

**UNIVERSITY OF YORK**

**Senate**

**TEACHING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2019**

**Present:** John Robinson (Chair)  
Michael Bate  
Mike Bentley  
Ed Braman  
Wayne Campbell (for M18-19/162)  
Charlotte Chamberlain  
Gill Chitty  
Sabine Clarke  
Nigel Dandy  
Joe Fagan (M18-19/147 to 158; M18-19/163 & 164)  
Jen Gibbons  
James Hare  
Claire Hughes  
Steve King  
Barry Lee  
Tracy Lightfoot  
Sinéad McCotter  
Lisa O'Malley (M18-19/147 to 158; M18-19/163 & 164)  
Matthew Perry  
Richard Waites (M18-19/147 to 156; M18-19/163 & 164)

**In Attendance:** Jane Iddon (ASO, Secretary) and Adrian Lee (ASO).

Apologies were received from: Stuart Bell, Gulcin Ozkan, Dave Smith and Jez Wells.

**CATEGORY I BUSINESS**

**M18-19/147 Welcome**

The Chair welcomed Adrian Lee (Academic Support Office) who, alongside the Secretary, was supporting the meeting.

Those members for whom this meeting was their last, were warmly thanked for their valuable and considerable contributions to the work of UTC:

- Stuart Bell [as Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Stuart would be the designated alternate for the Associate Dean – Jill Webb – from 2019/20]
- Ed Braman
- Charlotte Chamberlain
- Joe Fagan
- James Hare
- Barry Lee
- Dave Smith

- Richard Waites

It was reported that Ed, Barry and Dave would be nominated by the Chair to serve a second term on UTC; nominations were subject to Senate approval (July meeting) and where more than one nomination is received for a single vacancy a ballot is held.

#### **M18-19/148 Minutes and Matters Arising**

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 16 May 2019 (UTC.18-19/105).

The Committee **considered** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC. 18-19/105 **Appendix 1**).

- Three Year Review of International College Pathway (IPC) provision (M18-19/133 refers). At the May meeting of the PVC, Associate PVC, Associate Deans, and Head of ASO it had been agreed that the IPC, for Faculty Learning and Teaching Group (FLTG) purposes, be aligned with the Social Sciences Faculty. This decision had been endorsed at the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Group. This faculty alignment with respect to FLTG did not change the IPC's other governance and management structures.

**Action: Secretary FLTG Social Sciences**

- Periodic Review of Archaeology (M18-19/134 refers). In respect of the recommendation at para. 4.14, the Head of Archaeology had confirmed that the advice now published on the website ('Policy on staff groups seeking to engage with research activities') clearly defined the relationship between research and scholarship. In respect of the recommendation at para. 7.14, the Department had provided a revised response: the addition of a Google Calendar widget to the assessment deadline webpage. The Department had also reconfirmed that the precise deadline dates are communicated, by email, in advance of every deadline. This action is now closed.
- Periodic Review of Politics, Economics and Philosophy (M18-19/110 & 122 refer). Following a meeting between the Chair of the Panel, the Chair of UTC and the Head of Department of Economics and Related Studies, it had been agreed that the wording of para. 4.11 be revised as below [for transparency, additions are highlighted and text removed is indicated by strikethrough]

*The Panel was reassured by the Head's commitment to working with the PEP Director and students to understand their concerns and of her proactivity and openness to improving teaching performance that should benefit both PEP students and all students taking Economics modules. ~~However~~ In support of this, the Panel makes two recommendations to Economics:*

*a) To **continue to** address ~~long-standing~~ concerns about the quality of teaching and PEP student experience of Economics through review of the curriculum, **evaluating** ~~addressing~~ ~~peer~~ teaching practice and reviewing the separate provision of modules to single subject Economics students and combined (including PEP) students;*

*b) To review the **effectiveness of** training provided to Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA) collectively to ensure they are suitably equipped to teach what is expected of them, as well as continuing the tailored approach to addressing individual development GTA needs.*

The matters below were reported as ongoing:

- Model the impact of greater flexibility of staff on Timetable Key Performance Indicators (M18-19/102 refers). [Action: Space Services Manager].
- Review what is provided to exam boards and consider whether it would be useful to share a version of the report with external examiners (M18-19/126 refers). [Action: Chair of the Standing Committee on Assessment].
- Revise the proposal for an MA in Educational Practice in accordance with UTC conditions

(M18-19/135 refers). [Action: Department of Education]

It was reported that the Business Intelligence Unit (BIU) had conducted the initial additional analysis, arising from consideration of the Degree Entry and Attainment Profiles report (UTC. 18-19/88), requested by UTC. Whilst the initial analysis had been completed members noted that the further analysis (M18-19/125 refers), for example to investigate the link between Mathematics GCSE and A Level attainment on continuation/degree outcomes (in some degree programmes), had not yet been taken forward. It was reported that the BIU, in the light of other priorities, did not have the resource to conduct the further analysis. It was agreed that UTC's ongoing concern to better understand the withdrawn/withdrawn with award/failed cohorts (table 3 of report UTC.18-19/88) should be communicated to the Access and Participation Monitoring and Evaluation Team, and the analysis prioritised. The dependency, to complete this analysis, on the resource of the Access and Participation Monitoring and Evaluation Team, was noted.

**Action: PVC (TLS)**

### **M18-19/149 Oral Update from the Chair**

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

- Conjoint Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) / University approval events require that the Panel (appointed by the NMC and the Chair of UTC) act on delegated authority in any recommendation to approve.
  - A conjoint approval event for the new BSc in Nursing and MNurs programmes to start in 2019 had been held on 13 June. The programmes were recommended to the NMC for approval subject to three conditions. The Panel had comprised Steve King (Chair, UTC), Lisa O'Malley (UTC), Dr Isobel Ryder (University of Portsmouth, NMC registrant visitor), Caroline Thomas (Canterbury Christ Church University, NMC lay visitor), Dr Abbie Fordham-Barnes, (Birmingham City University, external subject specialist), Stephen Rogers (service user representative), Susan Birkitt (student representative), Juliet James (Academic Quality, Secretary for UTC) and Sally O'Connor (Academic Quality). The summary of the approval event would be received by UTC in October.
  - A conjoint approval event for the new FD in Health and Social Care: Nursing Associate would be held on 4 July. The UTC members of the Panel were Steve King and Richard Waites. Jane Iddon and Jan Ball would also be Panel members.
- The contingency meeting of UTC, scheduled for Thursday 18 July, was cancelled. It was possible that UTC consideration of a proposed combined degree in Law and Criminology would be needed prior to the first meeting of UTC in 2019/20 (M18-19/177 refers); if this were the case the proposal (including the reports of two external assessors) would be considered by circulation (remotely) by members.
- The Postgraduate Research Experience Survey had closed on 17 May with a final response rate of 40%.
- The Annual Learning and Teaching Conference 'Creating Valuable Learning Partnerships in the Contemporary University' would take place on Friday 21 June. The 2020 Annual Conference would take place on Friday week 10 of the Spring Term (13 March 2020).
- YUSU were congratulated on the organisation of the Showcasing Excellence Event (a celebration of student voice practices) and the Excellence Awards Ceremony which had taken place on 4 June.
- The final Professional Recognition and Accreditation Board for the Senior Technicians Accredited Co-Leaders in Science programme would take place on 3 July 2019. This is the sole programme delivered by STEM Learning and validated by the University; this meeting would therefore bring the validation arrangement between the University and STEM Learning to an end (UTC.18-19/125).

- Student Life Committee (SLC) had considered amendments, including a change of name, to the Fitness to Study/Attend Policy. The policy had been in operation for one year (from 2018/19) and the revisions had been informed by feedback from stakeholders and experience of the first year of operation. SLC had endorsed all of the proposed revisions with the exception of the change of the name of the policy; a consensus was being sought by remote correspondence.

*Secretary's post meeting note: the co-chairs of SLC had signed off the proposed changes to the policy (25 June 2019) and the Chair of UTC, acting on behalf of the Committee, endorsed the SLC decision and recommended approval of the policy revisions to Senate.*

- A revised complaints process had been approved by Student Life Committee (UTC.18-19/127).
- NSS 2019 results would be released by the Office for Students on 3 July. As last year, all data except for open comments will be publicly available from the outset. As is normal practice Marketing would provide advice on the messaging.
- The results of the Subject-Level TEF pilot were expected on 5 July. Results would be circulated to departments in the week of 8 July.
- The outcomes of the TEF Year 4 exercise had been published by the Office of Students on 19 June 2019 (and added to existing TEF awards). The University had not entered TEF Year 4; the Institution's Gold award lasts until the summer of 2021. The University's participation in the Subject-Level TEF pilot (and the results of this exercise) has no effect on the Institution's Gold.

#### **M18-19/150 Update from the Student Representatives**

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

- Those who had attended the Showcasing Excellence Event were thanked for their participation. Excellence Award winners, and those highly commended, were congratulated:  
*Teacher of the Year:* Winner - Peter O'Brien (Chemistry), Highly Commended - Phil Lightfoot (Physics)  
*Supervisor of the Year:* Winner - Louise Lepage (TFTV) Highly Commended - Christoph Baumann (Biology)  
*PhD Research Supervisor of the Year:* Winner - Penny Spikins (Archaeology), Highly Commended - Claire Chambers (English)  
*GTA of the Year:* Winner - Ruolin Hu (Education), Highly Commended - Charlotte Rowley (Archaeology)  
*Unsung Hero of the Year:* Winner - Jenny Smith (Cookies), Highly Commended - Jay-Jay Luckmann, Steve Foster, Andrew Hunter, Matt Brannan (Technician Team, TFTV)  
*Most Inspiring:* Winner - Dave Smith (Chemistry), Highly Commended - Freya Sierhuis (English)  
*Outstanding Feedback:* Winner - Stephen Minta (English), Highly Commended - Ignacio Jurado (Politics)  
*Supporting the Student Voice:* Winner - Alison Parkin (Chemistry), Highly Commended - Ruth Penfold-Mounce (Sociology)  
*Promoting Equality and Diversity:* Winner - Sara De Jong (Politics), Highly Commended - Edward Robson (SPSW)  
*Supporting Accessibility:* Winner - Walter Van Opstal (Space & Accommodation, Directorate of Estates & Campus Services), Highly Commended - Mariana Lopez (TFTV)  
*Championing Careers:* Winner - Amanda Barnes (Biology), Highly Commended - Fabien Baugard (Management)  
*Academic Officer's Award:* Winner - Jane Iddon (Academic Support Office), Highly

Commended -Ed Braman (TFTV)

- Recent issues, for consideration by the new Academic Officer (Giang Nguyen) in 2019/20, had been:
  - Peer Assisted Learning (PAL): Student Representatives were keen to support further PAL activities.
  - Content warnings: the Women's Officers had raised the value of issuing content warnings ahead of teaching subjects which could be distressing, due to lived experiences, to some students.

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

- Jane Baston had been elected Vice-President Academic for 2019/20. Jane was in post from 1 September and during her term of office was keen to look at the Graduate Teaching Assistant role.
- York was hosting the annual National Postgraduate Conference on 26 July 2019. The focus of the conference was the postgraduate experience in higher education. Members were welcome.
- A farewell celebration event for the President and the CEO would be held on 24 June.

#### **M18-19/151 Student Number forecasts**

*Rebekah Desport, Director of Planning, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report on student number forecasts (UTC.18-19/106). The paper provided an overview of current undergraduate and postgraduate taught student number forecasts (in terms of the potential to reach target).

The Director of Planning explained the ways in which the Medium Term Planning process had recently changed. During the course of the year the Planning Office had worked alongside Student Recruitment and Admissions to revisit, and in some cases 'reset', student number targets. This process of review had ensured that unrealistic targets (either overly ambitious or overly cautious) had been revised to a realistic base; thereby reducing the need for late-cycle changes (which are more difficult to accommodate). Discussions were taking place with those departments, where above target recruitment might accommodate an under recruitment elsewhere, for example in terms of what additional staffing and space is needed (to assure the quality of the student experience). The Director of Planning further explained that targets had been set to align with a department's strategy which in turn was aligned with the University strategy. These processes ensured that the Medium Term Planning process (and the resulting budget envelope) are informed by the department's (and University) strategy.

Members queried the extent to which the Medium Term Planning process took into account numbers of undergraduate students repeating year 1. The Director of Planning reported that the department's insight on those likely to repeat ensured that these numbers are factored in; that said it was difficult to predict accurate numbers this year due to the existence of just one year of data (2017-18).

Members commended the holistic approach being taken with respect to the Medium Term Planning process which, sought to minimise the impact of late decisions to recruit above the target numbers and therefore to protect the quality of the student experience.

The Chair thanked Rebekah for presenting the paper.

### **M18-19/152 Together York: International Student Integration project**

*Katy Mann Benn, Faculty Learning and Enhancement Project Manager, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report arising from the Together York: International Student Integration project (UTC.18-19/107). The project was based on the recommendations from a 2017-18 Together York project (UTC.17-18/102) plus overlapping proposals that were submitted to the Learning and Teaching Strategic Project Fund in Summer 2018.

The Project Manager outlined activities to date which included:

- the appointment of four interns who have each led a stream of work aligned to the project objectives;
- the mapping of existing buddy schemes and the establishment of a pilot framework for use online and in the Summer term;
- the creation of a series of postgraduate taught (PGT) workshops which focus on common challenges faced by PGT students whilst undertaking dissertations/advanced projects (at the time of the meeting there were 503 sign-ups);
- the establishment of a Special Interest Group which has attracted a large membership (82) and has met regularly to share practice and resources.

The Associate PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students (and academic lead for the project) noted that the project was an exemplar of collaboration between YUSU, GSA and the University. Members noted that it would be useful to consider how this model of activities might be used to support the integration of other groups, for example mature students. Members also noted that the resources created as part of the project would need to be carefully presented to avoid labelling as a set of resources for use by a particular group of students; the suite should be promoted as resources to support all students.

Teaching Committee **endorsed** the activities planned for 2019-2020:

- if the pilot proves to be effective, absorb integration workshops into existing support teams (with the Learning Enhancement Team, Library and Careers providing an annual programme of events from October 2019-September 2020);
- develop a series of staff workshops to share good learning and teaching practice for integrating students successfully into a learning community via forums/symposium;
- evaluate and analyse data from the pilots via surveys and focus groups and continue to roll out the buddy scheme for visiting students;
- locate case studies of good practice of internationalised curriculum and share these via existing forums.

The Chair thanked Katy for presenting the paper.

### **M18-19/153 Inclusivity Strategy**

The Committee **considered** a report from the Inclusivity Strategy Working Group (UTC.18-19/108). The paper outlined the background to the Inclusive Learning, Teaching and Assessment project and the overarching aim to implement a set of resources to embed inclusive practice(s) within the learning and teaching environment.

The Chair of the Working Group explained that the focus of the Group's work in 2018-19 had been objectives 1 to 5 (UTC.18-19/108, page 1). The audit (objective 3), which had focused on Sector-wide standards and practice, had not yielded data to effectively progress towards

a draft set of baseline standards for consideration by Teaching Committee. It had been decided that the audit framework should be contextualised around *York* best practice; the audit would therefore be repeated. The Chair of the Working Group confirmed the intention that the Group include student representation and that, during the Summer vacation, he would liaise with YUSU's Academic Officer and GSA's Vice-President Academic for appropriate nominees. During discussion of the redeveloped audit framework the following points were made:

- section 3 of the audit made particular reference to accessibility for students for whom English is an additional language and that it might be appropriate for section 4 to include a similar reference;
- it would be helpful to staff for there to be a clear delineation between legal requirements (for example the EU Directive on the Accessibility of Public Sector Websites and Mobile Applications which includes anticipatory responses for the needs of students) and what is aspirational best practice (but not a legal requirement);
- the framework (and the subsequent baseline standards) need to be inclusive of distance learners and degree apprentices (specifically with respect to the on-job training which is the substantive part of the delivery of a degree apprenticeship).

Subject to consideration of the comments above, Teaching Committee endorsed the redeveloped framework and **noted** that a proposed set of baseline standards would be brought, for approval, in the Autumn term.

#### **M18-19/154 University Policy on Recording of Lectures**

*Richard Walker, Head of Programme Design and Learning Technology, and James Youdale, Educational Adviser and Lecture Recording Coordinator, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report arising from the first year of implementation of the University Policy for the Recording of Lectures (UTC.18-19/**109**). It was reported that, as a condition of approving the policy (July 2018), Senate had requested that a review of the policy implementation (including data on student usage of recordings and impact on lecture attendance) be undertaken, with a report back to Senate in July 2019. The paper presented to Senate would be informed by feedback from Teaching Committee.

The paper presented a review of lecture recording activity across the University since the introduction of the policy, which came into effect at the start of this academic year (a 'soft' launch in September which allowed more time for departments to amend processes to ensure alignment with the policy by the start of the Spring term). As expected, the number of lectures being captured over the course of year was significantly greater when compared with the 2018 (the volume of recordings in the Spring term 2019 was 72% greater than the previous year). Two student surveys, undertaken via the Panopto gateway, formed part of the evidence base for the paper: the first took place between December 2018 and January 2019 (645 responses) and the second took place between April and May 2019 (619 responses). In addition to these two surveys a student focus group was held in January 2019 and a survey for Course Representative was conducted between April and May 2019. Feedback from staff (captured for example via departmental summaries, Chairs of Boards of Studies May meeting) on the impact of the policy also informed the review.

During discussion the following points were made:

- the ways in which feedback from students who are not using the lecture recordings was sought (for example the Course Representative survey which is considered to be more representative of usage) did not come through strongly in the paper;
- the evidence base appeared to be skewed towards self-reporting and therefore the paper might be strengthened, prior to consideration by Senate, by citing more of the

- technical data available via the VLE (for example, using one or two departments to illustrate, data of student usage at the module level);
- it would be useful to analyse the pattern of students' viewings across the academic year (and differentiate between undergraduate and postgraduate taught);
- lecture recordings do not universally capture the teaching of some subjects (for example Mathematics) effectively (whilst the paper cited an increase in the number of captures in the Department of Mathematics - 585 in 2017-18 to 1,702 in 2018-19 - these figures are not accompanied by student usage figures).

Teaching Committee suggested that the Senate version of the paper be revised, as appropriate (recognising the time and capacity constraints in order to meet the Senate deadline for papers), in accordance with members' comments, and **endorsed** the recommended actions outlined in the report, that:

- a summarised version of the policy be published on the Student Gateway;
- a stricter (prescribed) digital pro forma to capture recording provision and schedules be adopted;
- departments provide guidance to students on how to make use of lecture recordings, (this guidance be embedded within academic skills provision).

The Chair thanked Richard and James for presenting the paper.

#### **M18-19/155 Freshers' Survey**

*Dr Zoë Devlin, Executive Assistant to the Academic Registrar, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report arising from the Freshers' Survey results (UTC.18-19/110). It was reported that the Freshers' Survey is an internal-only survey (which was commissioned by the NSS Task Group) and has run annually since 2015-16. The survey ran from the middle of November to the beginning of January. It was **noted** that this was before the majority of students had completed any summative assessment, but such timing enabled first impressions to be surveyed contemporaneously.

Analysis had focused on understanding the characteristics of those respondents that self-reported they had been 'slow to settle' and 'slow to establish an effective study routine'. Surface-level analysis of the outcomes for these students suggests they were more likely to drop out of their programmes and to require resit attempts respectively. However, the need was identified to further analyse progression and award trajectories.

During its discussion, the Committee suggested:

- the value of additional analysis of the responses of students from Low Participation Neighbourhoods (LPN) and of the impact of UCAS tariff on entry on ability to establish an effective study routine;
- that exploration of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students' responses could question whether ethnicity or the wider contextual backgrounds of BAME students appeared influential;
- that departments could compare the contact hours on programmes against results for respondents reporting they were slow to settle, linking such activity to the *Together York* initiatives to promote international students' integration;
- that academic concerns were matters for departments to consider, but that where students slow to settle report loneliness or difficulties relating to flatmates that the colleges had a more leading role;
- consideration of the impact that Sociology's initiative to group first years with others from their college when organising first year seminar groups might have had on

- supporting Freshers to settle and establish positive routines;
- that the intersectionality of respondents' experiences warranted attention to understand the impact of multiple characteristics and to recognise nuanced experiences;
- that supervisors have a key role in identifying and supporting students that might be slow to settle and that the support and guidance to supervisors might need enhancing.

The Executive Assistant to the Academic Registrar believed it could be possible to examine LPN, tariff and BAME students' wider contexts, as well as sector comparisons in terms of ethnicity, drawing on the work by the Student Hub lead for BAME students. The Executive Assistant to the Academic Registrar also confirmed her intentions to meet with the GSA to discuss how the Freshers' Survey might be replicated to assess postgraduate students' initial experiences of the University.

The Committee was informed that the data would be made available to departments via Tableau, but advised that response rates from individual departments were often low, providing only limited insight into their Freshers' experiences. The Chair offered to add his support to any communication to departments promoting the release of the data, encouraging them to analyse it in their contexts and to use it to inform practices.

The Committee **endorsed** the recommendations for:

- additional analysis (by BIU and currently being scoped) of progression and award outcomes for respondents that were slow to settle and slow to establish effective study routines;
- additional analysis on the experience of BAME students (as part of the work of the Campus Community Cohesion Steering Group);
- a further report breaking down the data on students with disabilities, including those with mental health conditions, to be submitted to Student Life Committee at its next meeting; with the outcome of this work informing the Student Hub team in its planning of initiatives to support students with mental health difficulties.

The Chair thanked Zoë for presenting the paper.

#### **M18-19/156 Support for Repeat Year Students**

*Dr Jen Wotherspoon, Assistant Registrar: Student Progress and Deputy Director of Student Services, attended for this item.*

The Committee **considered** a report which outlined the process for supporting students when they begin their repeat year (UTC.18-19/111).

At its March meeting UTC considered a report (UTC.18-19/75) from SCA on the University's Repeat Study Policy. During discussion of the report, concern was expressed with respect to anecdotal evidence that repeating students were continuing to show patterns of poor attendance and engagement (UTC 18-19/108 refers). In the light of the concerns expressed by UTC in March and evidence, to date, which suggested that a large proportion of students who were permitted to repeat their first year in 18/19 were finding it difficult to meet the progression criteria, the Assistant Registrar: Student Progress had led on the drafting of a procedure and guidance to support students repeating study. It was noted that the approach was holistic, including both the department and the student's college, and included a 'Back on Track' plan (UTC.18-19/111, appendix III) which had been designed to encourage self-reflection and action planning.

During discussion the following points were made:

- for students taking resits in August, the time frame to make sense of the options and to make a decision, is very short;
- whilst the paper reported that “Departments and Colleges are invited to contact students directly to support them to make the right decision” the Assistant Registrar: Student Progress clarified that departments had been asked to designate a contact who was responsible for taking the lead (supported, in respect of pastoral matters, as appropriate, by the college);
- it would be helpful for the Guidance to Students (UTC.18-19/**111**, appendix II) to include a signpost for students studying with a Tier IV visa to seek advice from the University Immigration Advisor team;
- in order to support student engagement with the ‘Back on Track’ plan it may be beneficial to shorten its length;
- consider revising “This is a one-time offer. If things go wrong, there’s unlikely to be a third chance” (Guidance to Departments, UTC.18-19/**111**, appendix I) to make clear the circumstances under which a student might be permitted to study the first year for a third time.

Notwithstanding the discussion points there was universal support from the Committee for approach and the work undertaken. The Chair thanked Jen for her leadership to develop the process and guidance, and for presenting the paper.

#### **M18-19/157 Student Employability Strategy**

*Chris Tingay, Strategic Project Manager: Student Leadership, and Andrew Ferguson, Strategic Project Manager: Pedagogy and Placements, attended for this*

The Committee **considered** a report on progress with the Student Employability Strategy 2017-22 (UTC.18-19/**112**). The report provided an update on progress with the three key objectives of the Student Employability Strategy 2017-2022. In respect of Key Objective 1, York Futures, the Committee noted the dependency on IT resource and that the project would be scheduled into IT’s 2020 delivery roadmap.

An evaluation, including consultation with academic departments, of the 2017/18 York Strengths Development Days had been conducted, and had informed revisions to York Strengths (Key Objective 2), including a revised format (piloted at the end of the Spring term) to develop action planning. In respect of the timetable for delivery of the Development Days, it had been agreed that, for 2019/20, the Development Days would take place across the Spring and Summer terms (including some weekend dates). It was reported that, where a department had taken an active role in promoting the Development Days (and made links between York Strengths and the curriculum) student attendance was higher. Members advised that, in those instances where departmental engagement had been low, they could offer support to Careers (to encourage departmental engagement) in capacity as UTC departmental contact. Members queried whether subjects that are aligned more clearly to particular careers (for example vocational subjects) attracted greater student participation. It was reported that, whilst a causal relationship of this kind may well exist, the way in which the department had promoted the ‘relevance’ of the Development Day, appeared to be key.

In respect of York Strengths for postgraduates, it was reported that an online exercise (Online Discovery), resulting in feedback on strengths and development needs, had been developed. Autumn and Summer Development Workshops, to support students’ reflection following completion of Online Discovery, had also been developed. Members queried

whether postgraduate students could sign-up for an 'open access' Strengths Day (those Development Days not aligned to a department); the Strategic Project Manager: Student Leadership confirmed that postgraduate students could be given access to these in order to broaden the offering.

Members queried whether an explicit statement, on the way in which York Strengths linked to the York Pedagogy, had been developed. It was reported that, whilst skills were embedded within the nine (broad) Strengths, a formal mapping to the York Pedagogy framework had not been undertaken.

In respect of Key Objective 3, which is focused on students' opportunities to gain experiences to support personal and professional development, it was reported that 41 students would start the Careers-hosted placement year in 2019/20 (the figure in 2018/19 had been 21). An audit of professional development activity in the curriculum had been conducted in January 2019; departments' responses (18 received) would be used to develop case studies for wider dissemination.

The Chair thanked Chris and Andrew for providing the update.

### **M18-19/158 Module Evaluation**

The Committee **considered** a report from the Module Evaluation Working Group (UTC.18-19/113). Ed Braman, Chair of the Working Group, introduced the report and thanked the other Working Group members, Michael Bate, Joe Fagan, Sinéad McCotter, James Hare, Charlotte Chamberlain, Arthur Clune, and Adrian Lee, for their work. University Teaching Committee feedback on a progress report (M18-19/103 refers) and Faculty Learning and Teaching Group and Departmental feedback (UTC.18-19/113 **appendix 4**) had informed the proposals. The paper made a series of recommendations and raised points for discussion (provided in summary via Table 1 of the report); the primary recommendations were that:

- a small-scale pilot of the process (using a standardised evaluation form, ideally completed online, but with flexibility to use an alternative format) be undertaken in 2019-20 (with a view to full implementation, informed by the pilot, in 2020/21);
- the Working Group continue to meet to oversee the pilot and to develop a set of proposals (including policy and guidance) which draw on an evaluation of the pilot.

The Academic Officer, YUSU, explained that an underlying approach in respect of the design of the questions had been to stimulate student engagement with their own learning process

During discussion the following points were made:

- module learning outcomes in some subjects (for example History) are broad and it is therefore more challenging for a student to reflect on the extent to which their own learning and knowledge has developed;
- the proposed form did not directly address the design of student work nor did it explicitly seek the students' view on how the module fits into the programme and how it supports progression towards programme learning outcomes;
- elements of the Pedagogy were implicit in the proposed form and, if it were decided that the module evaluation process could also effectively serve to evaluate the impact of the York Pedagogy, the form would need to be substantively rewritten;
- perception that existing departmental innovative practice had not informed the proposals;
- in order for teaching staff to be able to evidence excellent teaching (for example for promotion) it would be beneficial for there to be more questions on teaching and the effectiveness of teaching methods.

The Associate Deans for Teaching, Learning and Students reported key points from faculty-level discussion.

Arts and Humanities -

- the rationale for the introduction of a standardised model was unclear;
- some departments had recently revised their own (local) processes with respect to module evaluation and therefore a process that promoted greater standardisation was perceived to undo this recent work;
- Qualtrics, the Working Group's preferred platform to support the proposed process, was not popular in some departments;
- whilst a pilot is the right approach the launch should be accompanied by a clear message that the pilot process did not represent a *fait accompli* in terms of universal implementation (from 2020/21).

Sciences -

- the benefits of moving to a standardised model were insufficiently clear;
- members queried whether, for the modules included in the pilot, the new process (and template) replaced the existing departmental module evaluation process or ran alongside (and in addition to) the existing module evaluation used;
- concern about the impact, on response rates, of completing the form online.

The Committee **agreed** that a pilot of the proposed module evaluation process (including use of a standardised evaluation form) be undertaken in 2019-20 and that the Working Group continue its work to oversee the pilot (and develop proposals based on the pilot).

#### **M18-19/159 Interdepartmental and cross-faculty teaching**

The Committee **considered** a paper on cross-faculty teaching (UTC.18-19/114). The paper set out the potential benefits of pursuing increased levels of interdepartmental and cross-faculty teaching at York alongside potential challenges, costs and obstacles to this. Barry Lee introduced the paper and he thanked all those who had contributed to the paper (acknowledgement<sup>1</sup> on pages 18 and 19 of the report). Whilst interdepartmental and cross-faculty teaching occurs within combined programmes elective take-up is lower at York compared with some of the University's competitors. The paper outlined the benefits of expanding interdepartmental and cross-faculty teaching and summarised the forms it might take including curated-electives and bespoke interdisciplinary modules.

During discussion the following points were made:

- a number of periodic reviews had highlighted the value of electives and interdisciplinary modules;
- the Faculty of Arts and Humanities was leading on the development of an MA in Creative and Cultural Industries (working title), an interdisciplinary programme (which, if approved, would also involve contributions from the York Management School and Electronic Engineering);
- the department of Theatre, Film, Television and Interactive Media (formerly Theatre, Film and Television) had recently developed a BA in the Business of the Creative Industries (approved by UTC in May 2018, M17-18/125 refers) with interdisciplinary modules / cross-faculty teaching;
- careful thought would need to be given to marking criteria for interdisciplinary modules;

---

<sup>1</sup> Including Paul Bishop, Psychology, whose name was missing from the acknowledgement.

- timetabling of modules for combined and interdisciplinary provision is especially complex (for example Natural Sciences pathways).

The Committee **agreed** that a Working Group (recommendation a) to carry out further investigation of the options for developing interdepartmental and cross-faculty teaching be established. The Committee endorsed the paper's recommendation with respect to membership (b) and the initial scope (c and d). Members were invited to contact the Chair of UTC if they would like to be on the Working Group.

#### **M18-19/160 Education: MSc in Mental Health and Well-being in Education**

The Committee **considered** a proposal (UTC.18-19/115) from the Department of Education for a full-time Masters programme to start in September 2020. The programme would comprise mainly of new core and optional modules, with the addition of two existing options. A Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate in Mental Health and Well-being in Education would be available as exit awards. The programme was yet to obtain planning approval, but was being considered by Teaching Committee on agreement with the Dean of the Faculty as Chair of the FLTG, and the Head of Department, to inform Planning Committee's consideration of a wider strategic plan in Education.

The proposals had also been considered by two external assessors who both recommended that the proposal should proceed. The Committee **noted** that the Department had addressed satisfactorily the external assessors' comments and suggestions.

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Matthew Perry and Jen Gibbons. They reported on the positive discussions they had had with the programme leader and their view that the programme was timely with an appropriate, holistic and inclusive focus. The proposal had the reviewers' support, subject to addressing the following issues which had been discussed in advance with, and agreed by, the programme leader:

- that summative assessment strategy relied too heavily on essays and that more real-world written assignments would be more appropriate and interesting for both students and examiners alike, as well as better reflect the practical and applied programme content;
- a number of minor amendments and clarifications to the programme design document, including revising section 5.d detailing requirements for lower awards, and to module descriptors.

The Committee **agreed to approve** the programme subject to addressing the reviewers' points.

**Action: Education**

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.

The Committee additionally **recommended** that the programme leader could consider:

- introducing a part-time variant of the programme;
- easing the student workload by staggering assessment deadlines so all summative work from Autumn and Spring terms is not handed in at the same time;
- revising the Programme Learning Outcomes as suggested by a Committee member and forwarded to the programme leader by the Academic Quality contact.

The Committee was informed that the ability to advertise the programme was subject to Planning Committee approval being obtained in due course.

### **M18-19/161 Law: Master of Laws in Law (Juris Doctor)**

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the York Law School for a new LLM programme, a 3 year taught, full-time, taught (400 credit) postgraduate law conversion programme starting with the UG Senior Status programme in years one and two and progressing to content from the LLM Professional Practice in year 3 (UTC.18-19/117). The programme would be taught on campus and would start in start in September 2020.

This proposal was a revised version of a proposal (for a Juris Doctor qualification programme) that had been considered in February (M18-19/83 refers). At its February meeting, the Committee had been supportive of the programme structure and content (subject to minor clarifications – all of which had subsequently been resolved) but had not approved the programme because it did not comply with the Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) (QAA, 2014), which reserves the use of ‘doctor’ for qualifications that meet, in full, the Level 8 descriptor.

The Committee was asked to note that, subsequent to the circulation of papers the Law School, on advice from the Academic Registrar, had agreed that the proposed programme title should be LLM in Law (Juris Doctor) rather than LLM in Law (JD). The use of Juris Doctor rather than the acronym JD ensured an open and transparent approach. Members observed that Leicester and Southampton included ‘pathway’ in the title of their LLB (Level 6) JD provision. It was reported that the Law School had considered use of the word ‘pathway’ and decided not to include it in the proposed new LLM because it could be interpreted as a preparatory programme.

It was noted that the revised proposal was for an award of LLM (as opposed to an award of Juris Doctor); an LLM award clearly identified the qualification to be Level 7. The proposed title – Master of Laws in Law (Juris Doctor) – signified, to the global market, that the programme was a gateway (subject to local bar regulations) to international legal practice. The Academic Registrar had written to the QAA for a steer on the appropriateness of the programme title (with respect to the FHEQ). Whilst the Committee agreed to **endorse** the proposal **in principle**, it agreed that approval be subject to a steer from the QAA that the proposal was FHEQ-compliant. A response from the QAA was awaited.

### **M18-19/162 Periodic Review: Management**

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessor reports and action plan arising from the periodic review of Management (UTC.18-19/118). John Robinson had chaired the review and he thanked the other Panel members, Lisa O’Malley, Charlotte Chamberlain and Jenny Brotherton, for their work.

The Panel had identified a large number of strengths including high levels of student satisfaction with respect to undergraduate provision, support for students to find placements, effective programme leadership and the successful launch of online postgraduate taught provision with an external partner (whilst recognising that this provision was not yet fully embedded in the School’s processes and structures, para. 2.10).

A central theme of the Periodic Review had been the rapid growth of postgraduate taught (PGT) student numbers. Related to this central theme were concerns about (i) the preparedness of some PGT students to study (particularly with respect to English language skills); (ii) deteriorating PGT student outcomes and; (iii) homogeneity of the PGT cohort. The Panel had made recommendations relating to these themes including working with International Recruitment with respect to increasing the diversity of the School’s PGT intake

and continuing to work closely with the Writing and Language Skills Centre with respect to student support needs.

The Committee noted that the Panel had made one University-level recommendation; that the relationship between TYMS students' admissions scores (including the component parts of IELTS scores) and attainment be analysed to examine correlations. The PVC for Teaching, Learning and Students (and Chair of the Panel) had requested that Student Recruitment and Admissions and the Business Intelligence Unit (BIU) take this work forward. The BIU were undertaking the modelling analysis for both the University and the School.

The Committee considered the action plan and the following points were made:

- 2.5, members observed that TYMS' response to the University-level recommendation indicated that the School had misunderstood the Panel's intention (which was focused on the need to understand, better than is currently the case, the impact of entry qualifications, including, but not limited to, IELTS component scores);
- 2.7, in the light of the shared concern (by the Panel and the School) regarding the homogeneity of the PGT cohort, members resolved that a stronger commitment to take this action forward (supported by International Recruitment) was appropriate;
- 2.10, whilst the response is very detailed, members observed that it might be beneficial for there to be greater specificity with respect to actions (and timescales);
- 6.2, typographical error ('over' should be replaced by 'other');
- 7.2, clarify whether the 'short student mental health' course relates to one of the (three) Mental Health First Aid training courses delivered by the University;
- 7.3, the action identified could be further strengthened through connecting the response with that at 2.4;
- 9.7, an action had not been identified (this was due to an omission on the template shared with the School).

*Secretary's post-meeting note: A response to 9.7 was received on 20 June. The Chair of Board of Studies would seek further information and take action to stop any discrimination within the department. This will be raised at the Board of Studies meeting in July.*

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.

#### **M18-19/163    Periodic Review: Education**

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessors' report and action plan arising from the periodic review of Education (UTC.18-19/119). Gulcin Ozkan had chaired the review and the other Panel members were Steve King, Charlotte Chamberlain and Adrian Lee. In the absence of the Panel Chair, Steve King spoke to the report.

The Department had engaged positively with the process of Periodic Review and the Panel was particularly impressed by the degree of collegiality and collaboration within the Department. The Panel had highlighted a large number of strengths which included the positive engagement with the implementation of the York Pedagogy, the effectiveness of relationships with external examiners and support for PGCE students.

The Panel had made a series of recommendations to the Department which included to: review the PGCE assessments to ensure consistency across subject areas; explore the introduction of assessed student contributions; and ensure through supervisor training and guidance, and information provided to students, that there is a common understanding of expected level of supervision support.

The Committee **approved** the report and agreed that appropriate actions in response to the Panel's recommendations had been identified.

#### **M18-19/164 Periodic Review: Psychology**

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessor reports and action plan arising from the periodic review of Psychology (UTC.18-19/120). Tracy Lightfoot had chaired the review and she thanked the other Panel members, Claire Hughes, James Hare and Juliet James, for their work.

Members of the Panel reported that the Review had been a very enjoyable experience, supported by two excellent external panel members. The Department had a widely recognised and well-deserved reputation for teaching and learning and this had been borne out during the visit.

The Panel had identified a number of strengths which included the Department's approach to improving employability and creating a culture that promotes teaching excellence and, its commitment to improving the student experience. In addition to the identification of areas of strength the Panel also highlighted seven elements of good practice which included the in-house support provided for academic writing, the active Early Careers Researchers Forum and the community-building Psych Squad Initiative. In order to support dissemination members of UTC were interested to know more about the Psych Squad Initiative (para. 2.4) and in particular the departmental structures in place which effectively support this student-led activity; a concise summary, which can be shared at, for example Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups (FLTG) and with Chairs of Boards of Studies, would be valuable.

#### **Action: Psychology**

The Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Students (Sciences) reported that the FLTG would receive the report, and discuss the good practice therein, at its first meeting in the Autumn term.

Members of the Panel noted that, where issues were flagged during the Review, in the vast majority of cases, they had already been identified by the Department and thus actions were already in progress. The recommendations made to the Department included to: explore how the assessment of the advanced option modules might be diversified; review the guidance for postgraduate research students with respect to the evidence needed for formal progress reviews; and consider the workload of GTAs, with the aim of ensuring that, in the short term, all GTAs are able to achieve an appropriate teaching-research-life balance and, in the longer term, that the use of GTAs is sustainable.

The Committee noted that the Panel had recommended that Academic Practice consider whether the briefings for Chairs of Boards of Studies might include a more informal element, to facilitate networking and sharing of good practice.

#### **Action: Academic Support Office**

The Committee **approved** the report and agreed that appropriate actions in response to the Panel's recommendations had been identified.

## CATEGORY II BUSINESS

### M18-19/165 New programmes, modifications and withdrawals

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

- two 3+1 variants to the BA in History and Politics (BA History and Politics with a year abroad and BA History and Politics with a year in industry) as transfer- in options at the end of the second year. The programme variants will be introduced for the 2018/19 1st year cohort.
- the suspension of the MA in Post-war Recovery Studies as follows: the part-time route is suspended for 2019-20 and the programme will only register full-time students in 2019-20. The full-time and part-time routes are suspended for 2020-21. The suspension is initially only for the above, pending a fuller review of the programme's future and wider Politics PGT portfolio.
- the suspension, for one year, of the LLM in Professional Practice (Corporate and Commercial) with immediate effect (the programme will not be offered for 2019-20).

### M18-19/166 Annual Programme Review

The Committee **received** an update on actions and issues arising from Annual Programme Review 2017/18 (UTC.18-19/**121**).

### M18-19/167 Policy amendments

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

- University Policy on the Approval of Modifications to Existing Taught Programme of Study (UTC.18-19/**122**);
- University Policy on Periodic Review (UTC.18-19/**123**).

### M18-19/168 Feedback Turnaround

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved Guidance for Heads of Department with respect to the consideration of exemptions to the University Policy on Feedback Turnaround (UTC.18-19/**124**).

### M18-19/169 Validated Provision

The Committee **received** an update on validated provision (UTC.18-19/**125**).

### M18-19/170 Revised UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Advice and Guidance

The Committee **received** a paper outlining the approach to reflecting on the revised UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Advice and Guidance (QAA, November 2018) and the outcome of the cross-university mapping exercise (UTC.18-19/**126**).

### M18-19/171 Annual report on formal complaints

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had considered the annual report on formal complaints received by the Registrar and Secretary in 2017/18 and resolved that there are no matters, patterns or trends that need further attention by Teaching Committee or other University-level body.

**M18-19/172 Revised student complaints procedure**

The Committee **received** the revised student complaints procedure (UTC.18-19/**127**).

**M18-19/173 2018 Statement from the OIA**

The Committee **received** the Annual Statement from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (UTC.18-19/**128**).

**M18-19/174 Degree apprenticeships**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved a Programme Design Document template for undergraduate degree apprenticeships.

**M18-19/175 Exchange agreements**

The Committee **noted** that the Chair had approved an exchange agreement between the Department of Archaeology and the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University, the Netherlands.

**M18-19/176 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups**

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

- Arts and Humanities meeting held on 29 May 2019 (UTC.18-19/**129a**);
- Sciences meetings held on 22 May 2019 (UTC.18-19/**129**).

**M18-19/177 Future meeting dates**

The Committee **noted** that the contingency meeting, Thursday 18 July, had been cancelled (M18-19/149 refers).

The Committee **noted** the dates of the 2019/20 meetings (all in HG21, Heslington Hall)

- Thursday 10 October 2019, 13.00-17.00
- Thursday 14 November 2019, 09.30-13.30
- Thursday 5 December 2019 - \*Annual Strategy meeting\* 09.30-13.30
- Thursday 12 December 2019: 09.30-13.30
- Thursday 6 February 2020: 09.30-13.30
- Thursday 12 March 2020: 09.30-13.30
- Thursday 14 May 2020: 09.30-13.30
- Thursday 18 June 2020: 09.30-13.30
- Thursday 16 July 2020 - \*contingency meeting\* 09.30-13.30. This meeting, to be held if required, is reserved for consideration of new programme proposals that cannot be accommodated in the cycle of term-time 2019/20 meetings and must be approved by the end of the academic year.