

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

Senate

TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2017

Present: Professor J Robinson (Chair)
Mr N Dandy
Mrs K Dodd
Dr S King
Professor S Bell
Professor J Buchanan (to M16-17/155)
Mr E Braman
Dr G Chitty
Mr J Fagan
Professor J Hudson
Professor A Hunt
Ms R Ibrahim (GSA representative)
Ms T Laycock (YUSU representative)
Dr B Lee
Professor T Lightfoot
Dr K Selby (to M16-17/155)
Professor J Thijssen
Professor R Waites

In Attendance: Mrs J Iddon (ASO, Secretary)
Mrs J Brotherton (ASO, Minute Secretary)
Mr J Porch (incoming YUSU Academic Officer)
Ms Helen Barret (SRA)
Dr David Gent (ASO) (M16-17/147- M16-17/149)
Louise Thurston and Tom Banham (Careers) (M16-17/154)
Dan Cashdan (BIU) (M16-17/159)

Apologies were received from Dr L Waldorf, Professor B Fulton, Professor G Ozkan
Professor D Smith and Dr E Major.

CATEGORY I BUSINESS

M16-17/142 Welcome

The Chair welcomed Helen Barret (SRA) and Julian Porch (incoming YUSU Academic Officer) who were observing the meeting.

The Chair reported that Dr Lars Waldorf would soon take up a post at another institution and that the terms of office of Rasha Ibrahim, GSA president (postgraduate student representative on UTC), and Tamaki Laycock, YUSU Academic Officer (undergraduate student representative on UTC) were coming to an end. Lars, Rasha and Tamaki were warmly thanked for their valuable and considerable contributions to the work of the Committee.

It was also noted that Dr Steve King, ex officio member of the Committee, would conclude his current term of office as Chair of the Standing Committee on Assessment (SCA) on 31 July 2017. The Chair thanked Steve for his invaluable contribution to Teaching Committee during his tenure as Chair of SCA.

M16-17/143 Minutes and Matters Arising

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 19 May 2017 (UTC.16-17/95).

The Committee **received** an update on matters arising from the minutes (UTC. 16-17/95).

- The proposal for the BA TESOL had not yet received planning approval (M16-17/60).
- The revised draft Policy on Inclusive Teaching Learning and Assessment would be received by UTC in the Autumn Term (M16-17/124).
- The summary of 2016/17 Postgraduate external examiners' reports would be explicit regarding actions taken by Departments in response to over-generous marking (M16-17/129).
- UTC would receive a progress report on the action plan arising from the Periodic Review of the Department of Health Sciences during the Autumn term (M16-17/131).
- The Chair of UTC had contacted the Director of Estates and Campus Services regarding the absence of a communal / informal space for students studying in Departments located near Alcuin and had also fed this into the Estates current vision development exercise advocating embedded social space (special reference to the Alcuin departments had been made) (M16-17/131).

M16-17/144 Oral Update from the Chair

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

- The Teaching Excellence Framework results had been announced and York had been awarded a Silver. The result was consistent with the University's performance against the metrics but, nonetheless, was a disappointment as the University had made representations for a Gold award. The BIU would be analysing the results and the methodology behind the benchmarking. The University would seek to act on any lessons that could be learned from the analysis and would consider appealing against the result if the analysis indicated that the decision was flawed.
- The Teaching and Learning conference had taken place on 20 June. The workshop and poster sessions had provided an excellent opportunity to share good practice. Thanks were extended to everyone who had contributed to the event.
- The Chair thanked members of the Committee and the Academic Quality team for the work that had gone into reviewing the 8 new programme proposals (M16-17/146-153 refer) which would be considered during the meeting
- It was noted that, further to M16-17/78, the proposal to extend the Spring CAP had been rejected by Faculty Executive Groups and therefore would not be taken forward.

M16-17/145 Update from the Student Representatives

GSA

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

- The new President and Vice-President of the GSA had been elected (a Masters and PhD student respectively) and they would take up their positions on 1 September 2017.

Student turnout had been significantly higher than in previous years with 681 votes cast.

- GSA was working on the induction for international students and had prepared a booklet providing key information about life in the UK.
- The GSA was celebrating its international student body by encouraging students to post blogs on its webpages about their country of origin, under the title 'International and Proud.'
- The GSA had been involved in the consultation on the revised policy on PGWT and the President of the GSA had been the student representative on the UTC three-year review of the Masters in International Humanitarian Affairs.
- The GSA representative warmly thanked members for their support during her time on the Committee.

YUSU

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

- Department representatives had completed their first training session. YUSU was still looking to recruit representatives from Criminology, Language & Linguistic Science and Social Policy & Social Work.
- YUSU's Excellence Awards had taken place and feedback from the event had been positive. Issues raised about timing would be taken into consideration in the planning for the 2017/18 event. The YUSU representative thanked all members of the Committee who had supported the event and members congratulated the award winners who were as follows:

Teacher of the Year: Highly Commended: Paul Pryor (Biology), Winner: Claire Metcalfe (Health Sciences)

Most Innovative Teaching: Highly Commended: Phil Lightfoot (Physics), Winner: Gareth Evans (Biology)

Supervisor of the Year: Highly Commended: Alex Reid (Psychology), Winner: Jessica Powell (Health Sciences)

Most Inspiring: Highly Commended: Angela O'Flaherty (Language and Linguistics), Winner Peter Thompson (Psychology)

PhD Research Supervisor of the Year: Highly Commended: Ruth Penfold-Mounce (Sociology), Winner: Jason Edwards (History of Art)

Supporting the Student Voice: Highly Commended: Cathy Dantec (Language and Linguistics), Winner: Richard Waites (Biology)

PGWT of the Year: Highly Commended: Annabell Zander (Archaeology) Winner: Jennifer McCaffery (Education)

Outstanding Feedback: Highly Commended: Katie Smith (Biology), Winner: Sam Hellmuth (Language and Linguistics)

Demonstrator of the Year: Highly Commended: Roberto del Pino (TFTV), Winner: Ben Coulson (Chemistry)

Unsung Hero of Non-academic Staff: Highly Commended: Ali Thompson (Natural Sciences), Winner: Auriel Hamilton (SPS)

Promoting Liberation & Inclusivity: Highly Commended: Matt Campbell (English), Winner: Sanjoy Bhattacharya (History)

Departmental Award for Teaching: Winner: Biology

Departmental Award for Feedback: Winner: Music

Departmental Award for Promoting Employability: Winner: York Management School
Academic Officer's Award: Library

- The YUSU representative introduced the incoming YUSU Academic Officer, Julian Porch. Members welcomed Julian to the Committee.

M16-17/146 MA in Social Research

The Committee **considered** the detailed proposal for the MA in Social Research (UTC.16-17/96) for which the programme structure (to allow recruitment to begin) had been approved by Teaching Committee at its meeting in November 2016 (M16-17/37 refers).

The programme was a one year full time, or two year part time, on campus programme to be introduced in September 2017. Possible exit awards were as follows: PGDip in Social Research, PGCert in Social Research, PGCert in Social Sciences. The following Departments would be contributing to the programme: Education, Economics, Health Sciences, Sociology, SPSW, Management, Politics, Psychology, History, Language and Linguistic Science, Law, CHE, CRD, Environment, PEP and CWS. The Programme had received planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Social Sciences.

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Dr Barry Lee and Prof. John Robinson. Comments from two external assessors had been requested by the programme team but had not yet been received. The UTC reviewers queried the evenness of the workload across the programme and, in particular, were concerned about the 60 credit load in the Autumn Term. It was noted that, whilst the teaching for the modules took place in the Autumn Term, elements of the summative assessment were scheduled for early in the Spring Term (thus spanning the four week Christmas vacation) and therefore students' workload was spread over a longer period than a single term. Furthermore it was explained that the structure had been amended slightly from that considered by Teaching Committee in November specifically the *Professional and Transferable Skills* module had moved from a three-term module to two-term (Spring and Summer) module; thus reducing the Autumn Term workload. The scheduling of Autumn module assessments had been carefully designed to allow for feedback during the module and also to support staff in guiding students with respect to the choice of more advanced modules later in the programme.

During discussion members also noted the large number of optional modules which may not all be available to every student due to timetable clashes. It was noted that constraints with respect to optional modules would be clearly articulated in the student handbook and that only the core modules would be published in detail on the website. The Associate Pro-Vice Chancellor for Teaching, Learning and Students reported that a programme leader would be soon be in post and emphasised the importance of the appointed programme leader owning the design of the programme; members endorsed this view

The Committee **agreed to approve** the detailed programme design (noting that the programme structure was approved by UTC in November 2016) subject to receipt of two external assessor reports and the satisfactory resolution of any issues raised by either assessor.

It was also recommended that the programme team consider:

- clarifying the meaning of "research decisions" (PLO 1) for example by adding "such as [...];"
- re-ordering PLO 3 to more clearly articulate its focus on ethics rather than dissemination (PLO 7) or design/methods (PLO 4);
- articulating the extent of the achievement of programme learning outcomes for exit awards in terms of what a graduate with a PGCert or PGDip is able to do (in addition to prescribing the module diet for the successful achievement of an exit award).

Teaching Committee decided that the proposal should be refined in the light of any issues raised by the external assessors and be subject to final sign-off by Dr Barry Lee (as the lead UTC reviewer) and Prof. John Robinson (as the second UTC reviewer and Chair of UTC).

M16-17/147 International Pathway College: Foundation Certificate Humanities, Creative Arts and Media

Dr David Gent attended for this item

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the International Pathway College for a two-term programme 'Foundation Certificate Humanities, Creative Arts and Media' (to run from either September to April or January to July) and a three-term programme 'Foundation Certificate Humanities, Creative Arts and Media (Academic Skills)' to run from September to July (UTC.16-17/97). Both programmes had received planning approval (from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Arts and Humanities) and would be introduced in September 2018.

Departments in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities which would be receiving students from the programmes had been extensively consulted and were supportive of the programme. A provisional list of progression requirements from the Foundation Certificate to programmes in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities had been submitted (UTC.16-17/97f).

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Prof. Andy Hunt and Prof. Gulcin Ozkan and it had their support. The proposal had also been reviewed by two external assessors and had their support subject to minor amendments.

It was noted that subsequent to the circulation of UTC papers, the assessment for the module 'Language and Study Skills 2' had been amended, such that the final mark would only be derived from the exams in speaking, writing, listening and reading. It was also reported that the error with respect to the number of contact hours (section 7c of the programme design document) had already been corrected by the IPC.

During discussion members of the Committee noted that the programme map had been well constructed. In line with a comment from one of the external assessors, members queried the appropriateness of the title of the programme given that modules offered very little humanities / arts content. The IPC's response (UTC.16-17/97e) explained the rationale for the programme title and acknowledged that the programme offers students a route into Arts and Humanities degree programmes rather than a being a detailed Arts and Humanities programme in its own right. Receiving departments had fully endorsed the inclusion of, for example, maths and statistics modules. The Academic Quality Team contact for the IPC confirmed that University naming conventions would not permit "for Humanities, Creative Arts and Media".

UTC **decided to approve** the programme (with no conditions).

Teaching Committee recommended that the IPC consider:

- amending the statement of purpose to ensure that it is applicant facing (it should be framed in the second-person [you]);
- amending PLO 2 to make clear the meaning of "key issues necessary";
- including more detailed explanation in section 7.c.i (contact with staff) of the programme design document.

In relation to the provisional list of progression requirements (UTC.16-17/97f) Teaching Committee recommended that, in consultation with the relevant department, the IPC update the list to ensure that:

- English language requirements were in line with the relevant standard departmental requirement;
- references to *ab initio* were made clear to those unfamiliar with the term;
- admission criteria were transparent and consideration of applications on a case-by-case basis (History) was avoided.

M16-17/148 MEng in Computer Science with Cyber Security

Dr David Gent attended for this item

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the Department of Computer Science for a MEng in Computer Science with Cyber Security (UTC.16-17/98); a four year full time on campus programme to be introduced in September 2018. A year in industry variant would be offered and there were no exceptions sought for the usual interim awards available for an Integrated Masters. The programme had received planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Sciences.

The proposal included an exception to the Modular Framework, as 6 modules would be studied simultaneously at Stage 3. This was necessary due to the programme's use of existing year-long modules.

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Dr Katherine Selby and Mr Ed Braman. The Department had provided satisfactory responses to the queries raised by the UTC reviewers and the proposal had the reviewers' support subject to some minor amendments. The proposal had also been reviewed by two external assessors and had their support subject to minor changes which had been addressed by the Department. The only substantive issue raised by the UTC reviewers and the external assessors concerned the coverage of cyber security material in Stage 2. It was reported that work in the Department to identify coverage of cyber security material in its undergraduate provision was already underway as a result of the requirements of IET and BCS accreditation; this would deepen connections between Stages 1 and 2 of the programme and Stages 3 and 4 (UTC.16-17/98e).

UTC **decided to approve** the programme, including the exemption from the Modular Framework to permit the study of six modules simultaneously, subject to the embedding of further preparatory material connected with cyber-security at Stage 2, and the strengthening of cyber security in the Stage-Level progression statements.

In addition to the condition above UTC recommended that the programme team consider:

- strengthening the statement of purpose and PLOs 4 and 5;
- the addition of further detail on assessment in the Overview of Modules table.

M16-17/149 MSc in Mathematical Sciences

Dr David Gent attended for this item

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the Department of Mathematics for an MSc in Mathematical Sciences (UTC.16-17/99); a one year full time on campus programme to be introduced in September 2018. Possible exit awards were a PGDip in Mathematical Sciences and PGCert in Mathematical Sciences. The programme had received planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Sciences.

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Prof. Dave Smith and Mr. Joe Fagan and it had their support. The proposal had also been reviewed by two external assessors and had their support, subject to minor changes.

The only substantive issue raised by the UTC reviewers in advance of the meeting was how the 20-credit 'project' module differed from the 60-credit dissertation module. The UTC reviewers had discussed this with the Department who had clarified that the 'project' module was far more guided (and involves skills development); students may do the same topic for both pieces of research, but if so they would not be assessed on the same material twice.

Members of the Committee also queried two further aspects of the proposal

- the limited coverage of PLO 6 and in particular the absence of references to the "literature review" element in module entries on the map;
- the absence of consultation with wider stakeholders at the development stage (section 4.b of the programme design document and raised by Careers in 5.c.vii);
- the clarity of the progression statements with respect to students who exit with a PGCert or a PGDip.

UTC **decided to approve** the programme subject to amending the programme map to more clearly articulate how PLO 6 was developed and where students gain experience of literature review.

In addition to the condition above UTC recommended that the programme team:

- ensure that the Department's process for guiding students with respect to differentiating their work for the project module and the dissertation module was clear;
- ensure that the mechanism for checking self-plagiarism with respect to the project assessment and the dissertation assessment was robust;
- consider amending the title of the project module to make it more distinct from the dissertation module;
- consider ways of ensuring students (particularly international students) were supported with transition by getting practice at examinations;
- articulate more clearly students' progressive development towards the achievement of PLOs for exit awards, specifically the progression statements should capture what a student who had achieved a PGCert/PGDip was able to do (in addition to the number of credits).

The Chair thanked David Gent for attending.

M16-17/150 Master of Social Work and Social Science in Social Work

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the Department of Social Policy and Social Work for a Master of Social Work and Social Science in Social Work (UTC.16-17/100); a four year full time on campus programme to be introduced in September 2018. The usual interim awards for an Integrated Masters would be available however it was noted that the interim awards were not approved by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) as giving entitlement to apply for registration as a social worker. The programme had received planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for the Social Sciences.

It was noted that the award of Master of Social Work and Social Science (MSWSS) was a new award title and, if approved, would require an amendment to the University's

ordinances. Furthermore it was reported that the programme required HCPC approval and a provisional date for the approval event had been set for January 2018. If approved by UTC the programme would need to be advertised in accordance with HCPC rules on programmes not yet approved by the HCPC.

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Prof. Tracy Lightfoot and Prof. Richard Waites. The proposal had also been reviewed by two external assessors and had their support, subject to minor changes. Substantive comments raised by the UTC reviewers concerned the:

- strength of the statement of purpose, the programme learning outcomes and the programme map;
- title of the exit award from Stage 3 of the programme;
- level of consultation with careers (section 5.e.v of the programme design document);
- consistency of approach at the module-level in particular with respect to the provision of formative assessment tasks and the notional hours allocated to private study versus assessment.

During discussion members of Teaching Committee queried several further aspects of the proposal:

- meaning of “statutory” (references throughout the proposal including in the statement of purpose and programme learning outcomes);
- clarity of the meaning behind “all teaching staff are made aware of every individual student support plan” (section 5.e.v of the programme design document);
- the scheduling of some assessments in Stage 4 during week 10 of the Summer Term and thus the timing of the meeting of the Board of Examiners;
- the scheduling of taught modules at the same time as placement modules in Stages 3 and 4;
- specific comments on the programme learning outcomes related to the complexity of PLO 4, the focus of PLO 5 (self-development and a critique of structured reflection) and the focus of PLO 7 which overlaps to some degree with PLOs 1 & 2;
- specific comments on the programme map included the limited coverage of PLO 4 (references to “relevant policy” and no confirmation of where local national and international policy are introduced or explored) and PLO 6 (there appeared to be limited development of promoting the health of others).

During discussion members queried the impartiality of one of the external assessor reports in the light of the existing relationship between the University of York and the University of Huddersfield as a result the Social Work Teaching Partnership. Moreover Huddersfield had recently validated an Integrated Masters programme in Social work which added to members’ concerns about the objectivity of the comments from the external assessor. On the one hand, given that the programme proposal is novel (no existing programmes of its kind were currently running), it was acknowledged that it was useful to have feedback from another institution that had recently approved a similar programme, nevertheless members were concerned that this gave rise to a possible conflict of interest. The Chair determined that the process had not been compromised on the basis that:

- planning approval had already been granted for the proposal and the external assessors were commenting on the content of the programme not the business case / market viability;
- as is usual practice, the proposal had been reviewed by a second external assessor, who had also advised that the proposal should proceed with minor amendments;

- the proposal had been subject to the usual internal scrutiny (including Board of Studies approval and review by the Department's Academic Quality Team contact and two nominated UTC reviewers).

UTC **decided to approve** the programme subject to a number of conditions:

- the Department should work with their ProPEL contact to strengthen the statement of purpose, the programme learning outcomes and the programme map. This work should take into account the feedback from Teaching Committee and the external assessors and should ensure that the differences between the integrated Master's programme and the MA in Social Work are clear (in the statement of purpose and the programme learning outcomes);
- clarify the title of the exit award from year 3 of the programme (section 1 of the programme design document);
- confirmation that Careers have been consulted and any issues they raise have been addressed;
- ensure that the award title and programme title are correct throughout the programme information;
- review modules to ensure that a consistent approach is taken, particularly with respect to the provision of formative assessment tasks and the hours allocated to private study versus assessment;
- consult with Student and Academic Services and External Relations with respect to ensuring that the distinctive elements of Stage 3 and Stage 4 of the programme, in terms of the additional credit load and requirement to work outside of standard term times, are properly communicated to prospective students.

Teaching Committee decided that the proposal should be refined accordingly and be subject to final sign-off by the UTC reviewers and the Chair of UTC.

Teaching Committee **recommended to Senate** the creation of a new award title, Master of Social Work and Social Science (this programme would be MSWSS in Social work), and that the University Ordinances be amended accordingly.

M16-17/151 MA in Comparative and International Social Work

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the Department of Social Policy and Social Work for an MA in Comparative and International Social Work (UTC.16-17/**101**); a one year full time, or two year part time, on campus programme to be introduced in September 2018. A PGCert in Comparative and International Social Work would be available as an exit award. The programme had received planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Social Sciences.

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Prof. Tracy Lightfoot and Prof. Richard Waites. The proposal had also been reviewed by two external assessors; one report had been included in the second circulation of UTC papers and the second report had been received by the UTC reviewers during the morning of the meeting. The first external assessor had been supportive and recommended approval with minor changes (UTC.16-17/**101a**) and the Department had responded appropriately to the external assessor's comments (UTC.16-17/**101b**). Substantive comments raised by the UTC reviewers concerned the:

- strength of the statement of purpose, the programme learning outcomes and the programme map;
- consistency of approach at the module-level in particular with respect to the provision of formative assessment tasks and the notional hours allocated to private

- study versus assessment;
- balance of coverage of research methods (very strong focus) and policy / practice (more thinly covered);
- absence of specialist modules or specialist material within modules (a comment also raised by the first external assessor).

During discussion members of Teaching Committee queried several further aspects of the proposal:

- the distinctiveness of the programme as articulated in the statement of purpose which members advised could be strengthened by using some of the detail in section 5.c.iii of the programme design document;
- the timing of the progression board (Summer week 10) in the light of the start of the ISM module;
- the clarity of the progression statement with respect to students who exit with a PGCert;
- specific comments on the programme learning outcomes related to the complexity and multi-dimensional focus of PLO 1 (and possible duplication with PLO 2), PLO 3 (members queried whether it should be design *and* conduct research) and a query whether “conducting and facilitating the management of a project” (PLO 6) is looking inwards to the programme content rather than employment;
- specific comments on the programme map included the limited development of different audiences with respect to PLO 5 (and the appropriateness of the reference to the dissertation in this context) and the limited development (one module) of PLO 6.

UTC **decided to approve** the programme subject to a number of conditions:

- the Department should work with their ProPEL contact to strengthen the statement of purpose, the programme learning outcomes and the programme map (and this work should take into account feedback from Teaching Committee);
- resolution of any issues raised in the second external assessor’s report;
- review of modules to ensure that all the information was complete and that a consistent approach was taken, particularly with respect to the provision of formative assessment tasks and the hours allocated to private study versus assessment;
- consideration as to how module aims, learning outcomes, content and assessment might be modified to address the first external assessor’s comments regarding the desire of students to pursue areas of specialist interest (e.g. mental health or children and families).

Teaching Committee decided that the proposal should be refined accordingly and be subject to final sign-off by the UTC reviewers and the Chair of UTC.

M16-17/152 LLM in Art Law

The Committee **considered** a proposal from York Law School for a LLM in Art Law (UTC.16-17/102) to be delivered in partnership with the Department of History of Art; a one year full time campus based programme to be introduced in September 2018. A PGCert in Art Law would be available as an exit award. The programme had received planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Social Sciences.

The programme had been reviewed in advance by Mr Joe Fagan and Dr Emma Major. The two UTC reviewers had met with the School in advance of UTC and were satisfied with the School's response to all of their queries. The proposal had also been reviewed by two external assessors who had recommended that it proceed without amendments.

It was reported that to aid student's preparation for the dissertation the School were considering adding workshops to the end of the later weeks of the Research Skills module and to the early weeks of the Dissertation module. It was noted that if the School pursued this the delivery breakdown would need to be amended accordingly in the module descriptors (via the module catalogue). It was also noted that the programme design document indicated that *Research Methods and Skills* (an existing module) was delivered during the Spring Term whereas the module descriptor indicated teaching over the Summer Term. The UTC reviewers reported that it was the School's intention to change the delivery cycle (Spring Term teaching only) of this module for all existing programmes.

During discussion of the proposal the following points were raised by members:

- assessment disparity across modules with the same credit weighting (for example one 20 credit module included a 1,500 word coursework task which was weighted at 80% whilst another 20 credit module included a 1,000 word coursework task weighted at 75%; other 20 credit option modules required a 4,000 word coursework task weighted at 100%);
- the proposed module *Art: A problematic life cycle* included a 20% participation assessment element and members queried the Department's justification for this element as non-reassessable (and considered there were alternative ways for 'participation' to be assessed after the conclusion of teaching, for example via a reflective piece);
- the start of the dissertation module relative to the end date of the taught modules;
- the clarity of the progression statement with respect to students who exit with a PGCert;
- the lack of input from the commercial sector for example auctioneers / dealers and their professional bodies (section 4b);
- the statement of purpose could reference auction/dealer environments;
- the development of students' digital literacy could be strengthened to cover for example online images and transactions (section 5.c.v);
- comments on the programme map included the absence of a reference to the ISM in contributing to the development of PLO 4 and erroneous references to the module Comparative Legal Systems (which should be Introduction to Comparative Law);
- the articulation of some of the programme learning outcomes was complex.

UTC **decided to approve** the programme subject to:

- addressing the gap in the programme with respect to the start of the dissertation module (for example by starting the ISM earlier in the Summer Term);
- articulating with greater clarity the development of students' digital literacy throughout the programme;
- clarifying the teaching cycle of *Research Skills and Methods* (LAW00021M) and ensuring that modifications to existing programmes were actioned and clearly communicated to the Student Services Assessment Team.

In addition to the conditions above UTC recommended that the programme team:

- review module assessments with a view to adopting a more consistent approach to the

- assessment workload for modules with the same credit weighting;
- articulate more clearly students' progressive development towards the achievement of PLOs for the exit award, specifically the progression statement should capture what a student who had achieved a PGCert was able to do (in addition to the award of a minimum of 60 credits).

M16-17/153 MA in International Development

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the Department of Politics for a MA in International Development (UTC.16-17/103); a one year full time, or two year part time, campus based programme to be introduced from September 2018. A PGDip in International Development and a PGCert in International Development would be available as exit awards. The Programme had received planning approval from the Faculty Learning and Teaching Group for Social Sciences.

The Programme had been reviewed in advance by Prof. Jacco Thijssen and Dr Gill Chitty. The two UTC reviewers had met with the Department in advance of UTC. The proposal had also been reviewed by two external assessors who had recommended that it proceed without amendments.

During discussion members queried the impartiality of one of the external assessors in the light of possible links between the programme team and the external's institution. To qualify as an independent external assessor nominees must:

1. not be a current or former external examiner of the University, unless a period of at least three years has elapsed since the expiration of your appointment
2. not be a former member of staff or student, unless a period of at least three years has elapsed since you left the University
3. not have any other links with the proposing department that might compromise the assessor's independence.

It was noted that that the third criteria was subjective and a matter of professional judgement.

Substantive comments raised by the UTC reviewers concerned the:

- strength of the statement of purpose;
- assessment of the programme learning outcomes and in particular the heavy reliance on group work to assess PLO 4 and PLO 6;
- rationale for the choice of programme learning outcomes as articulated in section 5 of the programme design document;
- compulsory fieldtrip and whether it was appropriate for students to be expected to pay for the cost of this in addition to the course fee (it was noted that if the student's tuition fee was not inclusive of the fieldtrip cost an alternative learning experience should be offered);
- visa implications for those studying with a Tier IV visa arising from the optional placement element;
- consideration of equality and diversity with respect to fieldwork and placements (section 5.e.iii of the programme design document);
- explanation of the programme and assessment design as articulated in section 7c of the programme design document;
- mapping the contribution of modules to programme learning outcomes and the appropriateness of the groupings of the modules on the programme map.

During discussion members of Teaching Committee queried several further aspects of the proposal:

- specific comments on the programme learning outcomes related to the need for PLO 2 and PLO 3 to convey the purpose (members suggested that some of the positive phrases from 5.c.vi about problem solving could be used) and a query whether “problem-based exercises and group presentations” (PLO 4) were references back to the programme content rather than employment situations;
- the timing of one assessment element for the Fieldtrip module which occurred immediately after the end of the fieldtrip;
- whether research training was embedded in the dissertation module (and if it was not where in the programme research training skills were developed);
- the explanation of the development of students’ digital literacy as was articulated in section 5.c.v of the programme design document (the focus was currently on how technology was used on the programme rather than articulating students’ active use of digital literacy abilities);
- the clarity of the progression statements with respect to students who exited with a PGCert or PGDip (which should capture what a student who had achieved a PGCert or a PGDip was able to do in terms of the extent of the achievement of the programme learning outcomes);
- the absence of consultation with wider stakeholders at the design stage (section 4.b of the programme design document);
- the strength of the programme map specifically:
 - ‘progress towards PLO’ had not completed
 - core modules had not been given separate entries
 - the absence of a clear sense of progression and where particular modules contributed differentially to the achievement of programme learning outcomes (for example the entries for PLO 4 and 5 were repetitious)
 - the balance between theory and practice, commended by one of the external assessors, was not evident in the programme map.

In the light of the substantive comments raised by members the Committee decided not to approve the programme proposal.

UTC decided that the programme team should work with their ProPEL contact to strengthen the proposal and to address the Committee’s comments. Furthermore in the light of the perception that there may be an issue regarding the independence of one of the external assessors it was decided that the Department should nominate a third external assessor to comment on the revised proposal.

In order that a substantive revision, in accordance with UTC comments, could be considered in a timely way the Committee agreed that the UTC reviewers and the Chair would be empowered by the Committee to consider for approval the revised proposal on UTC’s behalf.

M16-17/154 Employment Strategy

Louise Thurston and Tom Banham attended for this item.

The Committee **considered** the new Employment Strategy (UTC.16-17/**104**). The Strategy had been aligned with three key initiatives: the Student Leadership Framework, York Futures, and Placement Learning. An updated version of the strategy document (UTC.16-17/**104 appendix 1**) was tabled which included revisions made in response to feedback from the Employability Strategy Group (ESG), Employability Operations Group (EOG) and Careers. The updates included specific reference to postgraduates and industry connections in the Key Objectives, more detailed Supporting Objectives (SOs), and the Strategy had been linked to broader University strategies.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- Members considered the target outcome 'to be in the top 10 of Russell Group Universities for employment outcomes by 2022'. The University was currently 20th and members discussed whether the target was sufficiently ambitious. It was noted that achieving the target was dependent on the performance of other institutions and members suggested that a York specific target, instead of a league table position, could be considered particularly given the number of different metrics for employability.
- The wording of SO3 'all undergraduate students will have the opportunity to undertake an accredited placement year..' should be revised to make it clear that placements were not guaranteed and that a footnote should be added to highlight exceptions (UTC.16-17/82, considered by UTC at its May meeting, details the approved exemptions).
- KO1 stated that, by year 2 and 3, 4000 first years would be introduced to the Leadership Framework through York Futures. Members noted that this was ambitious given that York Futures was not a mandatory process.
- The Committee questioned how the 9 leadership principles had been determined for the Student Leadership Framework. It was reported that they had been identified by an external agency as the key things which the majority of employers were looking for.

The Committee noted that the Strategy would be given further consideration by ESG and UEB and, subject to consideration of the points above, it **endorsed** the proposed Strategy and the three key objectives.

The Chair thanked Louise Thurston and Tom Banham for presenting the paper.

M16-17/155 Attendance Monitoring Policy

The Committee considered a proposal for an Attendance Monitoring Policy (UTC.16-17/105). The Policy aimed to enable the capturing of data which would provide a greater understanding of student participation in teaching and learning and highlight any issues around engagement. Once a software solution had been secured, attendance at all timetabled teaching events, including exams, would be captured through a centrally managed online system and shared with Departments. Departments would be expected to set thresholds for attendance and the monitoring of attendance would be reviewed on an annual basis by Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups. It was intended that the software solution include the mechanism to generate automatic communications. The Policy would complement existing monitoring schemes for Tier 4 students and those set out by PSRBs. Once approved for implementation, it would be the Policy which UK Visas and Immigration (UKVI) would test the University against.

The following points were highlighted during discussion:

- Members considered that there were benefits in developing a separate engagement strategy to complement the proposed attendance monitoring policy.
- The Committee was pleased that the Policy would support the Policy on Presumed Withdrawal, as members had found this to be a difficult and protracted process.
- The Committee noted that the implementation of the Policy was dependent on the procurement of appropriate IT systems. It emphasised that attendance monitoring was not feasible unless processes were automated and robust.
- The Committee was supportive of the decision to allow Departments to set attendance thresholds but noted that this posed challenges for students studying on combined programmes. Departments would need to ensure that expectations

were clearly communicated and that this was particularly important for students on combined programmes (who may be subject to different thresholds).

- Paragraph 4.7 should state that the Department thresholds must be UKVI compliant.
- In addition to Department's attendance monitoring reports being reviewed by FLTGs, they should be considered by Boards of Studies and could be reflected on through the Departmental-level Annual Programme Review report. It was noted that this, to some extent, would address the point raised regarding engagement.
- Paragraph 4.11 should specify a time period (i.e. termly).
- Concerns were raised about the Policy being overly intrusive, particularly the plans to develop a Student Dashboard with analytics on contact points such as VLE usage, library access and key card swipes. While students may be appreciative of analytics, the development of this would need to be carefully planned and communicated; it would need to be clear to students that the analytics (benchmarked to peers) were a form of feedback to support positive self-monitoring. In the light of the sensitivities and possible student perceptions arising from the proposal for a Student Dashboard, members **agreed** that, while the benefits of analytics to support engagement should be borne in mind, the proposal under consideration should maintain a focus on attendance monitoring. To this end, the Chair proposed, and the paper's sponsor agreed, that 7.1 and 7.2 should be replaced with 'this Policy is not intended to establish a student analytics or engagement system, but acknowledges that implementation of the centrally managed online system (referred to in paragraph 4.5) should include consideration of possible usage for analytics (constrained by paragraph 4.8).'

Subject to the points raised above, the Committee agreed **to recommend the Policy to Senate** for approval for implementation once an IT system had been developed to support it.

It **agreed** that the following further work should be undertaken:

- Development of standardised templates for communicating to students
- Development of a student facing website for attendance monitoring

M16-17/156 Policy on Assessment Feedback Turnaround Times

The Committee **considered** a proposal to reduce the maximum time limit for feedback on student work from six weeks to four (UTC.16-17/**106**). The proposal had been included in the paper on the policy implications of the Student Partnership Agreement (UTC.16-17/**33**) which Departments had been asked to comment on. Some objections had been raised, however, a majority of Departments had indicated support of a reduced maximum turnaround time.

The Committee discussed the proposal and noted the following:

- An example from TFTV was highlighted where, for practical reasons, an exception to the current 6 week turnaround Policy had been approved. The Chair agreed that the process whereby Departments could seek an exemption from the University feedback policy would continue (via SCA and UTC consideration).
- It was noted that the release of marks together at the end of the Summer Term could, in some cases, mean that feedback given at that time could include exams from the early part of the Common Assessment Period which would be more than 4 weeks earlier.

- It was noted that the reduced turnaround period would increase pressure on markers, particularly during the Spring term when teaching started immediately after the exam period.
- If an amendment to the maximum turnaround time for feedback was agreed this would necessitate changes in the Module Catalogue. It was suggested that the University's Policy on maximum feedback turnaround time should appear as standard text in the feedback field. It was noted that, in addition to the introduction of standard text, careful thought would need to be given to the process for managing necessary amendments to the free text feedback field (which was populated by Departments) given that it sometimes included more information than just the feedback turnaround time (for example the format of feedback / formative assessment details).

Action: Programme Module Catalogue Board

- The period should be expressed as twenty working days rather than four weeks to take account of public holidays.

The Committee **agreed to recommend to Senate** that the University's maximum time limit for feedback on student work should be reduced from six weeks to twenty working days and that the revised policy should be a requirement from the start of 2018-19, allowing for transition during 2017/18.

M16-17/157 Policy on Postgraduates Who Teach

The Committee **considered** a proposal to amend the University Policy on Postgraduates Who Teach (UTC.16-17/107).

The revisions to the Policy (renamed the University Policy on Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs)) aimed to:

- improve clarity and make key information easier to find
- ensure that the Policy is up to date and consistent with applicable Human Resources policies and procedures
- place greater emphasis on the experience of taught students
- highlight the principles that should underpin departments' engagements with GTAs
- clarify what is expected of departments
- retain flexibility to allow for disciplinary and departmental differences
- strengthen existing policy where appropriate
- incorporate good practice.

The revised policy had been subject to wide consultation which included; Human Resources, PGWT coordinators in Departments, the Research Excellence Training Team, Academic Practice, GSA, YUSU, SCA, the Learning Enhancement Team, YGRS and RSA. The revised policy had been amended in the light of feedback received via this consultation.

Members welcomed the revised Policy, particularly the clarifications with respect to departmental responsibilities.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- where GTAs are appointed for a fixed duration it should be clear that this appointment is subject to performance and conduct (para. 39);
- it should be clear that, whilst PGRs may continue to be engaged as a GTA during a

- Leave of Absence, this would be subject to visa restrictions (para. 96);
- exceptions which permitted postgraduate taught students to engage in supporting student learning should be approved on an annual basis (para. 9);
- consideration should be given regarding any exemptions with respect to the IELTS requirement (for students for whom English is not their first language) for students who had successfully followed a full-time university degree level programme in the UK – specifically whether the standard admission threshold should be applied (para. 48);
- members noted that, whilst the Policy made clear that GTAs do not fall within the scope of Statute 24 on the conduct, discipline, dismissal, suspension and grievances of employees (para. 94), it was not clear which process would be followed in the event of a misconduct allegation;
- the Policy should capture the procedure GTAs should follow in the event of a conflict of interest, for example where a GTA had a close relationship with a student. It was noted that a comparable procedure had already been developed for College Tutors and that this could usefully be adapted for GTAs;
- the Policy should be checked to ensure that it gives no implication that PGR students on a taught module engaging with peer supported learning are GTAs;
- whilst the Policy made clear that support departments (for example the Academic Support Office with respect to the Writing Centre and Maths Skills Centre) were within the scope of the Policy (para. 12), in the absence of a Board of Studies, it was not clear where oversight for a support department's GTA policy lay (para. 14) or how it would be monitored and reviewed, and it was agreed that consideration of this issue should form an additional area of further work;
- the Policy made clear that attendance at the University's *Introduction to Learning and Teaching* course was not paid and the rationale for this (para. 60) but that attendance at additional meetings / incidental training (not considered an expected part of a PGR's professional development) should be paid;
- it was suggested that YUSU's 'What is Excellence' conference could have a GTA component.

The Committee **agreed to recommend the revised policy Senate**, subject to consideration of the points listed above, and **agreed** that Departments should update their policies to ensure that they were in line with the new Policy over the academic year 2017/18. The Committee **approved** the areas which had been identified for further work:

- updating the generic GTA role descriptions in consultation with stakeholders to form Appendix 1 of the Policy, and to include good practice in GTA training to form Appendix 2 of the Policy (both subject to the approval of the Chair);
- liaising with Human Resources with respect to their policies and procedures for temporary and casual workers to ensure compliance with UK employment requirements and to ensure clarity with respect to the correct process arising from an allegation of misconduct (amendments to the policy arising from this will be subject to the approval of the Chair);
- exploring whether any resources are available to develop a University level resource (e.g. on the VLE) for GTAs, and to produce an optional template for departments to use to provide essential information for their GTAs;

Action: ASO

- clarifying the role of GTAs with respect to assessment (to be considered by UTC in 2017/18).

The Committee also agreed that oversight of GTAs who are employed by support services should form an additional area of further work.

Action: ASO

M16-17/158 Programme Design Parameters for Distance Learning Programmes with Academic Partnerships

The Committee considered proposed programme characteristics for the design of distance-learning programmes developed in partnership with Academic Partnerships (UTC.16-17/108).

The programmes would consist of 180 credits at Masters Level, with a minimum of 120 credits of taught modules. All modules would be 15 credits with the exception of independent study modules which would be multiples of 15 up to a maximum of 60 credits. Each 15 credit module would normally be delivered over 7 weeks and up to one week for assessment; thus the notional weekly workload would be 18.75 hours. There would be 6 entry points a year and all programmes would operate a 'carousel model'. Students would be required to complete an introductory module, after which the other modules could be studied in any order (which would be determined by the point that the student joined the 'carousel'). The standard time for completion of a programme would be 2 years (studied part-time).

The proposed carousel structure would require exemptions to the University's rules regarding re-assessment: it was proposed that there be no upper limit on the number of modules which can be re-assessed, with the exception of any independent study modules which can only be re-assessed if a marginal fail was awarded.

It was reported that the Management School had been working on programme proposals, for consideration by UTC at its extraordinary meeting in July, on the basis of a 10 credit structure. The Committee noted that the recent proposal to design programmes using a 15 credit structure meant that developing high quality programmes in the timescale was challenging. The Associate PVC explained the rationale for the change from a 10 credit model (preferred by Academic Partnerships) to a 15 credit model which arose from the need to design a part-time Master's programme for which the standard duration would be two years (the sector norm in the UK).

It was acknowledged that the carousel model, which comprised a credit accumulation element, was challenging with respect to the Pedagogy; specifically its emphasis on progression. The Associate PVC reported that carousel model could accommodate the key principles of the Pedagogy; the introductory module would always be studied first and it was envisaged that the independent study modules would be studied towards the end of the programme, thus it was possible to ensure progression in a more flexible design. The School's ProPEL contact and the School's Academic Quality team contact had been supporting the Management School with respect to the design of the programmes and would continue to provide support as needed.

Other specific points noted by the Committee were as follows:

- 7.4 - should be amended to state that feedback would be delivered within 20 working days (see M16-17/156).
- 7.3 – “completed” should be changed to “submitted”
- 7.6 – “re-assessed” should be changed to “resubmitted”
- it should be clear that, whilst there were no maxima with respect to the number of modules which could be re-assessed, re-assessment for each module was limited to one occasion only.

The Committee **agreed to recommend to Senate**, subject to the agreed amendments, that:

- the proposed programme characteristics for the design of on-line programmes developed in collaboration with Academic Partnerships be approved;
- exemptions to the rules associated with compensation and re-assessment, which arise from these programme characteristics, be approved for the suite of Masters programmes designed in collaboration with Academic Partnerships.

M16-17/159 Degree Outcomes 2015/16

Dan Cashdan attended for this item

The Committee considered a report on undergraduate and postgraduate taught degree outcomes for 2015/16 (UTC.16-17/109). It was noted that the associated interactive Tableau workbooks could be accessed from the Management Information Gateway. The report highlighted that the percentage of good UG degrees awarded had increased by 0.7 percentage points to 81.2%. This increase was in line with the Russell Group where the percentage point increase was 0.8% (and the proportion of good degrees awarded was 82.5%). The proportion of postgraduate taught students ‘qualifying with an award at the intended level’ was slightly higher in the University than the Russell Group average, at 89.5% compared with 89.3%.

As in previous years there was significant variation between Departments where the proportion of good degrees awarded at UG level varied between 54.8 to 97.3%. A deep analysis of the results was being undertaken to better understand the contributing factors behind the variation and this would be considered by SCA and UTC in the Autumn term.

The Committee noted that a number of Departments were not included in tables showing postgraduate taught outcomes by Department. It was reported that this was the result of the application of a minimum threshold student cohort of 30. The results from these Departments could be accessed from the Management Information Gateway.

Members queried the methodology behind the use of value added data in the Guardian League table. It was reported that the Guardian’s methodology with respect to value added scores was opaque; BIU’s analysis of the University’s value added data reported a better outcome than the Guardian’s analysis of the University’s performance. It was noted that the BIU was undertaking a thorough analysis in order to understand the disparity.

The Chair thanked Dan Cashdan for presenting the report.

M16-17/160 Periodic Review of Social Work

The Committee **considered** a report, external assessors’ reports and action plan arising from the Periodic Review of Social Work (UTC.16-17/110).

It was reported that the Review had been positive and the Department had engaged constructively with the process. It was noted that the Review had taken place at a time of significant change for Social Work education; as a result, some discussions with the Department had focused on planned strategic developments. The Panel sought feedback from students prior to the Review, via scheduled telephone discussions including with distance-learning students (studying the Think Ahead programme), and during the Review via the usual face-to-face meetings; the Panel had found this feedback particularly helpful. The Periodic Review identified a number of strengths and good practice which included the:

- Department's approachable, supportive and responsive staff;
- innovative, fast-track Think Ahead programme;
- work of the placements team to improve the organization and management of placements;
- way in which research strengths fed into teaching.

The Committee considered the Department's action plan and agreed that the identified actions were appropriate. It was suggested that the Department should consider whether any other practical measures could be introduced in response to the recommendation related to the promotion of support services to Think Ahead students (para. 8.6). Members also suggested that it would be helpful for the Department to seek input from the Careers Service with respect to addressing the recommendation related to placement support (para. 8.10). The Committee was pleased to note that several actions had already been completed.

A concern was raised about recommendations which had resource implications given that the Panel did not have access to data regarding resource constraints. The Chair observed that although there were some resource implications, the recommendations related to teaching and learning, and the Department had the opportunity to respond to the recommendations in its action plan (a response could be the rationale for not being able to take a recommendation forward).

It was noted that four Departmental-level recommendations required support from professional services: the CPD Unit, the Learning Enhancement team, the Director of Colleges and the Timetabling Office. These offices would be advised of the recommendations. The Committee observed that the Review had, again, highlighted concerns about the absence of informal / communal space for students studying in Departments located near to Alcuin College (M16-17/143 refers).

The Committee **approved** the Report and the action plan arising from the Periodic Review of Social Work subject to further consideration of the actions identified in response to 8.6 and 8.10 (as suggested above).

M16-17/161 Repeat Study

The Committee **considered** a proposal from the Standing Committee on Assessment for a pilot to allow repeat study for undergraduate students who failed to progress from Stage 1 (UTC.16-17/111). The pilot would take place during 2017-18 and 2018-19, with a review at the start of 2018-19. Students would be required to repeat the year in its entirety including all teaching and assessment tasks. Both attempts at the year would be shown on students'

transcripts and there would be no numerical advantage, as the first year did not contribute to students' final degree classification.

The Committee was supportive of the intention to find a mechanism for allowing students to repeat study. It was noted that competitor institutions were already providing students with this opportunity and that not doing so was impacting negatively on the University's retention rate. It was noted that this proposal was a limited form of repeat study and would permit Stage 1 students, who may take longer to adapt to university life, the opportunity to repeat the year.

Members observed that the proposal would require Departments to ensure that they were not recycling summative assessment tasks. It was noted that this should not be happening in any case, and that students with exceptional circumstances may already be permitted to repeat study.

The Committee supported the proposed pilot introduction of repeat study of Stage 1 in 2017-18 and 2018-19 and **agreed to recommend to Senate** that the assessment regulations should be amended to permit this.

Action: Secretary / Chair of SCA

CATEGORY II BUSINESS

M16-17/162 Annual Programme Review 2015/16

The Committee **received** an update on actions and issues arising from Annual Programme Review 2015/16 (UTC.16-17/**112**).

M16-17/163 Validated Provision

The Committee **received** an update on validated provision (UTC.16-17/**113**).

M16-17/164 Timetabling data

The Committee received a report on the additional timetabling data which it had requested at its February meeting (M16-17/79 refers) (UTC.16-17/**114**)

M16-17/165 Programme withdrawal

The Committee noted that the Chair had approved the academic case to withdraw the MSc Advanced Mathematical Biology, with effect from 2018/19. Planning Committee approval to withdraw the programme was subject to approval of the MSc Mathematical Sciences. (approved, M 16-17/149 refers)

M16-17/166 Extraordinary meeting

The Committee noted that there would be an extraordinary meeting of Teaching Committee in July to consider, for approval, three proposed distance learning programmes.

(Secretary's post-meeting note: in order to allow more time for the distance learning programmes to be developed it was decided that Teaching Committee would consider the proposed Management School programmes in the usual cycle of UTC meetings in 2017/18. The extraordinary meeting scheduled for 13 July was thus cancelled.)

M16-17/167 LLM in Professional Practice

The Committee received an update report on the outcome of the second joint University/Solicitors Regulation Authority approval event (held on 15 May 2017) to consider the proposed LLM in Professional Practice (Corporate and Commercial) and noted the approval decision (UTC.16-17/**115**).

M16-17/168 Standing Committee on Assessment

The Committee **received** a report on the meeting of the Standing Committee on Assessment on 19 May 2017 (UTC.16-17/**116**).

M16-17/169 The Committee **noted** the minutes from the meeting of the Distance Learning Forum held on 15 May 2017 were available at

<https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/teaching/contacts/committees/distance/>

M16-17/170 Faculty Learning and Teaching Groups

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

- Arts and Humanities meeting held on 22 May 2017 (UTC.16-17/**117a**)
- Social Sciences meeting held on 22 May 2017 (UTC.16-17/**117b**)
- Sciences meetings held on 23 May 2017 (UTC.16-17/**117c**)

M16-17/171 Dates of Future Meetings

The extraordinary meeting would take place on Thursday 13 July at 13.30, in seminar room 001 in the Spring Lane building.

(Secretary's post-meeting note: The extraordinary meeting scheduled for 13 July was cancelled. M16-17/166 refers.)

The Committee noted the dates of the 2017/18 meetings which would take place in HG21, Heslington Hall:

Thursday 5 October 2017, 13.30-17.30

Thursday 9 November 2017, 9.30-13.30

Thursday 7 December 2017, 9.30-13.30

Thursday 8 February 2018, 9.30-13.30

Thursday 15 March 2018, 13.30-17.30

Thursday 17 May 2018, 9.30-13.30

Thursday 21 June 2018, 9.30-13.30 in HG21, Heslington Hall