Repeat Study Policy be approved for continuation, with a policy review in three years' time, by which time two cohorts of repeating students should have progressed to the end of their degree.

The Committee **noted** that the SCA would receive, annually, repeat study statistics in order to inform UTC of any significant changes in the operation of the policy.

### **M19-20/103 University Strategy Development**

The Committee **noted** that the report on University Strategy Development (UTC.19-20/87) had been deferred to a future meeting.

### **M19-20/104 Periodic Review of Natural Sciences**

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessor reports and action plan arising from the Periodic Review of Natural Sciences (UTC.19/20/88). Tracy Lightfoot had chaired the Review and Matthew Perry had been the second UTC panel member. Giang Nguyen had been the Student Representative and Sally O'Connor had been Secretary.

This was the School's first Periodic Review. The Natural Sciences programmes commenced in September 2015, with the first cohort of students graduating in 2018 (BSc) and 2019 (MSci). It was noted that Natural Sciences was relatively new as a recognised discipline, and was currently offered by only sixteen research-intensive Universities across the UK.

The Chair of the Panel reported that the review had been a positive experience supported by two excellent external assessors. The Panel identified many strengths, which included exceptional extra-curricular provision, a good sense of community and belonging and strong evidence of student voice opportunities. The Panel noted that the student participation in the Review was good, with positive student engagement.

Recommendations to the School included that:

- a review of skills provision, particularly coding, be carried out;
- consideration be given as to how to formally embed internationalisation and sustainability within the curriculum;
- the system of peer support be formalised;
- consideration be given as to how extra-curricular and student support activities would be preserved during staff changes.

During discussion of the report the following points were made:

- It was reported that, whilst the Panel had met with staff from some contributing departments, it might have been beneficial to have a wider spread of staff contributions from the participating departments. It was noted that although a number of other staff had been invited and planned to attend the Review, the availability for some staff had changed (unavoidably) by the time of the Review. It was noted that, rather than secure attendance on the day of the Review, another way of incorporating the views of the Heads of Department of the participating departments would be to seek views ahead of the Review; it was agreed that this should be incorporated in the Periodic Review guidance.

**Action: Academic Quality Team**

- The YUSU representative reported that, although student involvement in the recruitment of new staff members had not been included as a formal recommendation within the Report, it was hoped that this practice could be adopted

in the future. The Chair endorsed this point of view.

- Members noted that the Panel had acknowledged, as a strength, the “genuine interdisciplinarity” of the School’s provision (which had also been praised by the external assessors). Members queried whether the pathway structure was genuinely interdisciplinary. The Panel Chair noted that the programmes had been designed to draw on existing material delivered by the participating departments, and that interdisciplinarity was embedded primarily within the projects.
- Members noted that paragraph 4 of the report outlined some issues with respect to supervision and that it was not accompanied by a recommendation. The Panel Chair reported that supervision had not come out as strong theme within the Review (in either the documentation submitted in advance of the Review or the meetings with staff and students).
- Members observed that consideration of current student numbers versus the ambitious recruitment plans (which were in place at the inception of the School) did not feature in the report. The Committee noted that, whilst a Periodic Review is concerned with the impact of student numbers on the student learning experience, student intake targets were not within the scope of a Periodic Review.

The Committee **noted** that the Panel had made three University-level recommendations, that:

- Natural Sciences Professional Support staff be involved in the recruitment of the new School Director (para 6.3); this had been referred, for consideration, to the Operations Manager (Faculty of Sciences).
- The Director of School be appointed as a member of Senate (para 6.5); to be referred to Senate, for consideration, via Teaching Committee’s Senate synopsis report.
- The Student Systems team review the SITS access of the School Manager (para 9.5); this had been referred, for consideration, to the Deputy Director, Student Services.

The Committee **considered** the School’s action plan and the following points were made:

- An additional action had been added by the School. This did not relate to a Panel recommendation and would therefore be removed from the action plan.

**Action: Secretary to UTC**

- A number of actions were accompanied by ‘ongoing’ deadlines [in the ‘by when’ column]. All actions needed to be time-bound.
- Report para. 3.3, 3.4: The Committee noted that the agreed action did not specify coding. Given that the Panel had specifically mentioned coding (in respect of the review of skills provision) it was agreed that the action should be amended to specifically address this point.
- Report para. 8.1: The Committee noted that the School might wish to consider further ways to increase the diversity of students, for example the production of a MOOC to widen recruitment. Chemistry applicants from low participation areas, who successfully completed the Exploring Everyday Chemistry MOOC, were given an offer one grade lower than the standard offer.
- Report para. 9.2: The Committee suggested that the action related to workload planning needed to more clearly articulate that it was referring to embedding planning time into professional services staff workloads, rather than academic staff.
- Report para. 9.3, 9.4: Members noted that the extra-curricular activities were highly praised by students (and commended in the report) and observed that, in the context of the planned appointment of a new Director this year, a stronger response to ensure continuity of these activities should be identified.

**Action: Natural Sciences**

The Committee **approved** the report and, subject to consideration of the comments made by UTC, agreed that appropriate actions in response to the Panel's recommendations had been identified.

#### **M19-20/105 New programme proposal: MA Management in the Creative and Cultural Industries**

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the School of Arts for a new MA Management in the Creative and Cultural Industries (UTC.19-20/89). The proposal was for a full-time route (one year) on-campus proposal to be introduced in September 2021. The possible exit award was a PG Diploma in Management in the Creative and Cultural Industries. The Committee noted that it was a requirement of the University's Postgraduate Taught Programme Design Framework for all masters programmes to have a coherent 60 credit Postgraduate Certificate (with defined learning outcomes) stepping-off point; a condition of approval would therefore be to incorporate a Postgraduate Certificate exit award. The proposal had planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Arts and Humanities (May 2019).

Two external assessors had considered the proposals; both had recommended that the proposals should proceed, subject to the consideration of a number of recommendations. The Committee noted that the Department's response to Prof. Moore and Dr Selfe (UTC.19-20/89ii-iii refers) had satisfactorily addressed the recommendations raised (and both externals had confirmed this was the case). The proposal had been reviewed in advance by Matthew Perry and Sam Cobb and had the reviewers' support. The reviewers praised, in particular, the variety of opportunities that the programme created through the themed pathways, the work-based assessments and the final project module (which involved the production of a portfolio).

The proposal involved seven participating departments: Theatre, Film, Television and Interactive Media (TFTI) (lead department); Music; English and Related Literature; History of Art; Electronic Engineering; the York Law School (TYLS) and the York Management School (TYMS). The programme comprised four new core modules (totalling 120 credits) and a large variety of optional modules delivered by the participating departments (totalling 60 credits). It was reported that delivery of the new core modules would be via a new joint TFTI/Music post. It was anticipated that these core modules would also involve teaching from TYLS and TYMS. Whilst TYMS Board of Studies approval was still awaited, delivery of the modules was not contingent on this approval.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- The reviewers suggested that the proposal may be trying to accomplish too much across a wide variety of specialist areas, notably in relation to the delivery of numerous optional pathway choices. It was further noted that some modules required pre-requisite knowledge, e.g. Electrical Engineering. In the light of the number of optional modules (and the pre-requisites in some cases) the reviewers noted that guidance to students would need to be extensive and timely.
- The reviewers raised a concern regarding the availability of the optional modules to be delivered by Electronic Engineering, and questioned whether the Audio Lab route was genuinely an option given that, whilst Board of Studies approval had been granted, a number of restrictions were in place (number caps and priority given to Electronic Engineering students). The reviewers had suggested that this may cause a potential Competition and Markets Authority compliance issue. The University Marketing team had advised that the published information about a programme must accurately represent the 'likely' programme. Whilst these modules were options, it was noted that given the specialist nature of the modules (and titles), it

may well be the case that these options would be considered to be 'materially significant' in terms of an applicant choosing to study the programme. If it was the case that the specialist modules were unlikely to be available they should not be advertised.

- A further concern was raised in respect of ensuring a seamless student experience, whilst coordinating the timetabling of varied optional pathways, assessment calendars and student support, involving seven participating departments. The reviewers had been reassured that Timetabling had been consulted and the course combinations were viable in terms of timetable availability. Student support would be overseen by the lead Department (TFTI).
- The reviewers suggested that the initial recruitment target of eight students was not very ambitious and questioned whether there would be enough critical mass to ensure a good student experience. It was reported that the collaborative project aimed to promote cohesive working.
- The reviewers had expressed a concern regarding the consistency of the production and assessment of the final project module. It was noted that TFTI had vast experience in this area, and had an agreed set of common assessment standards.
- The reviewers noted that the primary target market were international students who may require additional study skills support. The reviewers had recommended that the programme team utilise the programme of study skills within the existing TFTI undergraduate Business of the Creative Industries programme.
- The GSA representative raised a concern regarding the absence of a part-time route, and suggested that it was very important to include a part-time route especially in respect of widening participation and access. It was reported that, due to the complexities (arising from the participation of seven departments), the programme team planned to develop a part-time route once the full-time route had been delivered (to at least one cohort of students). In terms of exploring possible structures for the part-time route, members suggested seeking advice from the MA Social Research programme team.
- The reviewers raised a concern about a phrase in the Statement of Purpose: '*The taught programme culminates in a collaborative project designing and delivering a public event or performance...*' might be taken to mean that students actually put on an event (which was not the case). The reviewers advised that the Statement of Purpose should be amended to express, with greater clarity, the theoretical nature of the collaborative project.

The Committee **agreed** to approve the programme subject to the following 2 conditions and 3 recommendations:

Conditions, that:

1. clarification be sort from the Department of Electronic Engineering of the likely availability of the Department's optional modules. If deemed unlikely that they would be available it was agreed that the Audio Lab route be removed as an optional pathway;
2. a Postgraduate Certificate be incorporated as an exit award;

Recommendations, that:

1. study skills support for students is further developed within the programme, drawing on experience from the TFTI undergraduate Business of the Creative Industries programme;
2. the Statement of Purpose be revised to articulate with greater clarity the nature of the collaborative project;

3. a part-time route be developed (to commence in 2023/24), during the second year of delivery of the full-time programme.

The Committee **agreed** that the revised proposal should be reviewed by the UTC reviewers and be subject to final sign-off by the Chair of UTC.

## CATEGORY II BUSINESS

### M19-20/106 Programme Suspension

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the suspension of the MSc Marine Environmental Management for one year (2020/21).

### M19-20/107 Conjoint NMC / UTC approval event

The Committee **noted** that a conjoint Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) University approval event to consider the new Independent & Supplementary Prescribing for Non-Medical Prescribers (Nurses, Midwives & Allied Health Professionals) programme was scheduled for 19 March 2020. It was **noted** that the Panel, appointed by the NMC and the Chair of University Teaching Committee, had delegated authority in respect of a recommendation to approve. The UTC members of the Panel would be Steve King (Chair) and Lisa O'Malley. Sally O'Connor would be the Academic Quality representative.

### M19-20/108 Characteristics Statements

The Committee **received** updated Characteristics Statements for Foundation Degree, Master's degree and Qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body (UTC.19-20/90).

### M19-20/109 Exchanges

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved an extension of the exchange agreement between the University of York and the University of Maastricht to include the York Law School and Maastricht University's Faculty of Law.

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved a University-wide student exchange agreement between the Centre for Global Programmes and the Macquarie University, Australia.

### M19-20/110 Periodic Reviews

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the following as external assessors for the Periodic Review of Academic Practice's suite of programmes:

- Dr Tim Herrick, University of Sheffield
- Dr Jane Pritchard, Oxford Brookes University

### M19-20/111 Sub-Committees / Groups

*Standing Committee on Assessment*

The Committee **received** a report on the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment held on 28 February 2020 (UTC.19-20/91).

*Access and Participation Steering Group*

The Committee **received** the minutes of the meeting of the Access and Participation Steering Group held on 21 January 2020 (UTC.19-20/92).

*Online and Distance Learning Special Interest Group*

The Committee **noted** that the meeting of the Online and Distance Learning Special Interest Group, held on 12 February 2020, had been a 'show and tell' event.

**M19-20/112 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups**

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

- Arts and Humanities meeting held on 11 February 2020 (UTC.19-20/93a)
- Social Sciences meeting held on 23 January 2020 (UTC.19-20/93b)
- Sciences meeting held on 12 February 2020 (UTC.19-20/93d)

The Committee would receive the report of the Social Sciences meeting, held on 18 February 2020, at its May meeting.

**M19-20/113 Dates of 2019/20 meetings**

The Committee **noted** the dates of future 2019/20 meetings:

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