

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 May 2019

**Present:** John Robinson (Chair)  
Michael Bate  
Mike Bentley  
Ed Braman  
Wayne Campbell  
Charlotte Chamberlain  
Sabine Clarke  
Nigel Dandy  
Joe Fagan  
Brian Fulton (designated alternate for the Associate Dean: Sciences) (to M18-19/131)  
Jen Gibbons  
James Hare  
Claire Hughes  
Barry Lee  
Sinéad McCotter  
Lisa O'Malley (to M18-19/132)  
Gulcin Ozkan  
Matthew Perry  
Dave Smith (to M18-19/135)  
Richard Waites  
Jez Wells (to M18-19/125)

**In Attendance:** Jane Iddon (ASO, Secretary), Jenny Brotherton (ASO, Minute Secretary), Jill Webb (observing the meeting).

Apologies were received from: Tracy Lightfoot, Steve King, Gill Chitty and Stuart Bell.

**CATEGORY I BUSINESS**

**M18-19/121 Welcome**

The Chair noted that this would be Gulcin's last meeting, as she was leaving the University to take up a post at King's College London. The Chair thanked her for her valuable contribution to the Committee. The Chair noted that this would be Jenny Brotherton's last meeting before her upcoming maternity leave and the Chair welcomed Jill Webb, who was attending the meeting and would be taking on the role of Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students for the Social Sciences in September.

**M18-19/122 Minutes and Matters Arising**

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2019 (UTC.18-19/87).

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC. 18-19/87 **Appendix 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.

- Careers and Placements were working to amend the proposal for a University wide 'Year in Enterprise' in line with the conditions for approval set by UTC.
- Timetabling had been asked to model the impact of staff availability on its key performance indicators.
- The Head of the Department of Economics and Related Studies had met with the Chair of the Periodic Review Panel and the Chair of UTC and it had been agreed that the recommendation at 4.11 would be revised.
- FLTGs had discussed the promotion of electives. A reflective paper on cross faculty teaching would be considered by UTC at a future meeting.

### **M18-19/123 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 response rate as at 13 May was 34%.
- The National Student Survey had closed on 29 April. The University had achieved a final response rate of 69.51% (above its 2018 response rate of 66.34% and the national average of 66.3%). All high-level subject areas had met the reporting threshold. The Chair thanked Departments, the Students' Union, the Academic Support Office and Marketing for the work involved in promoting the survey.
- The Academic Registrar and the Chair had recommended that the University should extend its license with Blackboard for a further three years and then undertake an open tender process with respect to the VLE (paper UTC.18-19/**101** *refers*).
- Members had access to the subject level TEF submissions which included examples of innovative practice (paper UTC 18-19/**102** *refers*).
- The Annual Learning and Teaching Conference 'Creating Valuable Learning Partnerships in the Contemporary University' would take place on Friday 21 June.
- The YUSU Excellence Awards and Showcase, a celebration of student voice practices, would take place on Tuesday 4 June.
- The Chair congratulated recipients of the Vice Chancellor's Teaching Awards:

Dr David Orton, Department of Archaeology

Dr Helen Goodchild, Department of Archaeology

Dr Pen Holland, Department of Biology

Dr Jeremy Airey, Department of Education

Dr Trev Broughton, Department of English and Related Literature

Dr Allison Green; Hull York Medical School

Dr Steven Oliver; Hull York Medical School

Dott. Mag Cinzia Bacilieri, Department of Language and Linguistic Science

Marina Noelia Cantarutti, Department of Language and Linguistic Science Lecturer,

Dr Stephen Connor, Department of Mathematics

Dr Daniel March, Department of Music

Dr Dan Keith, Department of Politics

Dr Sally Quinn, Department of Psychology

Dr Jed Meers, The York Law School

Dr Emma Waring, The York Law School

### **M18-19/124 Update from the Student Representatives**

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

- A paper from the GSA (UTC.18-19/**91**) would be considered later in the meeting which described its recent work on academic representation.

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

- Members were encouraged to attend the YUSU Excellence Awards on 4 June.
- YUSU was working to find study space for students during the exam period. Members were encouraged to direct students to areas which could be used.

#### **M18-19/125 Analysis of Degree Entry and Attainment Profiles**

*Jeremy Bennett and Karen Payne (Business Intelligence Unit), attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report on degree outcomes and attainment differences between groups of students (UTC 18-19/98). The report followed on from the linear regression analysis of graduate data undertaken in 2015 and a 2017 analysis of data from five entry cohorts using a logistic regression method. Like the 2017 analysis, data from five entry cohorts had been used (2011-2015). The logistic regression compared withdrawals (including fails and students with lower exit awards) to students who had completed. The linear regression analysis used award mark as the dependent variable.

The analysis indicated that the following variables increased the likelihood of a withdrawal:

- Having taken a leave of absence (this was the most significant correlate of a withdrawal)
- Having repeated year (this had not appeared significant in 2017 due to an error in the definition. Having corrected this, it was now highly significant. The variable reflected students who had been granted the opportunity to repeat a year by Special Cases Committee. It was noted that students repeating a year through the new Repeat Study Policy should be tracked separately)
- Being a mature student
- Being from a low participation neighborhood
- Being from socio-economic classification 4-7
- Having entered via clearing
- Being a male student (this was less significant on the more recent one year analysis models suggesting an improving trend)
- Being a BME student (the 5 year model showed no significant difference between BME and non BME, however the 2015 one year model showed a significant increase in the likelihood of BME students withdrawing).

The data indicated that having a disability and entry tariff had no significant impact on the likelihood of a withdrawal and the following variables reduced the likelihood:

- Being an overseas and EU student
- Having a GCSE A/A\* in mathematics or English language
- Having a school type of 'other'
- Having received a bursary (the impact of this had been inconsistent but students in the 2015 cohort who received a bursary were significantly more likely to complete).

The report had been received by SCA and the Committee had welcomed the analysis. The Committee had noted that the data should be used carefully, particularly as not all students from the 2015 cohort had completed and their outcomes would alter the data. The Committee had considered the outcomes of BME students and noted that the impact of this characteristic on award mark was significant and consistent with national trends. The Committee suggested that further analysis of the BME data would be helpful.

UTC discussed the report. Members were concerned by the percentages of withdrawn/withdrawn with award/failed students (shown in Table 3 in Appendix B),

particularly in maths based subjects (Computer Science, Engineering, Mathematics and Physics). Members noted that the figures seemed out of line with the high continuation rates the University had recorded in its TEF submission. The data did not include those who had transferred to other programmes at the University but did include those who had left with an early exit award. It was suggested that the impact of students exiting to undergraduate degrees from integrated master's programmes could be significant in certain Departments. It was also noted that data spanned entry cohorts from 2011 to 2015 and that Departments may have made recent improvements to completion rates (as was the case in Mathematics). The Committee agreed that further work was required to establish the composition of the withdrawn student cohort and to understand why the figures appeared to be out of line with the TEF completion rates. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to receive an update on this at the earliest opportunity.

**Action: BIU**

Members highlighted a number of other areas where further analysis would be useful.

- To establish the impact of certain GCSE and A level subjects and grades on outcomes in particular subjects
- Further investigation into the impact of tariff
- To compare the outcomes of widening participation (WP) students who had been involved in engagement programmes prior to arrival with other WP students, in order to assess the impact of the engagement activity
- To consider impact of different categories of disability
- To review the difference in outcomes between different groups of BME students.

The Committee noted that the University's Access and Participation Plan supported further analysis to better understand certain outcome gaps and that priorities would be influenced by work on this.

The Committee **agreed** that it should receive analysis on degree outcomes annually with a mid-year update on the data analysis that was being undertaken.

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

## **M18-19/126 Degree Outcomes**

*Jeremy Bennett and Karen Payne (Business Intelligence Unit), attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report on undergraduate and postgraduate taught degree outcomes for 2017/18 (UTC.18-19/89). The overall percentage of good undergraduate degrees had decreased by 0.1 percentage points to 80.5%. Across the Russell Group there had been an average increase of 1.1pp to 86%. There was significant variation in the percentage of good degrees awarded between different departments. This ranged from 60.9% to 96.3%. At faculty level more good degrees were awarded in Arts and Humanities.

The percentage of PGT students achieving their intended award had also decreased by 4.4pp (across the Russell Group there was a smaller decrease of 0.3pp). At Department level the largest decrease was in TYMS where the percentage of students leaving with their intended award had dropped by 21 percentage points.

The paper had been considered by SCA. SCA had noted the national pressure on universities to tackle grade inflation and was satisfied the data demonstrated that standards were being maintained. The Committee had suggested that it would be helpful to split 'good degrees'

into 1sts and 2.1s to indicate any disparity in the number of 1sts and starred 1sts being awarded.

SCA had been concerned by the decrease in the number of PGT students achieving their award. It noted that the issue was primarily in the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Committee had queried whether analysis was being undertaken of the impact of different entry routes (for example students coming from the IPC or Kaplan International College). The Chair noted that the Dean of TYMS had undertaken an analysis of PGT degree outcomes by entry route. This had been discussed at the School's recent periodic review and it was thought that language proficiency was a key factor in determining outcomes. There was an action on the University from the Periodic Review to better understand the impact of language requirements. This was currently being investigated by Planning and SRA.

UTC considered the report. The Committee noted that undergraduate degree outcomes impacted on university league tables and therefore the move further away from the Russell Group average was a cause for concern. Lower outcomes for York students would also put them at a disadvantage in the graduate recruitment market. Members were aware of action being taken at other Universities at module level to ensure positive outcomes. The Chair noted that the University was broadly in conformance with the Government's expectations on grade inflation.

Members noted that Departments which had been asked to recruit more students in order to meet University student number targets appeared to have seen a sharper decrease in the percentage of good degrees. The context of the student intake needed to be understood.

The Committee suggested that stepped marking was one way of encouraging markers to use the full mark scale and that this could have a positive impact on classifications. Other methods to improve outcomes were discussed, including adjusting the weightings between stages 2 and 3. It was noted that in some cases external examiners already thought that marks given at classification borderlines were overly generous.

The Chair of SCA suggested that the provision of cohort-level reports on degree-class distributions to module boards should be a priority. In addition, members suggested that it might be helpful to share the report with external examiners, making them aware of York's position in relation to other institutions. The Chair of SCA agreed to review what was provided to exam boards and to consider whether it would be useful to share a version of the report with external examiners.

**Action: Chair SCA**

The Committee **agreed** that departments should be asked to reflect on the report. In terms of additional analysis, it suggested that in next year's report it might be helpful to show the outcomes of students on combined programmes and the outcomes of distance learners.

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

#### **M18-19/127 Institutional reporting processes**

*David Gent, Faculty Learning Enhancement Project Manager, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a paper on scoping work undertaken for the review of institutional reporting processes (the review of reviews), including for approval a revised Annual Programme Review report template and guidance for 2018/19 (UTC.18-19/90).

The scoping work had revealed overlap between processes and opportunities for consolidation. It was hoped that a holistic review exercise could be introduced that would remove overlap between those reporting processes coordinated by the Academic Support Office (such as APR and NSS) and processes managed by the Library and Careers and Placements.

The paper proposed changes to the APR and NSS reporting processes for 2019 which aimed to remove unnecessary overlap and to embed reflection on subject level TEF. Instead of a NSS action plan and the identification of separate priorities in APR, the new pro forma would require Departments to complete one 'learning and teaching action plan' which could also support reflection and action planning in response to Subject TEF. The pro forma would be a Google Doc meaning that different sections of the document could be completed at different times. The Committee noted that it would be important for Departments to think carefully about edit rights to the google documents to ensure version control.

Other revisions included:

- the removal of questions in relation to the embedding of programme leadership and progress on enhancement plans
- updates to the employability question to reflect the fact that there would be no new DLHE or LEO results
- the removal of the section for reflection on individual programmes based on the pro formas completed by Programme Leaders. Reflection at programme level had been, instead, embedded into the questions on challenges and successes
- the question on student representation had been expanded to cover broader aspects of student voice activity.

The Committee **approved** the proposed changes to the APR and NSS reporting processes for 2019 subject to consideration of the following suggestions:

- the text in section 6 should make it more explicit that the action plan would relate to both undergraduate and postgraduate issues
- that the form should encourage Departments to provide evidence of the impact of good/innovative practice linked to the Subject TEF criteria

The Chair thanked David for presenting the paper.

#### **M18-19/128 GSA's Academic Representation Strategy**

*Dr Chris Bovis, Graduate Students' Association Representation and Democracy Coordinator, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a paper from the Graduate Students' Association (GSA) on its Academic Representation strategy (UTC.18-19/91). The paper provided members with an overview of the work undertaken by the GSA, as a result of the creation of the Vice-President Academic sabbatical position and the Representation and Democracy Coordinator post, to enhance academic representation for postgraduate students. Members positively endorsed the initiatives taken during the course of the year to develop the provision for academic representation which included: a monthly mailing to postgraduate representatives; the introduction of a 'Course Rep Drop-in' (every other Wednesday); and the creation of a Postgraduate Academic Representation Handbook.

The GSA Representation and Democracy Coordinator explained the initiatives, planned for 2019/20, to further enhance the provision, including:

- in conjunction with YUSU, the development of bespoke training to International Pathway College student representatives;

- in conjunction with YUSU, a new system for the training and engagement of postgraduate representatives (for implementation for the incoming cohort);
- plans to conduct a study of the efficacy of the current model of postgraduate research representation which will inform revisions, as appropriate, to that model.

The GSA Representation and Democracy Coordinator confirmed the GSA's plans to develop a specific handbook for distance-learning student representatives.

The Committee congratulated the GSA on the work undertaken during the last 12 months to improve postgraduate student representation, specifically the efforts to capture the distance-learning student population.

The Chair thanked Chris for presenting the paper.

#### **M18-19/129 Programme Module Catalogue (PMC)**

*Tim Andrew, PMC Project Manager, attended for this item.*

The Committee **received** a verbal update and demonstration from the PMC Project Manager. The project team had been working on functionality that would enable programmes to be edited, including adding new modules by pulling information from the module catalogue. It was reported that placeholder modules would be available for new modules that were not yet in the catalogue. The project team was beginning to look at raising proposals to change programmes and would be seeking feedback from Departments on the presentation of the new functionality.

The project team's other main area of work had been developing software to ingest existing Programme Design Documents (PDD) into the PMC. With exception of the Centre for Lifelong Learning and the International Pathway College, one programme from each Department had been ingested.

The PMC Project Manager confirmed that the google sheet PDD template should still be used for any new programme proposals.

A member raised a question about the presentation of modules delivered within the carousel model. The Project Manager confirmed that the project team was aware of the need for the PMC to accommodate distance-learning programmes and would discuss this further outside of the meeting.

The Chair thanked Tim for providing the update.

#### **M18-19/130 Postgraduate External Examiners' Reports**

The Committee **received** a summary report of the postgraduate external examiners' reports for 2017/18 (UTC.18-19/92). Subsequent to the circulation of papers, TYMS had responded to the issues raised by its external examiners. There were still four outstanding reports and reminders had been sent. All Examiners had confirmed that standards set were appropriate for the level of the qualification, that standards of student performance were comparable with similar programmes in other institutions and that processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards were sound and fairly conducted.

The reports had identified a significant amount of good practice, particularly with respect to assessment and feedback. Other common themes included concerns around the transparency of moderation processes, suggestions to improve consistency of feedback, and

concerns about the lack of contextual data at Module Boards (a matter that was being considered by SCA) (M18-19/126 *refers*). Fewer concerns had been raised about students for whom English was an additional language than had been the case in recent years, although this was still raised by Examiners in TYMS and Education.

The summary report had been considered by the SCA. The Chair of SCA had raised the concern about the transparency of moderation processes at the Chairs of Boards of Examiners (CBoE) forum. CBoE felt that there was no need for further central guidance on moderation processes and that it was appropriate for decisions about marking processes to be devolved to departments. SCA had agreed that the primary issue around transparency appeared to be the communication of marking procedures to students, and it would focus on addressing this.

In addition the SCA would add to the guidance on procedures for dealing with large discrepancies between first and second markers' grades. Departments were required to have a policy on this. It was noted that TYMS had responded to a specific concern about large discrepancy between the marks awarded by a first and second marker. The School had reported that the normal process would be to seek the view of a third marker.

In light of some CBoE reporting that there was a lack of clarity about what is expected of External Examiners, SCA had agreed to prepare a briefing for CBoE on their role in supporting External Examiners.

The Committee noted that the report had been shared with FLTGs (May meetings) and this was the appropriate route for the dissemination of good practice.

#### **M18-19/131 Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessment**

The Committee **considered** a report on the review of the implementation of the Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessment (ECA) Policy (UTC.18-19/93).

The SCA was proposing minor changes to the Policy, as consultation with stakeholders had indicated that the Policy was working well. Feedback had suggested that additional guidance would be helpful and the SCA had developed additional guidance for departments and students, including template emails.

The Committee considered the amended Policy and guidance and suggested that the footnote on page 1 should clarify how the Policy applied to ISM modules on PGT programmes.

The Committee discussed the principle that the ECA Policy did not take into consideration circumstances affecting attendance or other work, except where the assessment was closely linked to attendance. It was noted that it was for ECA Committees to determine what constituted a 'close link' but that the purpose of the policy was not to correct for missed teaching. Exceptional circumstances which impacted on a student's ability to attend teaching should be raised with Special Cases Committee at the time. It was suggested that the guidance should reference the separate procedure for circumstances that did not directly impact on an assessment. Members noted the importance of advising students to register with a doctor at the earliest opportunity to ensure that medical evidence could easily be provided.

The Committee also noted that the guidance for students referred to Unity Health and that it should reflect the fact that some students would be registered with other GP practices.

The Committee agreed to **recommend to Senate** approval of the revisions to the ECA Policy, with an update to the footnote on page 1 to provide clarification on ISM modules.

#### **M18-19/132 Academic Misconduct Policy**

*Stephen Gow, Academic Integrity Coordinator, attended for this item.*

The Committee considered a report on the review of the Academic Misconduct Policy and suggested policy changes (UTC.18-19/94). The Chair of SCA thanked members of the Working Group which had led the review.

Members reviewed the data on cases of academic misconduct. Overseas students accounted for 32% of all UG cases of academic misconduct and 89% of PGT cases. There was significant variation in the number of cases between departments and more offences were committed by PGT students than by undergraduates. SCA would be discussing, with the Chairs of Boards of Examiners, the very low rates reported in some departments (since this could be an indication of underreporting).

In relation to the higher number of cases amongst overseas students, the Committee observed that plagiarism might be easier to detect when a student was not writing in fluent English. It was felt that marker bias was unlikely to be a factor as work was generally marked anonymously.

It was noted that International Pathway College (IPC) modules had been made probationary and therefore cases of academic misconduct in the IPC were not included in the report. It was reported that the IPC had introduced a number of measures to reduce incidences of academic misconduct including by modifying its assessment strategies (see UTC.18-19/95).

The Committee considered proposed revisions to the Policy, made in response to the review and in response to guidance from the OIA. The following points were highlighted:

- Prescriptive guidance had been provided by the OIA in relation to academic judgement; academic judgement applied to the identification of the offence but only in certain cases to the determination of a penalty. The Committee noted the proposal to update the Policy in order to reflect this.
- The Policy would be updated to reflect the fact that mitigating circumstances should, in some limited circumstances, be taken into account when considering penalties. This update had already been implemented following a recent OIA judgement against the University where a student's circumstances had not been considered (paper UTC. 18-19/98 refers).
- It was proposed that academic misconduct in low credit assessment should initially be dealt with by the departmental StAMP member in coordination with the module leader and a procedure for considering academic misconduct in low-stakes assessment was set out.

The Committee was supportive of the proposed revisions. It noted that in section 4 SCA proposed to undertake a review of a number of key areas over the next five years. The Committee questioned if the time period for this work could be shortened. The Chair of SCA confirmed that he expected all of the identified areas to have been reviewed by the end of 2019/20.

The Committee **agreed to recommend** the proposed policy changes to Senate for approval.

The Chair thanked Stephen for attending UTC and for answering members' questions, alongside the Chair of SCA.

### **M18-19/133 Three Year Review: International Pathway College provision**

The Committee **considered** a report and action plan arising from the three-year review of the International Pathway College's provision (UTC.18-19/95). Michael Bate had chaired the review and he thanked the other Panel members, Jen Gibbons, Charlotte Chamberlain and Jane Iddon, for their work.

The Panel had met with a number of current and former students who were all positive about their experience at the IPC. The Chair of the Panel highlighted a number of strengths including measures taken to reduce incidences of academic misconduct, responsiveness to student feedback, and the pastoral support provided to students.

The Panel had made recommendations relating to strengthening connections with Departments, the co-opt membership of the Board of Studies, and the further dissemination of the feed-forward module form. The Panel was satisfied that the IPC had identified appropriate (and timely) actions in response to the recommendations.

The Panel had also made two University-level recommendations. It recommended that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning and Students (PVC [TLS]) review the position of the IPC in the learning and teaching faculty governance structure. The PVC (TLS) reported that, as a first step to taking this forward, he would raise this for discussion at a future meeting with the Associate Deans.

#### **Action: PVC (TLS)**

It was reported that the Director of Student Life and Wellbeing was taking forward the recommendation relating to the effectiveness of the process for informing the IPC Student Support Team about student welfare concerns.

The Panel had noted that work was ongoing to better integrate the IPC with University processes, to enable the student records system to more effectively support IPC assessment and reassessment records, and to develop an Attendance Monitoring system. The Panel emphasised the importance of these areas of work for the IPC.

### **M18-19/134 Periodic Review: Archaeology**

The Committee considered a report, external assessors' report and action plan arising from the periodic review of Archaeology (UTC.18-19/96). Ed Braman had chaired the review and he thanked the other Panel members, Joe Fagan, James Hare and Andrea Boam, for their work.

The Chair of the Panel highlighted a number of positives and noted that the Department had been successful in exploring opportunities for growth while maintaining its excellent reputation. The Panel was satisfied that the Department was working effectively and its recommendations focussed on enhancing the Department's, already excellent, provision. It had recommended that the Department would benefit from further engagement with the University's faculty structure and also made recommendations with respect to the management of its split site (between King's Manor and Campus West).

The Committee noted that there had been a drop in the Department's most recent NSS scores. The Panel had considered the NSS results and resolved that there had been no change to Departmental practice to cause the dip. The Chair of the Panel noted that student satisfaction remained at a high level.

The Committee noted that the Panel had made four University-level actions. The recommendations with respect to: timetabling (para. 3.4); the Huntington Room, King's Manor (para. 3.9); and the communication link between King's Manor and Campus West (para. 3.12) would be referred, for consideration, to the Director of Estates and Campus Services. In respect of the recommendation at 4.14, which was concerned with the clarity of

the relationship between research and scholarship, it was reported that a paper relating to this had been considered by University Executive Board in January. The PVC (TLS) agreed to take forward this recommendation with the PVC for Research.

**Action: PVC (TLS)**

The Committee considered the action plan. It felt that a more positive response to recommendation 7.14 should be identified; it was unclear why it would be problematic to provide students with accurate and precise (dates and times) assessment deadlines in all published information (including the VLE).

**Action: Archaeology**

The Committee approved the report and, with the exception of the action in response to 7.14, agreed that appropriate actions in response to the Panel's recommendations had been identified.

### **M18-19/135 Education: MA in Educational Practice**

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the Department of Education for a two year part-time Masters programme to start in September 2020, aimed at practising teachers or those working in a similar educational context. The programme would be delivered by blended learning, via the VLE and with 3 x 5 hour Saturday sessions per module. A one year part-time Postgraduate Diploma in Educational Practice would also be available, as both a separate entry route and an exit award from the MA. The programme had received planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Social Sciences.

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Gulcin Ozkan and Tracy Lightfoot and had their support subject to the following:

- the development of a clear strategy for supporting students who were unable to attend individual Saturday sessions, for example, through interactive VLE activity;
- that the Independent Professional Study module descriptor make clear that both empirical and non-empirical methodologies are welcome (and that the related skills are taught in sufficient depth) (the external assessor report from Prof. Fulford, UTC.18-19/97i refers);
- the establishment of a process to verify whether an applicant was working in a school/educational setting.

The reviewers noted that the programme required exceptions to the Policy on Credit Transfer and Recognition of Prior Learning. Students would enter the programme by the transfer of 60 credits or the recognition of prior learning to the value of 60 credits which may have been obtained more than five years ago (outside of the University's normal period of currency for credit/ prior learning), and all applicants would be treated as non-York graduates with marks from previous credit (whether awarded by York or another institution) not used to calculate the final award.

Exceptions to the rules on compensation (P2.5.1) and reassessment (P2.6.8) were also required. The proposed exception to P2.5.1 would have the effect shown in track changes below:

If a student fails one or more non-Independent Study Modules (ISM) (i.e., achieves a mark below 50) s/he may still receive credit for the failed module(s) provided that:

- (i) s/he has failed ~~no more than 40~~ no more than 20 credits, and
- (ii) no marks are lower than 40, and

(iii) the rounded credit-weighted mean over all non-ISM modules (including the failed module(s)) is at least 50. (This will be calculated based on first attempt marks in the first instance, but will be calculated based on the lesser of the resit mark and the pass mark should the student be successful at resit.)

And the following exception to P2.6.8 was proposed (shown in track changes):

Where a student has failed modules and the award requirements cannot be met by application of the compensation criteria, s/he is entitled to reassessment in a maximum of 40 credits-worth of failed modules provided that they have ~~failed no more than 60 credits with~~ no more than 40 credits-worth of outright fail (i.e. module marks less than 40).

The Committee noted that there was an error in the articulation of the proposed exceptions to compensation and reassessment rules on the Programme Design Document and that the text should be corrected to reflect the above.

The proposals had also been considered by two external assessors who both recommended that the proposal should proceed. The Committee noted that one of the externals, Prof. Fulford, had suggested that significant changes would be required if recruitment was not restricted to PGCE graduates (UTC.18-19/97i). The Department's response did not confirm whether applicants who had entered teaching from other routes would be considered (UTC.18-19/97ii). Whilst the Committee was content to approve the exemption to the University's Credit Transfer Policy for students who had a PGCE, it did not feel that it could universally approve the exemption for applicants from all routes into teaching. In the light of the relationship between the credit transfer exemption and the proposed exceptions to the compensation and reassessment rules, the Committee agreed that the suite of proposed exemptions be restricted to applicants with a PGCE with 60 credits on entry.

The Committee **agreed to approve** the programme and associated exemptions subject to the following conditions:

- the Department addressing the three points raised by the UTC reviewers;
- confirmation that recruitment was restricted to applicants who had a PGCE qualification.

**Action: Education**

If the Department planned to accept applicants who had entered teaching from alternative routes, the Committee advised that the Department should consider the suggestions, including provision of a bridging module, made by Professor Fulford.

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**

### **M18-19/136 New programmes, modifications and withdrawals**

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

1. BA in Social Policy, Children and Young People (for new students) from October 2020. Approval was granted on condition that existing students and those commencing in 2019 have their core option modules retained and sufficient third year options with a child/youth slant (with a minimum of two doable options that would fall into the child/youth category, broadly defined).

2. MA in Science Education (with PG Dip in Science Education), suspended from October 2013.

**M18-19/137 Policy on Academic Misconduct**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had recommended to Senate amendments to the University Policy on Academic Misconduct and that Senate approved the revised Policy. The amendments (in force from March 2019) arose from a request from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Students in Higher Education (issued in March 2019) (UTC.18-19/98).

**M18-19/138 Policy Statement on Study Abroad**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved minor amendments to the Policy Statement on Study Abroad. The amendments clarified that new PGR exchange agreements require approval from the Chair of York Graduate Research School's Policy and Programmes Sub-Committee (PPSC) (UTC.18-19/99).

**M18-19/139 Senior Technicians Accredited Co-Leaders in Science programme**

The Committee **received** an update from STEM Learning with respect to the teach-out of the final cohort of students on the Senior Technicians Accredited Co-Leaders in Science programme (UTC.18-19/100).

**M18-19/140 Blackboard and the VLE**

The Committee **endorsed** a recommendation from the Academic Registrar and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning and Students that the University extend its licence with Blackboard for a further three years and then undertake an open tender process with respect to the VLE (UTC.18-19/101).

**M18-19/141 Subject TEF**

The Committee **received** an evaluation report on the pilot of Subject TEF (UTC.18-19/102) and noted:

- that the UTC Steering Group had approved the recommendations therein;
- the good practice captured within the Subject Level TEF submissions.

**M18-19/142 Policy on Assessment Feedback Turnaround Time**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved the following exemptions to the policy on assessment feedback turnaround time:

- a) in the Department of Archaeology with respect to the postgraduate taught dissertation (all MA/MSc provision) to allow time for external examiner review and to align with the Board of Examiners meeting at the end of October (feedback would be received the day after the Board of Examiners meeting);
- b) in the Department of Music with respect to two modules Musicians' Health and Wellness (MUS00145I, MUS00126H) (feedback would be received within six weeks of submission of the assessments).

**M18-19/143 Standing Committee on Assessment**

The Committee **received** reports on the meetings of the Standing Committee on Assessment held on 8 March (UTC.18-19/103a) and 3 May 2019 (UTC.18-19/103b).

**M18-19/144 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups**

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

- Arts and Humanities meetings held on 13 February (UTC.18-19/**104a**) and 17 April 2019 (UTC.18-19/**104b**);
- Social Sciences meetings held on 25 February (UTC.18-19/**104c**) and 15 April 2019 (UTC.18-19/**104d**);
- Sciences meeting held on 18 April 2019 (UTC.18-19/**104e**).

**M18-19/145 Exchange Agreements**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved an exchange agreement between the Centre for Women's Studies and University of Oviedo, Oviedo in Spain.

**M18-19/146 Dates of 2018/19 meetings**

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

- Thursday 20 June 2019, 9.30-13.30
- *Extraordinary meeting if required*– Thursday 18 July 2019, 9.30-13.30